

[The following version of this paper is made available via www.arthuriana.co.uk; the final published version is T. Green, 'The British Kingdom of Lindsey', *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies*, 56 (2008), 1–43]

The British Kingdom of Lindsey

Thomas Green
Exeter College, Oxford

That there was indeed an early Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Lindsey is now generally accepted.¹ In confirmation of its existence might be cited a number of items, including that we have a genealogy of its kings in the eighth-century *Anglian Collection*;² a reference to it as a tribute-giving polity in the seventh-century list known as the *Tribal Hidage*, where it is assessed at the same level as the kingdoms of Essex and Sussex;³ a description of it as a *provincia* by Bede, his normal term for an Anglo-Saxon kingdom;⁴ and the names of a number of its bishops from the mid-seventh century onwards.⁵ What is less usually recognized, however, is that the attested seventh-century Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Lindsey was itself, to some degree, a development of an earlier British kingdom. The following discussion therefore has several aims. The first is to present and analyse the linguistic, historical, literary and archaeological evidence which supports the above contention. The second is to attempt a synthesis of this data in order that conclusions about the likely course of events in Lindsey in the fifth and sixth centuries can be drawn. The third and final aim is to begin to assess the lasting historical significance of this post-Roman British kingdom, through an

¹ For example, Sarah Foot, 'The Kingdom of Lindsey', in *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, edited by Alan Vince (Lincoln, 1993), pp. 128-140; Peter Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire* (Lincoln, 1998), pp. 44-52; Kevin Leahy, *The Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey* (Stroud, 2007). I would like to gratefully acknowledge the encouragement and comments provided by Kevin Leahy, Mick Jones, Barbara Yorke, Bruce Eagles, Susan Youngs, Chris Gwinn and Mark Bennet during the writing of this article; all errors and interpretations do, of course, remain my own.

² David N. Dumville, 'The Anglian Collection of Royal Genealogies and Regnal Lists', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 5 (1976), 23-50; Foot, 'Kingdom of Lindsey', pp. 129-135.

³ David N. Dumville, 'The Tribal Hidage: an Introduction to its Texts and Their History', in *The Origins of Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms*, edited by Steven Bassett (London, 1989), pp. 225-230.

⁴ James Campbell, 'Bede's *Reges* and *Principes*', in James Campbell, *Essays in Anglo-Saxon History* (London, 1986), pp. 85-98 at pp. 86, 88.

⁵ Foot, 'Kingdom of Lindsey', pp. 136-137.

examination of both the situation in seventh-century Lindsey and indications in later texts that this British background to Lindsey was not been entirely forgotten.

The Linguistic, Historical and Literary Evidence

The first piece of evidence which offers support for the above contention comes from the kingdom-name 'Lindsey' itself. Two forms of this name exist in Anglo-Saxon sources, reflecting two different Old English suffixes:⁶ *Lindissi* (later *Lindesse*, as used by Bede and the earliest manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*)⁷ and *Lindesig* (found in Asser's ninth-century *Life of King Alfred* and one later manuscript of the *Chronicle*; the root of modern *Lindsey*).⁸ The key point here is that the language of the consistent first element of this kingdom-name is not, in fact, Old English at all but rather Late British. It derives from a post-Roman British tribal/folk-name **Lindēs*, 'the people of *Lindon*, Lincoln', which in turn derives ultimately from British-Latin **Lindenses*, of the same meaning.⁹ Furthermore, it must be recognized that it is a mistake to assume that this British folk-name referred

⁶ Margaret Gelling, 'The Name Lindsey', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 18 (1989), 31-32. See especially Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, p. 10 for a refutation of the assumption that *Lindesig* – which involves the suffix *-ig*, 'island' – must refer originally to a small area of land rather than the whole kingdom, and a reassertion of the primacy of the *Lindissi* form of the kingdom-name, with *Lindesig* (whatever its meaning) as a subsequent late misunderstanding of *Lindissi*, as against Steven Bassett, 'Lincoln and the Anglo-Saxon See of Lindsey', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 18 (1989), 1-31. There is no reason to see *Lindissi* (which involves an uncertain suffix) as, in origin, anything other than the kingdom-name it is in all the early sources, *contra* the speculations of Bassett, especially given the above and the disproof of Bassett's hypothesis about the Wigford suburb of Lincoln: Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, p. 174. See also on this Barrie Cox, 'The Pattern of Old English *burh* in Early Lindsey', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 23 (1994), 35-56 at pp. 55-6.

⁷ Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, Preface, II.16 etc.; *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, s.a. 838 and 873.

⁸ Asser, *Life of King Alfred*, chapters 45 and 46; *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, s.a. 838 D, *Lindesige*.

⁹ Kenneth Jackson, *Language and History in Early Britain* (Edinburgh, 1953), pp. 332, 543; A. L. F. Rivet and Colin Smith, *The Place-Names of Roman Britain* (London, 1979), p. 393; Kenneth Cameron, *Place-Names of Lincolnshire II* (Nottingham, 1991), pp. 2-7. It is the city-name *Lindon*/**Lindocolonia* that is clearly meant by **Lindenses*, **Lindēs*, not the local pool (British **lindo-*) that the city ultimately took its name from, not least because 'folk-names in *-nys* [< Old Welsh *-uis* < Archaic Welsh/Late British **ēs* < Latin *-enses*] are not formed from minor localities', cf. *Gwenmrys* etc.: John T. Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin: Text and Context from Dark-Age North Britain* (Cardiff, 1997), p. 133. As such, **Lindēs* must mean 'the people of Lincoln', not 'the people of the pool'.

only to the people of Lincoln itself, as some recent commentators have.¹⁰ As Jackson has made clear, names involving Late British/Archaic Welsh *-ēs* are ‘district names’ and ‘always refer to regions and their inhabitants’,¹¹ so that a better translation of Late British **Lindēs* might be ‘the people of (the region of the city of) Lincoln’.¹² Given this, the fact that the Anglo-Saxon kingdom-name *Lindissi/Lindesig* is derived from the Late British tribal- and district-name **Lindēs* does, of course, necessitate the pre-existence of a post-Roman British folk-group and territory called **Lindēs*, which had Lincoln as its focus and which controlled a region that extended to some unknown degree beyond the city. It furthermore implies that the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Lindsey had some sort of intimate connection with this British territory, as it took on its name. Indeed, this pre-existing British territory would seem to be further confirmed and required by the collective folk-name for the seventh-century Anglo-Saxons of Lindsey which is found in Bede and the *Tribal Hidage*: Anglo-Latin *Lindisfari*, Old English *Lindisfaran*.¹³ This folk-name derives from Late British **Lindēs*¹⁴ plus Old English *faran* and, in light of other similar compounds of *faran* in the early medieval period and its use in Old English, it seems clear that the *Lindisfari* were thus ‘the people who migrated, *faran*, to the territory of the *Lindenses*, **Lindēs*’.¹⁵ As such the Anglo-Saxons of Lindsey seem to have not only

¹⁰ As Bassett, ‘Lincoln and the Anglo-Saxon see of Lindsey’, p. 7.

¹¹ Jackson, *Language and History*, p. 543 and Kenneth Jackson, ‘Once Again Arthur’s Battles’, *Modern Philology*, 43.1 (1945), 44-57 at p. 48. See, for example, Powys < **Pagenses*, which is both a folk-name and kingdom-name and involves the same suffix.

¹² Compare, for example, Welsh *Gwennyys*, ‘people of (the region of the city of) *Uenta* = people of Gwent’ (Welsh *-yys* < Archaic Welsh **-ēs*). John T. Koch similarly notes that ‘Lindsey’ < Romano-British *Lindenses*, originally referring to the *territorium* around the Roman town of Lincoln and its inhabitants’: *Celtic Culture, A Historical Encyclopedia*, edited by John T. Koch (Oxford, 2006), p. 1158.

¹³ For example, *Historia Ecclesiastica* III.24, IV.3, IV.12; Dumville, ‘The Tribal Hidage’, pp. 227, 229.

¹⁴ On Late British **Lindēs* > Old English *Lindis-*, compare Leeds – **Latenses* > **Lodes* > *Loidis* in Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica* II.14: Kenneth Jackson, ‘On the Name “Leeds”’, *Antiquity* 20 (1946), 209-210.

¹⁵ See especially Thomas Charles-Edwards and Patrick Wormald, ‘Addenda’, in J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People: A Historical Commentary* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 207-243 at pp. 234-235, who cite important comparative forms and other *fara* names on the continent in support of this. See also the laws of Ine, chapter 63 and 64: *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings*, edited and translated by F. L. Attenborough (Cambridge, 1922) and Vespasian Psalter 10.2 – *The Oldest English Texts*, edited by Henry Sweet (London, 1885) – on OE *faran*. This translation of the folk-name *Lindisfari* is far more credible than any of the others which have been suggested (such as Gelling, ‘The Name Lindsey’, p. 32),

borrowed the name of a pre-existing British territory called **Lindēs* for that of their seventh-century kingdom, but their own folk-name made reference to the fact that they had arrived as immigrants into an already existing British territory called **Lindēs*.

It might therefore be argued that the kingdom-name *Lindissi/Lindesig* and the folk-name *Lindisfari/Lindisfaran* are, on their own, enough to allow a post-Roman British territory of some sort, focussed on Lincoln, to be acknowledged as preceding the early Anglo-Saxon kingdom. The origins of this must obviously be obscure but it can hardly be separated from the context of the times. With the withdrawal of the Roman Empire from *Britannia* in the first decades of the fifth century, the central government structures ceased to function and there would seem to have been devolution of their power to the local aristocracies (*curiales*) of each *civitas* and its *territorium*. Snyder and others have argued that this consequent ascendancy of the local elites was the essential precursor of the dynastic *reges* and *tyranni* recorded by Gildas; in the absence of other sources of political power, the leading men of the *civitates* took political power and rulership upon themselves.¹⁶ Whilst Lincoln was not actually itself a *civitas*-capital, it was a major *colonia* and – most importantly – a late Roman provincial capital, and was thus an extremely significant centre in its own right which would have

which fail to convince on several grounds. This is especially true of the hypothesis advanced by Coates, who suggests that the folk-name *Lindisfaran* (multiply attested in Bede, in all manuscripts of the seventh-century *Tribal Hidage*, and in the eighth-century *Anglian Collection* of royal genealogies) is somehow a mistake for *Lindisware* (attested once in a single late – early-twelfth century – manuscript of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*), resulting from an implausible misapplication of the name of Lindisfarne to the people of Lindsey; this notion must be rejected as one that strains credulity beyond breaking point: Richard Coates and Andrew Breeze, *Celtic Voices, English Places* (Stamford, 2000), pp. 243-246 and fn.3 on p. 256, which is significant. On the relationship between Lindsey and Lindisfarne, the best explanation continues to be that offered by Eilert Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names* (Oxford, 1960), p. 298.

¹⁶ Christopher A. Snyder, *An Age of Tyrants: Britain and the Britons A.D. 400-600* (Stroud, 1998), especially pp. 225-232. See also, for example, Barbara Yorke, 'Anglo-Saxon *gentes* and *regna*', in *Regna and Gentes: The Relationship Between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdoms in the Transformation of the Roman World*, edited by H-W. Goetz, J. Jarnut and W. Pohl (Leiden, 2003), pp. 381-408 especially pp. 395-401; Alex Woolf, 'The Britons: from Romans to Barbarians', in the same volume, pp. 345-380; and David N. Dumville, 'The Idea of Government in Sub-Roman Britain', in *After Empire: Towards an Ethnology of Europe's Barbarians*, edited by G. Ausenda (Woodbridge, 1995), pp. 177-204. K. R. Dark's *Civitas to Kingdom: British Political Continuity 300-800* (London, 1994) and *Britain and the End of the Roman Empire* (Stroud, 2000), pp. 144-149 are also relevant, although the main focus here is western Britain.

been susceptible to the same developments. The most natural interpretation, in the context of the above, is that **Lindēs* was a political and folk grouping which was created from the *territorium* of the late Roman provincial capital, Lincoln.¹⁷

The case for a British Lindsey is not, however, solely confined to the evidence of the names *Lindissi/Lindesig* and *Lindisfari/Lindisfaran*. Confirmation of the existence and nature of this post-Roman British **Lindēs* comes from an early source which has been rarely, if ever, utilized by historians of early Lincolnshire: the Cambro-Latin *Historia Brittonum*, written in 829/30 in north Wales.¹⁸ In this text we find reference to events which apparently took place *c.* 500 *in regione Linnuis*.¹⁹ Despite the sometimes wild guesses that have been made as to the identity of this *Linnuis*, often in ignorance of Welsh philology, its location is in fact beyond reasonable doubt. Just as *Lindissi/Lindesig* is the regular Old English development of Late British **Lindēs*, so too is *Linnuis* the regular Old Welsh development of this tribal- and district-name.²⁰ So, *-nd-* > *-nn-* was probably complete in Archaic Welsh by the end of the seventh century – giving **Lindēs* > **Linnēs*²¹ – and *-ē-* was diphthongized to *-ui-* in Welsh writing by the second half of the eighth century, giving the *Historia Brittonum*'s early ninth century *Linnuis* (**Lindēs* > Archaic Welsh **Linnēs* > Old Welsh *Linnuis*).²² The

¹⁷ See J. C. Mann, 'The Creation of Four Provinces in Britain by Diocletian', *Britannia* 29 (1998), 339-341 and Bruce Eagles, 'Lindsey', in *The Origins of Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms*, edited by Steven Bassett (London, 1989), pp. 202-212 at pp. 202-203 on the question of which province Lincoln was the capital of. This *territorium* would seem likely to have extended for a some distance all around Lincoln, with Ancaster probably lying within its southern limits: Michael J. Jones, 'The Colonia Era: Archaeological Account', in Michael J. Jones, David Stocker and Alan Vince, *The City by the Pool: Assessing the Archaeology of the city of Lincoln* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 56-138 at p. 124.

¹⁸ See on the date and provenance David N. Dumville, 'Some Aspects of the Chronology of the *Historia Brittonum*', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 25 (1974), 439-445; David N. Dumville, 'The Historical Value of the *Historia Brittonum*', *Arthurian Literature*, 6 (1986), 1-26.

¹⁹ *Historia Brittonum* chapter 56, edited and translated by John Morris (London and Chichester, 1980), p. 76.

²⁰ See, for example, Jackson, 'Once Again Arthur's Battles', pp. 47-48 and the latest scholarly translation of the *Historia Brittonum* by John T. Koch – in John T. Koch and John Carey, *The Celtic Heroic Age: Literary Sources for Ancient Celtic Europe and Early Medieval Ireland and Wales* (Aberystwyth, 2003), p. 299 – where *in regione Linnuis* is translated as 'in the country of Lindsey'.

²¹ Jackson, *Language and History*, p. 695; Patrick Sims-Williams, *The Celtic Inscriptions of Britain: Phonology and Chronology, c.400-1200* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 283, 293.

²² Sims-Williams, *Celtic Inscriptions*, pp. 190-196, 286-287; Patrick Sims-Williams, 'The Emergence of Old Welsh, Cornish and Breton Orthography, 600-800: The

Historia Brittonum's reference to *Linnuis* consequently suggests that some memory of a post-Roman British folk-group and territory called **Lindēs*, 'the people of (the region of the city of) Lincoln', survived into early ninth-century Wales, something which is obviously of considerable significance in the present context; no other explanation is plausible.²³ Moreover, the fact that this was a regional British folk/tribal-name – not simply applied to inhabitants of the city of Lincoln itself – is confirmed by the meaning of the whole phrase *in regione Linnuis*, that is in the 'region' or 'country of *Linnuis*, **Lindēs*'.²⁴

The combined weight of the names *Lindissi/Lindisfari* and *Linnuis* is thus persuasive, offering two entirely independent witnesses to **Lindēs* as neither can derive from the other. The existence of the Old English kingdom-name *Lindissi/Lindesig*, the Old English folk-name *Lindisfari/Lindisfaran* and the Old Welsh 'country of *Linnuis*' is, as a result, sufficient to demonstrate that a British folk-group and territory called **Lindēs* must have existed in the post-Roman period, in order to account for these names; that it was focussed on the city of Lincoln but that it also controlled a wider territory (presumably the *territorium* of the Roman provincial capital *Lindum*), given the etymology of the name and the *Historia Brittonum*'s 'country of *Linnuis*, **Lindēs*'; and that it was sufficiently long-lived and significant for a later Anglo-Saxon kingdom to borrow its name and for its memory to persist in Wales long after its disappearance. The question accordingly becomes what, exactly, did the early-ninth-century Welsh believe to have happened in the post-Roman British 'country of **Lindēs*'? The answer is quite simple: battles between the Britons and the Anglo-Saxon immigrants. The *Historia Brittonum* claims that, at some point around 500, four battles were fought *in regione Linnuis* on a river named *Dubglas*, 'blue-black (water)' (unidentifiable, but perhaps an

Evidence of Archaic Old Welsh', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 38 (1991), 20-86 at pp. 49-59.

²³ Old Welsh *Linnuis* cannot be derived from Old English *Lindissi/Lindesig* and no **Lindēs* other than that which underlies *Lindsey* is known from Britain for *Linnuis* to develop from. All other suggestions – when not philologically impossible – are purely hypothetical with no evidence of their real existence outside of the *Historia Brittonum*, and most that have been made despite this uncomfortable reality fall foul of the fact that 'folk-names in *-nys* [< Old Welsh *-uis* < Archaic Welsh/Late British **-ēs*] are not formed from minor localities': Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin*, p. 133. In this context it may also be worth noting that the battles *in regione Linnuis* became battles at Lincoln in Geoffrey of Monmouth's expansion and elaboration of the *Historia Brittonum*'s account, suggesting that the location of *Linnuis* was understood as the Lincoln area as late as the twelfth century: *Historia Regum Britanniae*, IX.3.

²⁴ Jackson, 'Once Again Arthur's Battles', p. 48; Koch and Carey, *Celtic Heroic Age*, p. 299. Compare the usage of this term for various kingdoms – including Gwynedd – in the *Historia Brittonum*, e.g. chapter 40.

alternate name for the Witham or Ancholme?),²⁵ all of which were won by the Britons.²⁶ This, in itself, is not implausible – we know from the archaeology of the region that Lincolnshire saw significant Anglo-Saxon immigration in this time-frame.²⁷ There are, however, issues with the assumption that the *Historia*'s claims are a genuine memory of such battles, rather than simply invented battles attached to a ninth-century remembrance of the 'country of *Lindēs'.

The key problem is that, whilst there is no reason to doubt the genuineness of the name *Linnuis* and hence the implications that it carries for the existence of a British territory of *Lindēs, discussed above, there are reasons to be dubious of the *Historia*'s actual narrative of fifth- and early-sixth-century events, as Dumville and others have made clear.²⁸ Fundamentally, the *Historia Brittonum* is a synthetic pseudo-history written with specific aims in mind, rather than a 'heap' of unprocessed earlier sources as used to be believed, and even where credit might be given to its supposed sources 'the author's methods – praiseworthy enough for a writer not constrained by modern rules of evidence – do not encourage us to be confident about the possibility of recovering usable information about the period whose history he was narrating.'²⁹ Furthermore, it can be argued that a full analysis of all the available early evidence for Arthur – who is named by the *Historia* as the victor of the battles *in regione Linnuis*, along with eight further conflicts – suggests that it is highly unlikely that he was a real historical figure of c. 500 as opposed to a folkloric or even a mythical Hero Protector of Britain from supernatural threats who has been historicized with these battles by the author of the *Historia*.³⁰ Given this, it is clear that we cannot just assume that the successful British battles in the territory of *Lindēs, ascribed to Arthur, really took place. Indeed, can we, in fact, have any confidence in them at all?

²⁵ Thomas Green, *Concepts of Arthur* (Stroud, 2007), p. 257; Leahy, *Kingdom of Lindsey*, p. 210.

²⁶ *Historia Brittonum*, chapter 56.

²⁷ Kevin Leahy, 'The Anglo-Saxon Settlement of Lindsey', in *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, edited by Alan Vince (Lincoln, 1993), pp. 29-44; Leahy, *Kingdom of Lindsey*, pp. 35-56.

²⁸ Dumville, 'Historical Value of the *Historia Brittonum*'; N.J. Higham, *Arthur, Myth-Making and History* (London, 2002), pp. 119-169; Green, *Concepts of Arthur*, pp. 15-26, 30-38.

²⁹ David N. Dumville, 'Historia Brittonum: an Insular History from the Carolingian Age', in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, edited by Anton Scharer and Georg Scheibelreiter (Wien/München, 1994), pp. 406-434 at p. 419.

³⁰ Green, *Concepts of Arthur*, especially pp. 8-130, 177-201; O. J. Padel, 'The Nature of Arthur', *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies*, 27 (1994), 1-31.

To a large extent the degree of confidence that we can feel able to place in the *Historia's* claims of British battles in the 'country of **Lindēs*', in light of the above, depends on our concept of how the folkloric Arthur was historicized. There is only one battle of the twelve ascribed to Arthur in the *Historia* which can be independently demonstrated to have actually taken place *c.* 500, namely the Battle of Badon Hill, and its context is telling. In Gildas' sixth-century *De Excidio Britanniae*, Ambrosius Aurelianus is given prominence as the initiator of the British counterattack against the Anglo-Saxon invaders which, after the fighting of several battles, culminates in the Battle of Badon, just as Arthur in the *Historia Brittonum* initiates the British counterattack against the Anglo-Saxon invaders which, after the fighting of several battles, culminates in the Battle of Badon.³¹ As has been argued elsewhere, this is surely telling and the most convincing explanation is that the historicization of Arthur was based on a framework of deeds borrowed from the genuinely historical Ambrosius Aurelianus.³² This framework then appears to have been filled in using battles drawn from a variety of sources. Some of the battles have no obvious real-world location and look to have been invented spontaneously for the purposes of Arthur's historicization.³³ Others appear to have been mythical Arthurian battles which were historicized alongside Arthur himself.³⁴ Finally, yet others seem to be real conflicts which were fought by other leaders (such as the late-sixth-century Urien of Rheged) but which had probably become, by the ninth century, stock events that could be freely used and re-attributed by Welsh authors.³⁵

From this perspective, the etymology and consequent context of the *Linnuis* battles³⁶ indicates that they ought to be placed within the last category, which in turn suggests that they are based on the vague remembrance of real battles *in regione Linnuis* which had become 'stock

³¹ Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae*, edited and translated Michael Winterbottom (London and Chichester, 1978), chapters 25-6.

³² Green, *Concepts of Arthur*, pp. 204-16.

³³ For example, the battles on the rivers *Bassas* ('shallow-?') and perhaps *Glein* ('clear, pure'): Jackson, 'Once Again Arthur's Battles', pp. 46, 48. See further Padel, 'Nature of Arthur', p. 21 and Green, *Concepts of Arthur*, pp. 207, 214.

³⁴ For example, *Tribruit*, which is the only battle from the entire list to be associated with Arthur in an actual Old Welsh source, where it appears as a mythical battle involving former gods and monstrous dog-heads: Green, *Concepts of Arthur*, pp. 62-67, 84-85, 119-121, 207-208.

³⁵ For example, *Breguoin*: see Rachel Bromwich, 'Concepts of Arthur', *Studia Celtica*, 10/11 (1975-6), 163-181 at pp. 171-172; Green, *Concepts of Arthur*, pp. 208-209.

³⁶ It should be noted that the fact that four battles are claimed to have been fought *in regione Linnuis* may well simply reflect the fact that the author of the *Historia* wished to give Arthur 12 victories: Higham, *Arthur, Myth-Making and History*, p. 148; Green, *Concepts of Arthur*, p. 210.

events' whose original victors and probably also details were either obscured or lost. This, on the whole, is the most convincing explanation, although it does mean that we cannot hope to know who fought the battles or who won them; for example, one of Arthur's other victories in this category actually seems to have been a British defeat which has been reinvented as a victory by the author of the *Historia*.³⁷ On the other hand, the battles *in regione Linnuis* are the only ones from the *Historia*'s list for which a historical origin as a battle/battles against Anglo-Saxon invaders of *c.* 500 (rather than later enemies) seems defensible, aside from the case of the Battle of Badon itself. This coincidence is, in itself, intriguing and naturally leads to speculation as to whether one or more battles *in regione Linnuis* might not actually have been part of the same framework of historicization that Badon was.³⁸ That is to say, it is not beyond the realms of possibility that a battle in the 'country of **Lindēs*' was remembered as a battle of Ambrosius Aurelianus too.³⁹

This is, of course, largely speculative but it is worth pursuing a little further. After all, unlike many of the other battles in the *Historia*'s list, there is no reason to believe that the battles in *Linnuis* were spontaneous inventions, nor to consider them to have been borrowed from Arthurian myth and story, whilst at the same time we have no record of any other leaders fighting *in regione Linnuis*, as we do with the other 'stock events' such as *Breguoin*.⁴⁰ The very obscurity of the *Linnuis* battles may thus point to at least one of their number belonging to the *Historia*'s framework of historicization. In further support of this it may well be worth observing that both the actual area of operation of Ambrosius and the location of Badon have never been satisfactorily established. In the case of Badon, all the locales that have been suggested rest almost exclusively on etymological

³⁷ As Jackson, 'Once Again Arthur's Battles', p. 57 notes.

³⁸ Indeed, I find I am not alone in these suspicions: John Koch has recently made a very similar point, although he considers the framework to genuinely belong to Arthur rather than Ambrosius, a position which I would consider untenable. He notes, with regards to the striking appropriateness of the location of battles in *Linnuis* (Lindsey), that this 'certainly raises the possibility that the same oral tradition [which, he believes, correctly preserved the name of Arthur as victor of Badon] also correctly remembered that Arthur fought and won there' too: John T. Koch, 'Arthur, the Historical Evidence', in *Celtic Culture, A Historical Encyclopedia*, edited by John T. Koch (Oxford, 2006), pp. 117-122 at p. 120. Further discussion of the case for a historical Arthur who fought in Lindsey, and the essential caveats which must accompany such a case, can be found in Thomas Green, 'Lincolnshire and the Arthurian Legend', http://www.arthuriana.co.uk/notes&queries/N&Q3_ArthLincs.pdf.

³⁹ See Green, *Concepts of Arthur*, pp. 213-215 for some discussion of this point.

⁴⁰ In the case of *Breguoin*, it is also assigned to two late-sixth-century British leaders, Urien of Rheged and Gwallawc: Bromwich, 'Concepts of Arthur', pp. 171-172.

grounds and on this basis we ought to recognize that Baumber in Lindsey (*Badeburg* at Domesday) has as good a claim to be Badon as any of the other candidates.⁴¹ In the case of Ambrosius, theories based around the place-names Amesbury and the Wallops are not convincing,⁴² whilst one respectable school of thought holds that Gildas was, in his account of the British counter-attack in the late-fifth century led by Ambrosius Aurelianus, writing about the north of Roman Britain and in particular about the region around the East Riding of Yorkshire, which is only separated from Lindsey by the river Humber.⁴³ Of course, both Ambrosius and Badon could easily be located in some other area of the country, and the *Linnuis* battles could well not be part of the framework of historicization and instead simply 'stock events' that became associated with it by the author of the *Historia*. However, the possibility raised above does deserve at least some serious consideration.

Whilst the *Historia's* reference to battles between Britons and Anglo-Saxons *in regione Linnuis*, 'in the country of **Lindēs*, the country of the people of Lincoln', is the most significant Welsh allusion to a British

⁴¹ Jackson and Gelling have convincingly argued that, whilst Bath is etymologically one possibility, Badon could equally well be one of several sites whose name potentially derives from Late British *Badon-* + Old English *byrig/burb*, Baumber being one of these: Kenneth Jackson, 'The Site of Mount Badon', *The Journal of Celtic Studies*, 2 (1953-8), 152-155; Margaret Gelling, 'Towards a Chronology for English Place-Names', in *Anglo-Saxon Settlements*, edited by Della Hooke (Oxford, 1988), pp. 59-76 at pp. 60-61; Green, *Concepts of Arthur*, p. 213. The historical context for Lindsey as a whole would seem appropriate for Badon to be fought there; see further below and Green, *Concepts of Arthur*, pp. 210-212. Why Baumber as a battle-site might be a better question. The area has not been investigated archaeologically but the name Baumber indicates that there was some kind of fortress there in the early Anglo-Saxon period at the latest, as Barrie Cox has noted, and it is on the likely road route from the fort at Horncastle to Lincoln: Cox, 'The Pattern of Old English *burb*'; Barrie Cox, 'Baumber in Lindsey', *English Place-Name Society Journal*, 30 (1997-8), 27-32; A. E. B. Owen, 'Roads and Romans in South-East Lindsey', in *Names, Places and People*, edited by Alexander R. Rumble and A. D. Mills (Stamford, 1997), pp. 254-268 at pp. 257, 262.

⁴² Green, *Concepts of Arthur*, pp. 214, 257; Barbara Yorke, *Wessex in the Early Middle Ages* (London, 1995), p. 15; see A. D. Mills, *A Dictionary of English Place-Names* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 9, 343-344 for the current consensus on both names, which runs counter to theories that attempt to connect them with Ambrosius.

⁴³ E. A. Thompson, 'Gildas and the History of Britain', *Britannia*, 10 (1979), 203-226; Patrick Sims-Williams, 'Gildas and the Anglo-Saxons', *Cambridge Medieval Celtic Studies*, 6 (1983), 1-30 at p. 7; David N. Dumville, 'The Chronology of *De Excidio Britanniae* Book I', in *Gildas: New Approaches*, edited by Michael Lapidge and David Dumville (Woodbridge, 1984), pp. 61-84. See, however, N. J. Higham, *The English Conquest: Gildas and Britain in the Fifth Century* (Manchester, 1994), pp. 90-117 for an alternative theory.

territory which preceded the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Lindsey, it may not be the only one. Another potential source of information is the collection of heroic death-songs known as *Y Gododdin*, traditionally ascribed to the early Welsh poet Aneirin, with at least some of its stanzas probably having written origins in the period before c. 638.⁴⁴ Essentially *Y Gododdin* purports to tell the story of a battle fought by the war-band of the British kingdom of the Gododdin, based in southern Scotland, perhaps c. 570.⁴⁵ This war-band seems to have travelled to *Catraeth* – usually considered to be modern Catterick, in the Vale of York – to fight the battle, which it lost disastrously, and it has recently been convincingly argued that the conflict is best interpreted as being fought between two separate British groups (with some Anglian assistance on both sides) rather than between British and Anglo-Saxon hosts.⁴⁶ In this context it is important to observe that not only are Gododdin warriors mentioned in the various stanzas (death-songs) but warriors from other British kingdoms also appear in the text, fighting on both sides, including some from the kingdoms of Elmet, Aeron (Ayrshire) and Strathclyde, and probably also some from Lindsey too.⁴⁷ The text of the relevant portion of *Y Gododdin* (from stanza A.15, which Koch considers to probably have its origins in the mid-seventh century)⁴⁸ runs as follows:

*O vreithyell gatraeth pan adrodir.
maon dychiorant eu boet bu hir.
edyrn diedyrn amygyn dir.
a meibyon godebawc gwerin enwir.*

⁴⁴ For the text see *Canu Aneirin*, edited by Ifor Williams (Cardiff, 1938). A good modern translation is available in *Aneirin: Y Gododdin, Britain's Oldest Heroic Poem* translated by A. O. H. Jarman (Llandysul, 1988), whilst the text has been reconstructed into its purportedly original early-seventh-century form (with a translation) in Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin*. The latter study makes a strong case for the existence of an early-seventh-century written, rather than simply oral, version of at least some of the stanzas; see also John T. Koch, 'When Was Welsh Literature First Written Down?', *Studia Celtica*, 20/21 (1985-6), 43-66.

⁴⁵ Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin*, pp. xiii-xlii for a detailed discussion of the dating of the battle.

⁴⁶ Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin*, pp. xxxv-xlii; Craig Cessford, 'Where Are the Anglo-Saxons in the Gododdin Poem?', *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*, 8 (1995), 95-98. See also Tim Clarkson, 'The Gododdin Revisited', *The Heroic Age*, 1 (1999), archived at <http://www.heroicage.org/issues/1/hatf.htm>, who considers that in this regard 'Koch is probably right'.

⁴⁷ Craig Cessford, 'Northern England and the Gododdin Poem', *Northern History*, 33 (1997), 218-222 at pp. 220-221; Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin*, pp. xiii-xlii.

⁴⁸ Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin*, pp. 189-190; the stanza does contain some Archaic Welsh features indicative of a written origin before the ninth century.

*dyforthynt lymyysawr gelorawr hir.*⁴⁹

Koch suggests that this passage ought to be translated as follows: ‘It is concerning Catraeth’s variegated and ruddy [land] that it is told – the followers fell; long were the lamentations for them, the immortalised men; [but] it was not as immortals that they fought for territory against the descendants of Godebawg, the rightful faction: long biers bore off blood-stained bodies.’⁵⁰ The key point here is that the word usually translated as ‘blood-stained bodies’ in the above passage (*lymyysawr* < Old Welsh **linuissaur*) could equally legitimately be translated as ‘Lindsey-men’, ‘men of *Linnuis*’ – as Koch himself has noted – giving ‘long biers bore off men of *Linnuis*’.⁵¹ Given that the presence of men from British kingdoms other than the Gododdin in the poem is now widely recognized, there is no obvious reason why this reading, also proposed by Cessford, should not be adopted.⁵² Indeed, the context of stanza A.15 itself might support such a contention, as this is in any case one of those stanzas in which the presence of non-Gododdin British warriors at the battle of *Catraeth* is indicated. The implication of the above text is that the British *meibyon godebawc*, ‘descendants of *Godebawc*’, were the enemy against whom the Gododdin warriors were contending, with this phrase seeming to be an allusion to Gwallawc, king of Elmet – who was supposedly descended from this *Godebawc* – and his retinue.⁵³

In light of the above, a reference to British warriors from *Linnuis*, ‘Lindsey-men’, being killed at the battle of *Catraeth* is entirely plausible.⁵⁴

⁴⁹ *Canu Aneirin*, lines 131-135.

⁵⁰ Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin*, p. 67; an alternative reading proposed by Bromwich would offer, for the middle section, ‘not as immortals did the descendants of Godebawg fight for territory’, making the *meibyon godebawc* allies of the Gododdin warriors. Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin*, p. xxv discusses the different readings; on balance, the former reading seems preferable.

⁵¹ John T. Koch, ‘The Cynfeirdd Poetry and the Language of the Sixth-Century’, in *Early Welsh Poetry: Studies in the Book of Aneirin*, edited by Brynley F. Roberts (Aberystwyth, 1988), pp. 17-41 at p. 33.

⁵² Cessford, ‘Northern England and the Gododdin poem’, pp. 220-221.

⁵³ See further the discussion in Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin*, pp. xxiii-xxvi, 189-190. The positive description of these *meibyon godebawc* (‘the rightful faction’), despite the fact they opposed the Gododdin war-band, may reflect – if it can be sustained; note that an alternate reading of ‘an evil people’ is possible: Cessford, ‘Northern England and the Gododdin poem’, p. 220 – the fact that this stanza looks to have been a summarizing interpolation composed after the text left the north and came into Wales, where members of the Elmet kindred were probably to be found in the mid-seventh century.

⁵⁴ That they were British is indicated by the form *lymyysawr* < **linuissaur* which if it means ‘Lindsey-men’ must reflect Old Welsh *Linnuis* (in a modernized spelling; the

The author of this stanza may have considered the ‘Lindsey-men’ to have been part of the Gododdin’s own war-band and thus the above passage would be a lament for them; certainly other stanzas of the poem claim that the Gododdin’s war-band contained non-Gododdin British warriors, including some from Aeron (Ayrshire), Gwynedd and Strathclyde.⁵⁵ In this context it is tempting to follow Cessford’s suggestion that the ‘men of *Linnuis*’ were kingdom-less warriors who had found a place at another British court (and took part in its battles) after the recent final loss of their homeland – the ‘country of **Lindēs*’ – to Anglo-Saxon immigrants.⁵⁶ Alternatively, the ‘Lindsey-men’ in A.15 might have been seen as part of the *meibyon godebanw* that the Gododdin kingdom was fighting, either as kingdom-less warriors who had joined its warband or as allies, if the ‘country of **Lindēs*’ still existed (Elmet would seem to have been **Lindēs* north-western neighbour), their deaths being the result of the Gododdin’s doomed attack on the *meibyon godebanw* and partial recompense for its own dead mentioned earlier in the stanza.⁵⁷ Whatever the case may be, the implication of the above reading of *Y Gododdin* A.15 is that the author of the stanza believed that the British territory of **Lindēs* continued in existence until at least the mid-sixth century and that warriors from it still existed and died *c.* 570 at *Catraeth*.

A final piece of early historical evidence to be considered here can help with answering this question of how long the ‘country of **Lindēs*’ survived and also the important issue of what the relationship between this post-Roman territory and the attested kingdom of Lindsey was. The royal genealogy of the Anglo-Saxon kings of Lindsey is preserved in the late-eighth-century *Anglian Collection*⁵⁸ and would seem to that of one Aldfrið, presumably the last king of Lindsey before its absorption into Mercia. It used to be thought that this Aldfrið was also mentioned in a late eighth-

manuscript of *Y Gododdin* dates from the thirteenth century and the spelling of the original stanzas has been modernized accordingly) rather than Old English *Lindissi/Lindesig*.

⁵⁵ Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin*, pp. xxx-xxxi.

⁵⁶ Cessford, ‘Northern England and the Gododdin poem’, p. 221. Such an interpretation of the ‘men of *Linnuis*’ in this stanza would remain legitimate even if Bromwich’s interpretation of the *meibyon godebanw* was adopted (n.50, above).

⁵⁷ On the British Kingdom of Elmet, based around Leeds, see R. Geraint Gruffydd, ‘In Search of Elmet’, *Studia Celtica*, 28 (1994), pp. 63-79. If this is the correct interpretation then one has to wonder, given the context of stanza A.15, whether the ‘Lindsey-men’ too, or at least their rulers, were considered part of the *meibyon godebanw*; certainly the rulers of Rheged, the other likely allies of Elmet at *Catraeth*, also seem to have been part of this kindred: Koch, *The Gododdin of Aneirin*, pp. xxiii-xxv.

⁵⁸ Dumville, ‘Anglian Collection’, pp. 31, 33, 37, 23-50.

century Mercian charter, where Stenton followed Birch in reading one *Ealdfrid rex* as a witness, but this now appears untenable.⁵⁹ As such, the question of Aldfrið's *floruit* is now open to debate, although Foot has made a good case for presuming that he was king *c.* 679 and that after this there were no more (semi-)independent Lindsey rulers.⁶⁰

The significance of all this comes from the fact that, seven generations down the Lindsey genealogy, we find the name *Cædbæd* as one of Aldfrið's ancestors. Dumville, Koch, Foot and others have all considered this to be an anglicized form of a 'wholly Celtic' name,⁶¹ with its origins probably lying in British **Catuboduos* > Archaic Welsh **Cadboddu* (Koch compares Old Breton *Catuuodu*).⁶² On the other hand, Stenton suggested that it could be instead an Anglian-British hybrid name, with an Old English second element but a British first element (*Catuu* > *Cad*, 'battle'); although often now dismissed as a possibility, this idea has recently been revived by Insley.⁶³ Whatever the case may be, in the present context the dynastic claim that the kings of Lindsey had an ancestor with a British or half-British name – who would have probably lived in the early-mid sixth century, on Foot's dating of Aldfrið – is highly interesting. How far, then, can we trust this claim, and what does it signify? Certainly parts of the Lindsey genealogy have been viewed with some suspicion in the past, most particularly due to the fact that the names alliterate in groups of two and three.⁶⁴ On the other hand,

⁵⁹ F. M. Stenton, 'Lindsey and Its Kings', in *Preparatory to Anglo-Saxon England*, edited by Doris Mary Stenton (Oxford, 1971), pp. 127-135 at pp. 129-131; Foot, 'Kingdom of Lindsey', p. 133; *Charters of Selsey* edited by S. E. Kelly (Oxford, 1998), p. 54.

⁶⁰ Foot, 'Kingdom of Lindsey', pp. 133-135, especially p. 135. See David A. Hinton, *A Smith in Lindsey: The Anglo-Saxon Grave at Tattershall Thorpe, Lincolnshire* (London, 2000), pp. 114-115 for some interesting speculation regarding where Aldfrið may have had one of his major residences and a link between his reign and a smith's grave dated *c.* 660-70.

⁶¹ David N. Dumville, 'Kingship, Genealogies and Regnal Lists', in *Early Medieval Kingship*, edited by P. H. Sawyer and I. N. Wood (Leeds, 1977), pp. 72-104 at p. 90; Pauline Stafford, *The East Midlands in the Early Middle Ages* (London, 1985), p. 87; Eagles, 'Lindsey', p. 206; Foot, 'Kingdom of Lindsey', p. 133; Kenneth Cameron, *English Place Names* (London, 1996), p. 32; John T. Koch, 'Anglo-Saxon "Conquest" in Celtic Culture, A Historical Encyclopedia', edited by John T. Koch (Oxford, 2006), pp. 58-61 at p. 60.

⁶² Jackson, *Language and History*, p. 244 n.3; Stafford, *East Midlands*, p. 87; J. Insley and M. Eggers, 'Lindsey', in *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde* 18 (Berlin, 2001), pp. 471-479 at p. 477; Koch, 'Anglo-Saxon "Conquest"', p. 60.

⁶³ Stenton, 'Lindsey', p. 129; Insley and Eggers, 'Lindsey', p. 477; his chief reason for doing so – a disbelief that a name **Catuboduos* would exist – is undermined, however, by Koch's Old Breton *Catuuodu*.

⁶⁴ Dumville, 'Kingship, Genealogies and Regnal Lists', p. 90; Foot, 'Kingdom of Lindsey', p. 132; Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, p. 49. Another feature, the

such alliteration between generations seems to have been a common practice and is found in other Anglo-Saxon genealogies too.⁶⁵ Furthermore, the fact that the Lindsey list is not standardized to the suspicious 14 generations back to Woden found in all the other Anglo-Saxon genealogies in the *Anglian Collection*, instead consisting of only 11 generations, has been seen as a reason to consider it untampered with⁶⁶ – as indeed is the very rare and obscure nature of many of the names found within it, such as *Cueldgils*, *Cretta*, *Bubba* and *Winta*. Stenton long ago observed that there ‘can be no doubt that a series like this represents a genuine tradition.’⁶⁷

Given the above, it seems not unreasonable to treat the genealogy as representing something like a genuine lineage of a probably late-seventh-century king of Lindsey named Aldfrið, reflecting his own concept of his own ancestry. Of course, genealogies are potentially propaganda in this period and this conclusion cannot guarantee the genuine existence of anyone in the genealogy, particularly in the lower reaches.⁶⁸ Nonetheless, with regards to the British or Anglian-British *Cadbad* it is difficult to see what might have motivated a false inclusion of such a name in the ancestry of a late-seventh-century Lindsey king. Indeed, Dumville was inclined to see ‘the Celtic *Cadbad*’ as the most trustworthy element of the genealogy below Aldfrið’s immediate family. Similarly, Stafford has quite rightly argued that, despite the potential for political tampering in such genealogies, there could be little reason for the late fabrication of an ancestor with a Celtic or hybrid name, and I would follow Insley in contending that her subsequent conclusion on this matter is sound too: that the name *Cadbad* ‘is evidence at

appearance of the name *Biscop*, was a cause of potential concern for Stenton (‘Lindsey’, pp. 128-129, also Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, p. 49) but Foot (‘Kingdom of Lindsey’, pp. 132-133) has convincingly argued against this being a reason for doubting the genuineness of the genealogy.

⁶⁵ Dumville, ‘Anglian Collection’, pp. 30-37; Foot, ‘Kingdom of Lindsey’, p. 132. Stenton, ‘Lindsey’, p. 128 saw the alliterative nature of the genealogy as a positive argument in favour of its antiquity.

⁶⁶ Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, p. 98. Note, the suggestion that the Lindsey genealogy was in fact standardized to (or had) the suspicious 14 generations to Woden and then saw three removed due to the addition of generations below Woden to that genealogy in the *Anglian Collection* seems implausible and is further undermined by the testimony of the genealogies appended to the twelfth-century chronicle of John of Worcester: *The Chronicle of Florence of Worcester*, translated by Thomas Forester (London, 1854), pp. xii-xiii, 440. There we are given the Lindsey genealogy without the generations below Woden but still with only 11 generations to him, whilst the form of the name Aldfrið (*Ealdfrith*) found there suggests an origin for this genealogy separate to that of the *Anglian Collection* (via a West Saxon source? See Insley and Eggers, ‘Lindsey’, pp. 477, 478).

⁶⁷ Stenton, ‘Lindsey’, p. 128.

⁶⁸ See especially Dumville, ‘Kingship, Genealogies and Regnal Lists’ on this point.

the very least of contact, even intermarriage, between Briton and Anglo-Saxon at the highest social levels in sixth-century Lindsey'.⁶⁹

The necessary implication of the above is that high-status Britons still existed in sixth-century Lindsey for the leading Anglo-Saxon family (or one of them) to come into contact – and quite likely intermarry – with. As such the evidence of the Lindsey genealogy bears out the conclusion reached previously: that a post-Roman British polity emerged in the fifth-century, based around Lincoln and known as the ‘country of **Lindēs*’, with which the Anglo-Saxon immigrants came into contact. Given the likely *floruit* of *Cadbad* (early-mid sixth century) and the fact that the disappearance of high-status Britons from the region – and hence, presumably, the end of the ‘country of **Lindēs*’ – must post-date his naming, it furthermore supports the implication of the *Y Gododdin* reference to mid-late sixth-century ‘Lindsey-men’ and the *Historia*’s account of supposedly successful British battles *in regione Linnuis* c. 500 that this British territory of **Lindēs* survived at least some way into the sixth century, perhaps even into the mid-sixth century. And, finally, the Lindsey genealogy indicates that relations between the Britons of **Lindēs* and the Germanic immigrants were, sometimes at least, of a less consistently violent nature than the *Historia Brittonum* references to battles *in regione Linnuis* suggests was the case, as high-status intermarriage is surely the most credible explanation for the presence of such a name in the Anglo-Saxon royal genealogy.

The Archaeological Evidence

The case for the existence of a British ‘country of **Lindēs*’ which survived into the mid-sixth century has been made thus far without recourse to the archaeological evidence. However, we must now turn to this, as the evidence amassed above can not only provide a historical framework to assist in the interpretation of the archaeology of early Lindsey but it is also confirmed and taken further by this.

In Lincolnshire, archaeological evidence for the settlement of significant numbers of Anglo-Saxon immigrants is found from the second half of the fifth century onwards and is initially concentrated in a number of large cremation cemeteries, such as that at Cleatham where 1528 burials were recently excavated.⁷⁰ The widely-spaced locations of these mass-cemeteries are suggestive of them having defined territories for which they presumably

⁶⁹ Stafford, *East Midlands*, p. 87 and Insley and Eggers, ‘Lindsey’, p. 477, *contra* the unwarranted hyper-scepticism of Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, p. 50.

⁷⁰ See Kevin Leahy, ‘*Interrupting the Pots: The excavation of Cleatham Anglo-Saxon Cemetery*’, CBA Research Report 155 (York, 2007); Leahy, ‘Anglo-Saxon Settlement’, pp. 33, 36; Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, pp. 35-56; Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, pp. 39-42. The date of the *adventus* in Lindsey is briefly discussed below.

acted as a central burial ground and which seem to have become later political and administrative units.⁷¹ So, for example, the Cleatham cemetery is actually on the boundary of Kirton-in-Lindsey parish, which was arguably the pre-eminent Anglo-Saxon administrative centre of the West Riding of Lindsey, and it is furthermore close-by the richest early Anglo-Saxon barrow-burial found in the region, at Caenby.⁷² The key point here is, however, that these cremation cemeteries avoid Lincoln *entirely*, forming in effect a ring around the city. This ‘ring’ does, in fact, enclose a vast territory around Lincoln, with the closest of the large cremation cemeteries to the city being Loveden Hill seventeen miles to the south and Cleatham nineteen miles to the north.⁷³ This avoidance is most unusual when compared with the situation found at other Roman towns in the region – such as York, Caistor-by-Norwich, Leicester, Ancaster and Caistor – which all have cremation cemeteries close by them.⁷⁴ As Leahy has cogently argued, some

⁷¹ Leahy, ‘Anglo-Saxon Settlement’, p. 36; Kevin Leahy ‘The Formation of the Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey’, *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*, 10 (1999), 127-133 at pp. 129-130; Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, p. 49; Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, p. 51; Eagles, ‘Lindsey’, p. 211; Paul Everson, ‘Pre-Viking Settlement in Lindsey’, in *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, edited by Alan Vince (Lincoln, 1993), pp. 91-100 at p. 98. For a comparable situation in Norfolk, see Tom Williamson, *The Origins of Norfolk* (Manchester, 1993), pp. 68, 102-4 and see generally on large cremation cemeteries as central places Howard Williams, ‘Cemeteries as central places – place and identity in Migration Period eastern England’, in *Central Places in the Migration and Merovingian Periods*, edited by Birgitta Hårdh and Lars Larsson (Stockholme, 2002), pp. 341-62.

⁷² Everson, ‘Pre-Viking Settlement’, pp. 96-98; Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, pp. 49, 95-96. Another very good example is that of the South Elkington cemetery, just to the west of Louth, which probably originally housed c.1200 urns: Leahy, ‘Anglo-Saxon Settlement’, p. 41. Not only does Louth seem to have been the centre of an pre-Viking minster estate and a major Late Saxon administrative centre, but it has place-name evidence – Ludborough, ‘the *burh*, fort, belonging to Louth’, five miles to its north and Ludford, ‘the ford belonging to Louth’, eight miles to the west – suggestive of defined *territorium* in existence by the seventh-century at least: see Cox, ‘Pattern of Old English *burh*’ for the dating of the place-name Ludborough and Kenneth Cameron, *Place-Names of Lincolnshire IV* (Nottingham, 1996), pp. 25-26; Owen, ‘Roads and Romans’, p. 263; A. E. B. Owen, ‘Louth Before Domesday’, *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology*, 32 (1997), 60-64.

⁷³ Leahy, ‘Anglo-Saxon Settlement’, pp. 36-37; Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, p. 44; Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, p. 50 and figure 8; Leahy, *Cleatham Anglo-Saxon Cemetery*, p. 11.

⁷⁴ Leahy, ‘Anglo-Saxon settlement’, p. 36. With regards to neighbouring Leicestershire, there does indeed seem to be a positive correlation between larger Roman settlements and ‘Pagan’ Anglo-Saxon cemeteries; thus Leicester itself not only has a large cremation cemetery three miles from the town at Thurmaston but also a mixed cremation and inhumation cemetery outside of the East Gate: Peter

explanation of this remarkable situation is demanded and the only plausible scenario is that the early cemetery evidence reflects a British authority at Lincoln which continued to control the city and a significant area around it throughout the fifth century and into the early-sixth century, and which was furthermore able to control the settlement of Germanic immigrants on the edges of this territory. No other explanation of the distribution of the cemetery evidence carries conviction.⁷⁵

The above is, of course, highly significant in the present context: the archaeological evidence is not only perfectly explicable in terms of the British ‘country of **Lindēs*’ found in the non-archaeological sources, but it adds considerable further weight to the arguments for the existence and significance of this polity made above. Indeed, this situation would seem to accord well with the picture of Anglo-Saxon immigrants being controlled by successful British military action *in regione Linnuis* c. 500 that we find in the *Historia Brittonum*.⁷⁶ Furthermore, if we consider the distribution of inhumation cemeteries too, then the Anglo-Saxon archaeological evidence would also seem to support the notion that the balance of power in the ‘country of **Lindēs*’ shifted from British to Germanic hands during the course of the sixth century. Whilst the large cremation cemeteries and their implied territories gave Lincoln a wide berth in the fifth and early-sixth centuries, there are no such indications of deliberate avoidance from the subsequent small inhumation cemeteries which supplemented and replaced these cremation cemeteries, with examples being found only a few miles to both the north and south of Lincoln by the mid-sixth century. This might certainly be taken as indicative that control of the ‘country of **Lindēs*’ had shifted, or was shifting, decisively away from the Britons by this point, although it should be remembered that these inhumation cemeteries are often very small indeed and the evidence for an Anglo-Saxon presence actually within the city itself or in its immediate hinterland remains extremely meagre throughout the entire ‘pagan’ period.⁷⁷

Liddle, *Leicestershire Archaeology: The Present State of Knowledge. Vol 1, To the End of the Roman Period* (Leicester, 1982); Philip W. Williams, *The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Thurmaston, Leicestershire* (Leicester, 1983).

⁷⁵ Leahy, ‘Anglo-Saxon Settlement’, pp. 36-37; Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, p. 50; Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, p. 44; Leahy, *Cleatham Anglo-Saxon Cemetery*, p. 11.

⁷⁶ How these Anglo-Saxon immigrants came to be in Lincolnshire, and thus in need of ‘control’ by the British rulers of Lincoln, is not certain, but the traditional narrative of invitation followed by directed settlement and, later, conflict may not be inappropriate: see further below.

⁷⁷ Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, pp. 50, 59; Leahy, ‘Anglo-Saxon Settlement’, p. 37; Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, p. 46; Kevin Leahy, ‘The Early Saxon Context’, in *The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Castledyke South, Barton-on-Humber*, edited by

Looking at the archaeology of the city of Lincoln, this too offers additional support for – and elaboration of – the evidence for the British ‘country of **Lindēs*’. The key site here is that of St Paul in the Bail, inside the former Roman forum, where there is a highly complex sequence of burials and east-west orientated buildings.⁷⁸ The earliest structure on this site appears to be a rectangular timber building, probably identifiable as a small church, one end of which is divided off by three or more post-holes which may mark the line of the chancel.⁷⁹ Cutting the foundations of this building is a timber apsidal structure which seems to belong to the same building tradition to the first one and is generally agreed to have been a church.⁸⁰ This second church is the one that usually features in discussions of this

G. Drinkall and M. Foreman (Sheffield, 1998), pp. 6-17 at pp. 11-12; Leahy, *Cleatham Anglo-Saxon Cemetery*, pp. 10-11; John Hines, ‘Britain After Rome’, in *Cultural Identity and Archaeology: the Construction of European Communities*, edited by Paul Graves-Brown, Siân Jones and Clive Gamble (London, 1996), pp. 256-70 at pp. 262-263. See also Paul Everson, ‘Pagan Saxon Pottery’, *Lincolnshire History & Archaeology*, 14 (1979), 79-80. The three closest sixth-century inhumation cemeteries to Lincoln – at Welton, Waddington and South Carlton – only have, respectively, 11, 11 and 5 burials so far excavated from them; the contrast with cremation cemeteries such as Loveden Hill (c.2000 burials) is striking, as is that with other local inhumation cemeteries away from Lincoln, such as Castledyke South (196 burials excavated out of c.436) and Sheffield’s Hill I and II (129 burials): Leahy, ‘Anglo-Saxon Settlements’, p. 41; Leahy, *Cleatham Anglo-Saxon Cemetery*, pp. 12-13; Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record, no. 54979; Wessex Archaeology, *pers. comm.*. In addition, there may well have also been another very small sixth-century inhumation cemetery at North Hykeham (to the south of Lincoln), where five brooches and a girdle-hanger have been found by a metal-detectorist: Adam Daubney, *pers. comm.*. Within Lincoln itself, the early Anglo-Saxon material consists chiefly of a couple of handfuls of pottery sherds which could date from any point between the fifth century and c. 650 or even later: Alan Vince, ‘Lincoln in the Early Medieval Era, Between the 5th and 9th Centuries: Archaeological Account’, in Michael J. Jones, David Stocker and Alan Vince, *The City by the Pool: Assessing the Archaeology of the City of Lincoln* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 141-156 at pp. 145-146, 152.

⁷⁸ A full account of the features from this site – although without any detailed interpretation of the same – is now available in Kate Steane, *The Archaeology of the Upper City and Adjacent Suburbs* (Oxford, 2006).

⁷⁹ Kate Steane, ‘St Paul-in-the-Bail – a Dated Sequence?’, *Lincoln Archaeology*, 3 (1990-1), 28-31; Michael J. Jones, ‘The Latter Days of Roman Lincoln’, in *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, edited by Alan Vince (Lincoln, 1993), pp. 14-28 at p. 25; Michael J. Jones, ‘St Paul in the Bail, Lincoln: Britain in Europe?’, in *Churches Built in Ancient Times: Recent Studies in Early Christian Archaeology*, edited by Kenneth Painter (London, 1994), pp. 325-347 at pp. 329-330 and fig.5; Jones, ‘The Colonia Era’, pp. 127-129, 137; Steane, *Archaeology of the Upper City*, p. 192.

⁸⁰ For example, Jones, ‘St Paul in the Bail, Lincoln’, pp. 328-330; Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, p. 115; Steane, *Archaeology of the Upper City*, p. 192.

site, although both buildings do need to be considered in any full interpretation of what is happening here; both are orientated with reasonable precision in the centre of the forum and the proximity of the unexcavated west end of both churches to the assumed western portico of the forum implies that it was probably designed to be entered from there.⁸¹ The absolute dating of the second church is difficult, depending on a coin of Arcadius (388-402) which came from either the latest forum surface or the internal floor of the church, and the radiocarbon date-ranges of a number of burials which are found surrounding, within and cutting the walls of this church. The most significant of the latter include what seems to be a foundation deposit for the second church, dated A.D. 370±90 (CAL 441),⁸² and two burials which cut the wall-line of the church, dated A.D. 540±80 (CAL 642) and 500±80 (CAL 613).⁸³

The evidence of these graves and their radiocarbon date-ranges; the building style and plan of the churches; the positioning and alignment of them within the forum and their relationship to the western portico; the dedication to St Paul; and the fact that the apsidal church seems to have been a direct successor to an earlier church, have all been used by Jones to argue cautiously, but in my view persuasively, that this sequence of churches probably began in the late-fourth century and that it continued into the post-Roman period.⁸⁴ Looking at the evidence and Jones's arguments, a fifth-century date of construction for the second church best fits the available data, with this apsidal church succeeding a smaller late-fourth-century church (this is certainly a far more convincing scenario than any attempt to date the construction of the second church to the early-mid seventh century).⁸⁵ At some point this second church was demolished and

⁸¹ Jones, 'The Colonia Era', p. 129 and fig.7.70; Steane, 'St Paul-in-the-Bail – a Dated Sequence?'; Jones, 'The Latter Days of Roman Lincoln', p. 25; Eagles, 'Lindsey', p. 207.

⁸² Jones, 'St Paul in the Bail, Lincoln', pp. 332-333, 344; Jones, 'The Colonia Era', p. 129; Steane, *Archaeology of the Upper City*, p. 210.

⁸³ Jones, 'St Paul in the Bail, Lincoln', pp. 332, 344; Steane, 'St Paul-in-the-Bail – a Dated Sequence?', pp. 30-31; Steane, *Archaeology of the Upper City*, p. 210.

⁸⁴ Jones, 'St Paul in the Bail, Lincoln'; Steane, 'St Paul-in-the-Bail – a Dated Sequence?'; Jones, 'The Colonia Era', pp. 127-129, 137; Michael J. Jones, *Roman Lincoln: Conquest, Colony & Capital* (Stroud, 2002), pp. 127-129; see also Eagles, 'Lindsey', p. 207.

⁸⁵ This interpretation – that the apsidal structure is an early-mid seventh-century construction, very likely the church referred to by Bede as being built in Lincoln by Paulinus – has been occasionally argued: Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, pp. 226-230 and, far more tentatively, Vince, 'Lincoln in the Early Medieval Era', pp. 147-151 (note, however, that even when suggesting this Vince, p. 149, would still consider the first church as either late Roman or post-Roman British). This theory does, on the whole, seem significantly less credible on a number of grounds,

this most likely took place at some point in the sixth century, although the radiocarbon dates for the two earliest burials to cut the walls would just allow for this occurring in the early-seventh century.⁸⁶ The area of St Paul in the Bail then continued in use as a Christian burial ground into the Late Saxon period, with a single-celled timber structure erected on top of the demolished apsidal church to cover a seventh-century cist grave, this later being succeeded at some point by a stone structure.⁸⁷

In light of the above, it seems probable that we have here a late-fourth-century Romano-British church set up in a significant area of the city – in the centre of the forum – that was rebuilt at some point into a larger apsidal

including the succession of churches on the site (especially given their similarity in terms of construction etc.) and the positioning within the forum. In particular, however, we might point to the radiocarbon dates of the graves that cut the church, which must be stretched to their utmost limits if they are to be made to fit with such an early-mid seventh-century date of *construction* (as in Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, pp. 226-230), given that they suggest that the second church was actually probably *demolished* around this time, if not in fact earlier (as is also noted by Jones, *Roman Lincoln*, p. 129 and Vince, 'Lincoln in the Early Medieval Era', p. 150). Indeed, this is a particular problem if the apsidal church is supposed, as by Sawyer, to be Paulinus's church, as this was still standing *c.* 730 according to Bede, and was furthermore built of stone, not wood (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.16). In light of all this, the case for a seventh-century date for the second church would seem to involve an unfeasible degree of special pleading (as Vince indeed recognizes, pp. 150-151) and the existence of a fifth-sixth century British 'country of **Lindēs*' set out above provides a convincing context for Jones's churches.

⁸⁶ Jones, 'St Paul in the Bail, Lincoln', pp. 332, 344; Steane, 'St Paul-in-the-Bail – a Dated Sequence?', pp. 30-1; Jones, 'The Colonia Era', p. 129; Jones, *Roman Lincoln*, p. 129. The notion that the demolition of this fifth-century apsidal church might have occurred in the fifth-century cannot be completely excluded but it has to be recognized that it is motivated not by the archaeological evidence but by assumptions about how short-lived the British control of Lincoln must have been (as in Jones, 'Latter Days of Roman Lincoln', p. 26), assumptions which the above show to be unsustainable. Gilmour has recently concurred with regards to a potential demolition of the apsidal church in the seventh century, but he also believes that the first church on the site was not built until around the mid-sixth century. This latter contention seems implausible: his view of the first building is debatable and a mid-sixth-century date for the construction of the apsidal church lacks any obvious context: Brian Gilmour, 'Sub-Roman or Saxon, Pagan or Christian: who was buried in the early cemetery at St-Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln?', in *Pagans and Christians – from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*, edited by Lauren Gilmour, BAR International Series 1610 (Oxford, 2007), pp. 229-256.

⁸⁷ Jones, 'St Paul in the Bail, Lincoln', p. 333; Kate Steane and Alan Vince, 'Post-Roman Lincoln: Archaeological Evidence for Activity in Lincoln from the 5th to the 9th Centuries', in *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, edited by Alan Vince (Lincoln, 1993), pp. 71-79 at pp. 72, 74; Steane, *Archaeology of the Upper City*.

structure and which then continued in use into the sixth century and perhaps beyond. Such a sequence of late and post-Roman churches has a good context within late- and post-Roman Britain, as well as the empire at large. As Hase has observed, any major town in Britain ‘without a church would have found itself embarrassed by the third quarter of the fourth century’, and just about the only sin Gildas does not accuse his fellow sixth-century Britons of is paganism, indicating that he considered them to be Christians, albeit sinful ones.⁸⁸ Any significant British polity based at Lincoln might thus be expected to have at least one church. Indeed, one attractive interpretation of the role and importance of the St Paul in the Bail churches stems from the fact that Lincoln seems to have had its own bishop from the early-fourth century, when Adelphius bishop of Lincoln was sent to the Council of Arles (314), thus suggesting that the St Paul in the Bail sequence could be seen as part of a continuing episcopal establishment in what had been one of the capital towns of late Roman Britain and was now the centre of a British territory.⁸⁹ Parallels for the existence of such religious centres into the fifth century and beyond are to be had from the West Midlands, where Bassett has shown there to be a strong probability that there were British bishops in places such as Gloucester and Lichfield before there were Anglo-Saxon ones, and in other areas of Britain such as at Exeter.⁹⁰ Indeed, if we were to interpret the burial evidence as pointing to an early-seventh-century demolition for the apsidal church, then this would fit well with Bassett’s argument from the West Midlands that in the seventh century the pre-existing British bishops were silently replaced with Anglo-

⁸⁸ Patrick H. Hase, ‘The Church in the Wessex Heartlands’, in *The Medieval Landscape of Wessex*, edited by Michael Aston and Carenza Lewis (Oxford, 1994), pp. 47-52 at p. 47; Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae*. See further on Christianity in late- and post-Roman Britain, Snyder, *Age of Tyrants*, especially pp. 235-240 and, for example, Richard Sharpe, ‘Martyrs and Local Saints in Late Antique Britain’, in *Local Saints and Local Churches in the Early Medieval West*, edited by Alan Thacker and Richard Sharpe (Oxford, 2002), pp. 75-154.

⁸⁹ Jones, ‘St Paul in the Bail, Lincoln’; Charles Thomas, *Christianity in Roman Britain to AD 500* (London, 1981), p. 197; Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, p. 117.

⁹⁰ Steven Bassett, ‘Church and Diocese in the West Midlands’, in *Pastoral Care Before the Parish*, edited by John Blair and Richard Sharpe (London, 1992), pp. 13-40; Steven Bassett, ‘Medieval Ecclesiastical Organisation in the Vicinity of Wroxeter and its British Antecedents’, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 145 (1992), 1-28; Barbara Yorke, ‘Lindsey: The Lost Kingdom Found?’, in *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, edited by Alan Vince (Lincoln, 1993), pp. 141-150 at p. 145; Jones, ‘The Colonia Era’, p. 137. An alternative is that the second church represents a fifth- and sixth-century cult and political centre of a British ruler based at Lincoln, although the size of the apsidal church (which could have held more than 100 worshippers) might argue against this. Either explanation is, of course, important from the present perspective.

Saxon bishops for political reasons, as the new Anglo-Saxon rulers of these areas were converted to the Roman brand of Christianity. From this perspective it should be remembered that Paulinus – one of St Augustine’s companions – converted the Anglo-Saxon *praefectus* of Lincoln (named Blæcca) and his household in *c.* 627/8 and, most significantly, built a new stone church somewhere in the city at the same time.⁹¹ It is tempting to wonder whether there might not be some relationship between these events and the demolition of the apsidal church, to be interpreted in light of Bassett’s findings. Indeed, in support of such continuity into the seventh century we ought to note Yorke’s suggestion that Bede may have known of miracles associated with a British saint in Lincoln but chose not to explain them fully because of their British associations, for the same political reasons.⁹²

Once again, this picture drawn from the archaeology has a very good context in terms of the British ‘country of **Lindēs*’ found in the non-archaeological sources whilst also adding yet more weight to the arguments for the existence and – most particularly – significance of this polity made previously. Most especially, it suggests that the ‘country of **Lindēs*’ was a fully-functioning Christian territory which was probably able to not only maintain its late Roman bishopric but also had the resources and will to rebuild and enlarge its church in the forum in the fifth century (the second church could hold up to 100 or so worshippers). The likely period in which the second church was demolished is also telling, providing additional supporting evidence for the view argued above that the British control of Lincoln continued into the sixth century. Moreover, if the demolition date can be pushed into the early-seventh century – by which time Lincoln was undoubtedly in Anglo-Saxon hands – then the archaeology of St Paul in the Bail would also seem to further the notion (evidenced in the names *Lindissi/Lindesig* and *Cadbad*) of a relatively peaceful final takeover of Lindsey by the Anglo-Saxons, allowing British religious practices and perhaps organization to continue (until the Anglo-Saxons were converted by the Roman church). That such a peaceful accommodation between pagan Anglo-Saxons and British Christians in Lindsey could occur is, in fact, signified by a recent study of dedications to St Helen in the region, which are usually found in association with springs and water-courses. Lindsey has

⁹¹ Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II.16; Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, pp. 114–115, 117. See Eagles, ‘Lindsey’, p. 210 on Blæcca’s status, which is probably not fully conveyed by its usual translation as ‘reeve’; was he another of the early Anglo-Saxon kings of Lindsey?

⁹² Yorke, ‘Lindsey: the Lost Kingdom Found?’, p. 145. Compare the treatment of the presumably British St Sixtus that St Augustine encountered in Kent, whose unorthodox cult was replaced by St Augustine with that of a Roman St Sixtus: Nicholas Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury* (London, 1984), p. 20.

been shown to be in the core zone of sites with such dedications, alongside Elmet and Deira, with the argument being made that these dedications represent a Christianisation of the well-attested Romano-British pagan veneration of springs and wells, in this case sites dedicated to a British goddess named *Alauna*.⁹³ Such Christianization would presumably have been undertaken by fourth- and fifth-century British Christians, given Gildas's lack of knowledge of sixth-century British paganism, and the Christian veneration of these sites then must have continued through the pagan Anglo-Saxon period into the seventh century, in order for the dedications to have survived.⁹⁴

Other archaeological evidence from Lindsey may be similarly explicable in terms of the British 'country of **Lindēs*' and can help to further flesh out and develop our understanding of this and its relationship to the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Lindsey. One might point, for example, to the very limited but intriguing evidence for some degree of continuity in the Romano-British pottery industry around Lincoln. Dark has drawn attention to a sixth-century Anglo-Saxon stamped pot that was found in the flue ashes of a fourth-century Romano-British pottery kiln near Lincoln, which he considers both dates and represents the last firing of this kiln.⁹⁵ Similarly, Leahy has argued that four wheel-thrown cremation urns from the Cleatham Anglo-Saxon cremation cemetery were made using Roman techniques but cannot be seen as re-used Roman-era pots due to their body-shapes and fabrics, instead representing products of the post-Roman fifth-century British pottery industry.⁹⁶ There is also the curious case of Lea kilns, near Gainsborough. This site, which saw activity through to the very-late-fourth century, includes a kiln with what appears to be normal Roman pottery from its last firing still inside it; however, magnetic dating samples taken during the excavation indicate that the last firing actually took place in the mid-late fifth century.⁹⁷ Finally, there are a handful of items which seem

⁹³ Graham Jones, 'Holy Wells and the Cult of St Helen', *Landscape History*, 8 (1986), 59-75; Yorke, 'Lindsey: the Lost Kingdom Found?', p. 142.

⁹⁴ This model of a peaceful accommodation between pagans and Christians in Lincoln holds good even if the church was demolished in the sixth century, as Christian burial on the site seems to continue from the British period until the Late Saxon period, as Eagles, 'Lindsey', p. 207, has observed.

⁹⁵ K. R. Dark, 'Pottery and Local Production at the End of Roman Britain', in *External Contacts and the Economy of Late Roman and Post-Roman Britain*, edited by K. R. Dark (Woodbridge, 1996), pp. 53-65 at pp. 58-59; see also Jones, 'The Colonia Era', p. 138.

⁹⁶ Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, pp. 52-53, 86; Leahy, *Cleatham Anglo-Saxon Cemetery*, pp. 126-127.

⁹⁷ Naomi Field, 'Romano-British Pottery Kilns in the Trent Valley', *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology*, 19 (1984), 100-102. Dr D. Tarling and Mrs N. H. Yassi, who

to be made from 'Romano-British' pottery fabrics but occur in 'Anglo-Saxon' forms, the most interesting example being a bottle sherd from Hibaldstow that was found in a ditch along with Romano-British greyware and some 'normal' early-mid Saxon sherds. This is in an attested local late-fourth-/early-fifth-century fabric but has the form of a Germanic sixth- or seventh-century bottle.⁹⁸ All the above might be taken to suggest that some limited form of Romano-British pottery production continued in the Lincoln area, perhaps assisted by continued British control of the region but obscured archaeologically by a lack of fifth-century and later coins, something which Whyman and others have argued is a major problem with dating the final phase of pottery production.⁹⁹ If so, it would add weight to the case for peaceful interaction and/or acculturation between the British and immigrant populations, particularly given that the implication of the above seems to be that the remains of this Romano-British industry in Lindsey started to produce pottery for immigrant groups. However, all this is open to debate¹⁰⁰ and a better final source of evidence may come from another type of artefact, namely post-Roman penannular brooches.

conducted the analysis, conclude that 'If the kiln was not last fired at this time, then the reason for the observed deviation is not known and urgently requires further study.' (pp. 101-102).

⁹⁸ C. F. Lingard and L. Bonner, *Blyborough-Brigg 300mm Gas Pipeline, 1993, Archaeological Report* (1994), pp. 21-26, 79, fig. 7, who also discuss two other vessels currently in Lincoln Museum, to which attention was first brought by J. N. L. Myres, 'Lincoln in the Fifth Century A.D.', *The Archaeological Journal*, 103 (1946), 85-88.

⁹⁹ As Whyman, Dark and others have noted, pottery is dated through association with coins and the fact that there are no (or very few) fifth-century coins may well have caused archaeologists to assign an early-fifth-century end-date to Romano-British pottery fabrics and forms when these may have continued in production and use for some time after this date: Mark Whyman, 'Invisible People? Material Culture in 'Dark Age' Yorkshire', in *In Search of Cult*, edited by Martin Carver (Woodbridge, 1992), pp. 61-68; Dark, 'Pottery and Local Production', p. 59; Philip Rahtz, 'Anglo-Saxon Yorkshire: Current Research Problems', in *Early Deira: Archaeological Studies of the East Riding in the Fourth to Ninth Centuries AD*, edited by Helen Geake and Jonathan Kenny (Oxford, 2000), p. 1.

¹⁰⁰ The quantity of such material recognized so far from the study region is, after all, meagre, and additionally claims for post-Roman pieces in 'Romano-British' forms rather than fabric/construction (as with one of the pots discussed by Myres, 'Lincoln in the Fifth Century') might be explained as simply immigrant potters copying Roman pots that they found. Nonetheless, in this context it may be worth reconsidering the origins of certain supposedly Anglo-Saxon fabrics from the region – thus Hayfield has argued on the basis of evidence from Barton-on-Humber that early-mid Saxon shell-tempered pottery might in fact have a late Roman origin: Colin Hayfield, *Humberside Medieval Pottery*, BAR British Series 140, 2 volumes (Oxford, 1985), I, p. 50.

There is a remarkable concentration of post-Roman British Class 1 penannular brooches in Lindsey, with twelve such items having so far been discovered, all of which probably belong to the fifth and sixth centuries.¹⁰¹ Nationally these brooches are concentrated around the Severn estuary and in the Votadini territory north of the Roman Wall, and they are extremely rare in those areas which (like Lindsey) lie within the archaeologically-described limits of fifth-century Anglo-Saxon settlement.¹⁰² However, the Lindsey group is not only comparable in size with the total number of brooches known from all the rest of this zone of Anglo-Saxon settlement, as recorded by Youngs, but also with the number recorded from the individual core areas for this class of British brooches too.¹⁰³ Consequently, although the Class 1 penannular brooches found in eastern Britain are often taken to be imports from the British regions to the west,¹⁰⁴ if they are viewed as such then the Lindsey finds must at the very least represent both significant contacts between the British west and Lindsey and also a very considerable interest amongst the population of Lindsey in acquiring these obviously non-Anglo-Saxon pieces. The latter impression is, moreover, greatly increased by the fact that evidence for local production of some of

¹⁰¹ James Graham-Campbell, 'Dinas Powys Metalwork and the Dating of Enamelled Zoomorphic Penannular Brooches', *Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, 38 (1991), 220-232; Leahy, 'The Early Saxon Context', p. 11; Leahy 'Formation of the Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey', p. 132; Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, pp. 83-84, 106. The latter includes an illustration of some sixth-century examples from Lindsey and a distribution map of ten of the Class 1 brooches, both complete and partial, from the region; the eleventh and twelfth brooches come from Riby and Nettleton and are recorded by the Portable Antiquities Scheme as LIN-13A030 and NLM2812 (pin only: Susan Youngs, *pers. comm.*). As a group, Class 1 brooches are usually dated to the fifth and sixth centuries and this is followed by Leahy for the Lindsey finds; Dark dates them generally from the fifth to seventh centuries and is sceptical as to whether the one example from Britain thought to pre-date c.A.D. 400 actually does so: *Britain and the End of the Roman Empire*, p. 132, however cf. Susan Youngs, 'Britain, Wales and Ireland: Holding Things Together', in *Ireland and Wales in the Middle Ages*, edited by Karen Jankulak and Jonathan M. Wooding (Dublin, 2007), pp. 80-101 at p. 82.

¹⁰² See Stuart Laycock, *Britannia, The Failed State* (Stroud, 2008), p.173 for a recent plot of fifth-century Anglo-Saxon sites, which updates Dark, *Britain and the End of the Roman Empire*, p. 11 (figure 1.1); see also John Hines, 'Philology, Archaeology and the *adventus Saxonum vel Anglorum*', in *Britain 400-600: Language and History*, edited by Alfred Bammesberger and Alfred Wollmann (Heidelberg, 1990), pp. 17-36 at p. 34. Youngs, 'Holding Things Together', p. 96 gives the distribution of Class 1 brooches, as does Dark, *Britain and the End of the Roman Empire*, p. 131.

¹⁰³ Youngs, 'Holding Things Together', p. 96 and *pers. comm.*

¹⁰⁴ Roger H. White, 'Scrap or Substitute: Roman Material in Anglo-Saxon Graves', in *Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries: A Reappraisal*, edited by Edmund Southworth (Stroud, 1990), pp. 125-152 at p. 127; Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, p. 84.

these items within Lindsey itself has been discovered, which Leahy argues signifies ‘an active local tradition of making and wearing these British brooches.’¹⁰⁵ Obviously all of this is highly intriguing in the present context, and some further consideration of the Lindsey brooches is required.

Given the number of Class 1 brooches involved and the evidence for their local production in Lindsey, the view that their presence there is indicative of nothing more than simply small-scale trade between the British west and the Anglo-Saxon east seems implausible. A more credible alternate explanation for the significant concentration of these brooches in Lindsey is to see them as being imported by and made for local British elites within the ‘country of **Lindēs*’, who were looking to signal and reinforce their ethnic identity and status in response (and opposition) to the very visible material culture of competing and threatening local immigrant groups who had settled on the edges of this British territory in second half of the fifth century.¹⁰⁶ Certainly in this context the frequent use of brooches as elite symbols in Late Antiquity and the Early Medieval period ought to be noted, and both Youngs and Dark do indeed consider Class 1 penannular brooches to be British elite objects used for symbolic displays.¹⁰⁷ Similarly, the idea that such elite symbols could be particularly used to reinforce both social status and identity within groups facing significant opposition or threat is well-established. One instructive example of this comes from the Merovingian Frankish kingdom, where the region that shows the most lavish, ostentatious and deliberate use of Frankish material culture is the Rhineland area, which our historical sources indicate was the periphery of the kingdom. This was where the local elites felt most under threat (from the Danes, for example) and so needed to express their identity in a very obvious way; in contrast, the elites in the secure centre of the kingdom had no such need and so we find no such lavish displays in the archaeology of this area.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁵ Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, p. 84 and *pers.comm.*

¹⁰⁶ Susan Youngs, *pers. comm.*, would similarly see these brooches as being made for and worn by British elites living in Lindsey, and additionally considers that the vast majority of the Lindsey examples are likely to have been made locally rather than imported from the west, emerging from a local British tradition of wearing penannular brooches; see further Youngs, ‘Holding Things Together’.

¹⁰⁷ Margaret R. Niecke, ‘Penannular and Related Brooches: Secular Ornament or Symbol in Action?’, in *The Age of Migrating Ideas: Early Medieval Art in Northern Britain and Ireland*, edited by R. Michael Spearman and John Higgitt (Edinburgh, 1993), pp. 128-34; Dominic Janes, ‘The Golden Clasp of the Late Roman State’, *Early Medieval Europe*, 5.2 (1991), 127-153; Youngs, ‘Holding Things Together’, pp. 86-89; Dark, *Britain and the End of the Roman Empire*, p. 133.

¹⁰⁸ Guy Halsall, ‘Social Change Around A.D.600: an Austrasian Perspective’, in *The Age of Sutton Hoo: The Seventh-Century in North-western Europe*, edited by Martin

The distribution of the fifth- and sixth-century British penannular brooches would seem to support the above interpretation of their function in post-Roman Lindsey society. Accordingly, none of the twelve brooches so far found in Lindsey come from the area around Lincoln, which was kept largely free of immigrant groups to judge from the early cemetery evidence discussed above. All instead come from what would seem to have been the periphery of the ‘country of *Lindēs’, where the large cremation cemeteries and the immigrant groups were located, a distribution recently confirmed by the discovery of the first two Class 1 brooches from southern Lincolnshire, both of which were found a few miles to the south of the southern cremation cemeteries.¹⁰⁹ Indeed, there would seem to be a positive correlation between the cremation cemeteries and the localities that these items have been found in.¹¹⁰ Thus, for example, three brooches come from Kirmington, a small Roman town.¹¹¹ This settlement seems to have remained reasonably active and prosperous right up until the point where the end of the coin sequence masks what is happening there, and it is only a few miles south-east of the large cremation cemetery at Elsham.¹¹² Living close to the primary centres of Anglo-Saxon activity in Lindsey, any local British elites in these peripheral areas would have plentiful reason to try to assert their ethnic identity and status through the manufacture, possible

Carver (Woodbridge, 1992), pp. 265-278; Lotte Hedeager, ‘Kingdoms, Ethnicity and Material Culture: Denmark in a European Perspective’ in *The Age of Sutton Hoo: The Seventh-Century in North-western Europe*, edited by Martin Carver (Woodbridge, 1992), pp. 279-300 especially figs.53-55 and pp. 299-300; Guy Halsall, *Early Medieval Cemeteries: An Introduction to Burial Archaeology in the Post-Roman West* (Glasgow, 1995), pp. 12, 66.

¹⁰⁹ These brooches come from two separate sites and bring the total Class 1 finds from Lincolnshire to fourteen: Portable Antiquities Scheme, LIN-0C0594 and LIN-67EA05 (pin only).

¹¹⁰ See Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, p. 106 (figure 38).

¹¹¹ One of these, dated by Leahy to the sixth century, is illustrated in Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, p. 106 (figure 37). The description of Kirmington as a town is debatable but it is used by the literature so is retained here; Kirmington covered 20ha. so was certainly a major rural settlement, if nothing else.

¹¹² For example, it has 1511 coins dated 364-388 and an impressive (given the context of the times) 102 from 388-402, as well as numerous late-Roman belt fittings. As Leahy has noted, given that ‘base metal coins were not imported into Britain after c.402’ and are our main source of dating evidence, this site ‘could have been occupied well into the fifth century’: *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, p. 33; Ben Whitwell, ‘Late Roman Settlement on the Humber and Anglian Beginnings’, in *Recent Research in Roman Yorkshire*, edited by J. Price and P. R. Wilson, BAR British Series 193 (Oxford, 1988), pp. 49-78 at p. 59. These three fifth- and sixth-century British brooches from Kirmington do, of course, tend to confirm and develop this line of thought.

importation, and wearing of these brooches (and whatever associated clothing), at least as long as the British ‘country of **Lindēs*’ survived and was able to exert some control over the Anglo-Saxon settlers in its territory.¹¹³ Presumably such arguably defiant Britishness would only be practical for such local peripheral British elites whilst there were British leaders of influence at Lincoln who could support them; after the point at which the balance of power in the region shifted decisively away from the Britons (as it must have), these same elites may well then have felt the need to align themselves with the new ascendant power and adopt the immigrant culture in order to survive. The above suggestion does, actually, provide a plausible context for the presence of two of these British brooches in local Anglo-Saxon cemeteries – one from Cleatham cremation cemetery and one from a sixth-century inhumation at Sheffield’s Hill cemetery – which might be thus seen as the result of such ultimate and inevitable acculturation and assimilation of these local British elites by the immigrants’ ascendancy.¹¹⁴

If the above explanation is correct then it provides yet another instance where the archaeological evidence both becomes explicable in terms of the British ‘country of **Lindēs*’ found in the non-archaeological sources, as well as adding to our understanding of this unit and its character. So, the date, distribution and find-spots of these penannular brooches indicates, once again, that British control of the territory and Anglo-Saxon settlement within it lasted through the fifth century and at least partway through the sixth century, but not into the seventh century. Rather, by the end of the

¹¹³ The interpretation of the Class 1 brooches advanced here might also be applicable to the five or six post-Roman British type G brooches from Lincolnshire, nearly all of which were found in **Lindēs*’s periphery regions, with the single exception still being found around ten miles from Lincoln: Tania M. Dickinson, ‘Fowler’s Type G Penannular Brooches Reconsidered’, *Medieval Archaeology*, 26 (1982), 41-68 at pp. 48, 52 and figures 1-4; Portable Antiquities Scheme, NLM1052, LIN-7866F3, DENO-DD5FA4 and perhaps NLM6301.

¹¹⁴ There may be other archaeological evidence for British elites close-by the cremation cemeteries of Lindsey acculturating and thus maintaining their status. For example, a large Roman villa at Kirton-in-Lindsey has produced (through field-walking) an enormous amount of early Anglo-Saxon pottery, some early Anglo-Saxon loom-weights, a *francisca* and evidence of continuity in field boundaries. This material is being interpreted as continuous occupation and acculturation in the forthcoming publication of this site and it is difficult to avoid associating the site with Cleatham cemetery just two miles to the north (North Lincolnshire Sites and Monuments Record, no. 6531; James Albone, *pers. comm.*). Was this possibly the home of a member of the post-Roman British elite who responded at some point to the settlement of the immigrants just to the north of him by signalling his ‘affiliation with the new ascendancy’ through the rapid adoption of immigrant material culture in order to protect his own social position? It may be relevant that the Hibaldstow pot, discussed above, comes from this area too.

sixth century it would seem that at least some members of the local British elites who presumably used these items had thrown their lot in with the immigrants (as at Sheffield's Hill), which ought to be taken as indicative that power within Lindsey had passed, or was beginning to pass, 'from British to Germanic hands'.¹¹⁵

Nonetheless, whilst these brooches may simply confirm the chronology deduced previously and the likelihood of some peaceful Anglo-British interaction/accluration, they potentially add new information too. Primarily, the above interpretation of the brooches allows us to recognize for the first time that such local British groups and elites probably did exist in those areas of Lindsey where the Anglo-Saxons were settled, and that these groups and elites were willing to compete with the Anglo-Saxon groups into the sixth century and maintained contacts with their fellow Britons in western Britain too. Of course, peer-competition between British and Anglo-Saxon groups, followed by the acculturation of the British groups, is just what Scull and others have theorized was taking place in eastern England in this period, and so the above evidence fits nicely into this model.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, the existence of such local British elites across fifth- and sixth-century Lindsey, and their eventual acculturation, may also help explain the fact that more 'Celtic' hanging bowls have been found in Lincolnshire than in any other comparable area of Anglo-Saxon England, with fourteen known from Lindsey alone.¹¹⁷ Although the evidence is too complex to pursue in detail here and some of these items were certainly subsequently utilized in Anglo-Saxon graves, it is important to note that these hanging bowls were most probably originally high-status pieces of British table-ware, dating chiefly from the sixth and early-seventh centuries.¹¹⁸

¹¹⁵ As Yorke puts it: Yorke, 'Lindsey: The Lost Kingdom Found?', p. 142.

¹¹⁶ Christopher Scull, 'Approaches to the Material Culture and Social Dynamics of the Migration Period in Eastern England', in *Europe Between Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, edited by John Bintliff and Helena Hamerow, BAR International Series 617 (Oxford, 1995), pp. 71-83. See also on peer competition at a local level being an essential precursor to Anglo-Saxon kingdoms: Christopher Scull, 'Archaeology, Early Anglo-Saxon Society and the Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms', *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*, 6 (1993), pp. 65-82.

¹¹⁷ Rupert Bruce-Mitford, 'Late Celtic Hanging Bowls in Lincolnshire and South Humberside', in *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, edited by Alan Vince (Lincoln, 1993), pp. 45-70; Susan Youngs, 'Insular Metalwork from Flixborough, Lincolnshire', *Medieval Archaeology*, 45 (2001), 210-220 at pp. 216-220; Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, pp. 84-85 and p. 106 for a distribution map of the fourteen bowls from Lindsey.

¹¹⁸ Youngs, 'Insular Metalwork', pp. 219-220; Dark, *Britain and the End of the Roman Empire*, pp. 132-133; Susan Youngs, *pers. comm.*. See also Rupert Bruce-Mitford, *A Corpus of Late Celtic Hanging Bowls* (Oxford, 2005), especially pp. 32, 34-40 for a restatement of the British origins of these bowls and support for such a usage;

Second, the presence of British elites in the periphery of the ‘country of **Lindēs*’ implies that Lincoln maintained at least vestigial control through the late-fifth century and into the sixth century of even the areas of its territory settled by Germanic immigrants, in order that these Britons there could maintain their identity so late. This in turn suggests that the traditional narrative of deliberate invitation and controlled settlement of the Anglo-Saxons by the British authorities for the purposes of defence – followed by a later breakdown in relations and conflict – might be an appropriate paradigm for the presence of Anglo-Saxons in the ‘country of **Lindēs*’, which is interesting in light of the *Historia Brittonum* reference and the possibility of placing Badon in Lindsey. In further support of this we might cite both the fairly even distribution of cremation cemeteries in a ring around Lincoln and the fact that these are often close-by potential strategic sites for the defence of British Lindsey. Thus, for example, the Elsham cremation cemetery is located 3½ miles from the important earthwork fortification known as Yarborough Camp (whose name derives from Old English *eorð-burg*, ‘earthen fortification’), which was probably refortified in the late-fourth or early-fifth century and would have been used in the defence of north Lindsey.¹¹⁹ Similarly the South Elkington-Louth cremation cemetery is located to the south-west of another Yarburgh, which Cox believes was likewise used and fortified in the very late-/post-Roman period for the defence of the eastern seaboard.¹²⁰

note, Bruce-Mitford considers some of the hanging bowls to date from the fifth century, including two from Lincolnshire (p. 26: Sleaford and Caistor). On the use of these bowls in Anglo-Saxon graves, see Helen Geake, ‘When Were Hanging Bowls Deposited in Anglo-Saxon Graves?’, *Medieval Archaeology*, 43 (1999), 1-18.

¹¹⁹ Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, pp. 111-114; Cameron, *Place-Names of Lincolnshire II*, p. 8.

¹²⁰ Barrie Cox, ‘Yarboroughs in Lindsey’, *English Place-Name Society Journal*, 28 (1994-5), 50-60 at pp. 52-3, 59. In this context it ought to be noted that the West Keal cremation cemetery stands on a high spot of the southernmost Wolds overlooking the Witham valley, one of the major entry-points for Lincolnshire and Lincoln itself. If the Bolingbroke soke does derive from the territory that originally was served by this cemetery – see Everson, ‘Pre-Viking Settlement’, p. 98 and additionally above for similar situations around the other cremation cemeteries – then it may be significant that some of the other parishes within this territory have a name (Toynton All Saints and Toynton St Peter < *Totintun*, *Totingtun*) that may well mean ‘the estate associated with the look-out hill, OE *tōf*: Mills, *Dictionary of English Place-Names*, pp. xvii, 333. Might this, or something similar, have been a name that originally applied to the whole territory?’

Synthesis: Britons and Anglo-Saxons in Post-Roman Lindsey

The evidence discussed above does not, of course, reflect all the potentially relevant archaeological material, but it does cover the most significant elements of it. Each element is, on its own, intriguing and suggestive. Taken together and put alongside the non-archaeological material discussed in the first part of this article, a clear and convincing picture of a fifth- and sixth-century British polity based around Lincoln begins to emerge. Whilst no detailed narrative of the post-Roman period in the Lincoln area survives to us,¹²¹ the following would seem to be a reasonable reconstruction based on all of the evidence discussed so far. The ‘country of **Lindēs*’ is best seen as the British successor to the *territorium* of Lincoln, which was one of the four provincial capitals of Britannia and seems to have been notably prosperous in the very-late fourth century.¹²² This polity would have had British leaders, drawn almost certainly from the late Roman aristocracy, and very likely a British bishop too, the old forum of the town being given over to a church which was entered from its western portico; continued commitment to both the town and its church by the Britons of the ‘country of **Lindēs*’ is indicated by an expansion and elaboration of this church, which can be tentatively dated to the early-mid fifth century.

At some point in the mid-late fifth century the peripheral parts of this British ‘country of **Lindēs*’ were settled by Anglo-Saxon immigrants, quite possibly as part of a deliberate strategy of territorial defence.¹²³ These

¹²¹ Unless Ambrosius Aurelianus really was based in the region, as is tentatively suggested above, in which case Gildas’s narrative and the legendarized version of it applied to Arthur in the *Historia Brittonum* would constitute this. Certainly the above picture of a British polity in eastern England, which maintained its bishopric and was able to not only survive into the sixth century but control the Germanic immigrants settled on its periphery, would seem to provide a good context for Gildas’s Ambrosius and Badon.

¹²² There is evidence for specialist industry, a cohesive central organization, a considerable population and a thriving market to the end of the fourth century, with streets continuing to be repaved after this, see Keith Dobney, Deborah Jaques and Brian Irving, *Of Butchers and Breeds: Report on Vertebrate Remains from Various Sites in the City of Lincoln* (Lincoln, 1996), particularly pp. 2-4, 57-61; Jones, ‘Latter days of Roman Lincoln’; Steane and Vince, ‘Post-Roman Lincoln’, p. 71; Jones, ‘The Colonia Era’, pp. 133-135. This is not, of course, to say that Lincoln did not suffer greatly from coin shortages and the withdrawal of the Roman army – like all Roman towns in Britain: Simon Esmonde-Cleary, ‘Late Roman Towns in Britain and Their Fate’, in *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, edited by Alan Vince (Lincoln, 1993), pp. 6-13 – nor from a fourth-century decline in public buildings and alteration in the usage of the urban space, although we should not forget that these latter are empire-wide trends: for example, Bryan Ward-Perkins, *From Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1984).

immigrant groups seem to have been controlled by the Britons and prevented – at least into the early-sixth century – from significantly encroaching upon the Britons’ chief settlement of Lincoln, judging from the distribution of the large cremation cemeteries and their implied territories. The *Historia Brittonum* suggests that military action *c.* 500 may well have played a role in this containment; indeed, it is not beyond the realms of possibility that such action was led by Ambrosius Aurelianus and that famous Battle of Badon could have been fought in Lindsey, although this must remain speculative. Whatever the case may be, it seems credible that the British leaders based at Lincoln in this period were able to exert some degree of political control not only over the immediate area around Lincoln but also the peripheral regions settled by these Anglo-Saxons too, given the evidence for the local British elites in these areas being able and willing to assert their ethnic identity in opposition to the immigrant groups there – via the use of Class 1 British penannular brooches – through the fifth century and into the sixth. The potential survival of rural British Christian cult-sites in Lindsey (as in Elmet), indicated by dedications to St Helen, might also be explicable as a result of such a degree of continued British control in the immigrant-settled areas.

The power and influence of this British ‘country of **Lindēs*’ seems to have deteriorated from the early-sixth century onwards. The most obvious evidence of this is that there are no indications of a deliberate avoidance of Lincoln by the small Anglo-Saxon inhumation cemeteries which supplemented and replaced the large cremation cemeteries, with examples being found only a few miles to both the north and south of Lincoln by the mid-sixth century – although it must be recognized that these sites are not

¹²³ There is certainly evidence for Anglo-Saxon immigrants in Lincolnshire from the second half of the fifth century; how early they were here, and if any were here before *c.* 450, is still very much a matter of debate though. Thus, for example, the first phase at Cleatham could begin as early as the first quarter of the fifth century or as late as the last quarter, although the excavator plausibly considers a date *c.* 450 as most likely: Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, p. 44; Leahy, *Cleatham Anglo-Saxon Cemetery*, p. 263. Similarly, we have from Lindsey a small but fascinating body of fourth- and early-fifth-century Germanic metalwork which might be taken as indicative of the type of early post-Roman federate settlement discussed by Welch. However the value of these pieces for establishing the date and nature of the settlement is questionable, given that the date of their deposition is unknown and finds of a similar antiquity from elsewhere in Britain have been found in contexts as late as the last quarter of the fifth century and beyond: Leahy ‘Formation of the Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey’, p. 129; Martin Welch, ‘The Archaeological Evidence for Federate Settlement in Britain Within the Fifth Century’, in *L’Armée Romaine et les Barbares du IIIe au VIIe Siècle*, edited by Françoise Vallet and Michel Kazanski (Rouen, 1993), pp. 269-277; Hines, ‘Philology, Archaeology and the *adventus Saxonum vel Anglorum*’, pp. 21-2.

on anything like the scale of the cremation cemeteries (for example, the sixth-century cemetery at Welton-by-Lincoln only has 11 graves so far discovered, whereas around 2000 burials were excavated at Loveden Hill) and the evidence for a ‘pagan’ Anglo-Saxon presence in Lincoln itself is meagre indeed. Similarly, there is no hint that the local British elites in the peripheral zones continued to emphasize their separateness from the immigrants in the above manner into the seventh century. In fact, the find-spots of the penannular brooches indicate that at some point in the sixth century these outlying elites may have aligned themselves with a new ascendant power and adopted the immigrant culture in order to survive, which in turn implies that the this period was one in which the dominant power within Lindsey had passed, or was beginning to pass, from British to Germanic hands. The sixth century is also likely to be the period in which the apsidal church at Lincoln was demolished; although Christian and presumably British burial occurred at the site subsequently, this demolition might well be taken to suggest a decline or disappearance of the British elites in the city.

On the whole, the best explanation of the above evidence is probably that the Britons of Lincoln finally lost control of the ‘country of **Lindēs*’ at some point around the mid-sixth century. This would seem to be corroborated by the reference to *hynnysawr*, ‘Lindsey-men’, at the battle of *Catraeth* c. 570, whom Cessford has plausibly argued were kingdom-less warriors who had found a place at another British court (and took part in its battles) after the recent final loss of their homeland. Certainly Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica* II.16 indicates that there was an Anglo-Saxon (Blæcca) in control of Lincoln by the early-seventh century. It is also noteworthy that the bearer of the British or part-British name in the genealogy of Aldfrið, king of Lindsey, would have probably lived in the early-mid sixth century. The name *Cadbad* is, after all, suggestive of intermarriage between the Britons of Lincoln and the pre-eminent Anglo-Saxon lineage in Lindsey, which went on to rule the kingdom,¹²⁴ and such intermarriage would most

¹²⁴ This lineage that eventually took over the British kingdom of Lindsey presumably emerged from the kind of peer-polity competition between the different immigrant groups discussed and described by Scull, ‘Archaeology, Early Anglo-Saxon Society and the Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms’. I would tentatively suggest that this lineage may have its origins in the group based around Cleatham-Kirton in Lindsey: the richest barrow burial in Lindsey seems to be associated with this group (Caenby) and Kirton was clearly a very important centre in the Anglo-Saxon period. In this context it may be worth pointing to the fact that this group appears to be centred on the main north-south Roman road to Lincoln, Ermine Street. Where this meets the Humber we find two place-names, Winterton and Winteringham, both of which contain the name *Wintra*, which is also found in the form *Winta* in the Lindsey royal genealogy, where it is the first name to appear after the mythical

credibly belong to a period in which the immigrants were gaining in power but had not yet taken over the ‘country of **Lindēs*’.

Intermarriage may, of course, indicate that when the takeover came it was relatively peaceful, or at least not entirely violent. This interpretation is supported by other evidence too. Most importantly the kingdom name *Lindissi/Lindesig*, ‘Lindsey’, is clearly taken from that of the preceding British polity, and it is quite possible that British Christianity was tolerated by the new rulers, with the St Helen’s dedications surviving in the countryside and the apsidal church at St Paul in the Bail being just possibly maintained into the early-seventh century.¹²⁵ Furthermore, local British elites on the periphery could well have acculturated and ‘become’ Anglo-Saxon in order to protect their own status, as noted above, just as British potters seem to have turned their hand to making items for the new ascendancy. Indeed, there is some evidence that high-status Britons close to Lincoln were also able and willing to acculturate and, we must assume, peacefully join with the new ascendancy when the final takeover came. Thus the place-name Washingborough, which is close-by Lincoln, derives from Old English **Wassingaburh*, ‘the fortified place of the *Wassingas*, the family or dependents of *Wassa*.’¹²⁶ However, whilst *Wassingas* is a perfectly regular Old English group-name, **Wassa* is not a Germanic personal name. Rather, it is a British name deriving from Celtic *vasso-*, equivalent to Cornish *Was(s)ō* and related to the continental Celtic names *Vasso-rix* and *Dago-vassus*.¹²⁷ This might very

Woden (see Insley and Eggers, ‘Lindsey’, p. 477 on the forms). Is there a connection? Whilst it is impossible to prove the real existence of this *Winta* as an ancestor of the Lindsey kings, a connection between him and the *Wintra* of Winteringham/Winterton is tempting and if sustainable then it might seem to support the above contention.

¹²⁵ Similar evidence for a potentially peaceful relationship between the British **Lindēs* and the seventh-century Anglo-Saxon kingdom might be had in the fact that the place-name Lincoln itself seems to be derived directly from the British form of the town-name, something which is not the case for other Roman cities in Britain – British Latin **Lindocolonia* > Late British **Lindgolun* > Old English **Lindcolun* etc.: Jackson, *Language and History*, pp. 273, 309; Kenneth Cameron, *Place-Names of Lincolnshire I* (Nottingham, 1985), pp. 1-3. That the name and, most importantly, its second-element was understood is indicated by the fact that the Anglo-Saxons did not add Old English *ceaster*, ‘Roman walled town/fort’, to the town-name as they did at other Roman sites, as has been pointed out by Cameron (p. 3).

¹²⁶ Kenneth Cameron, *Dictionary of Lincolnshire Place-Names* (Nottingham, 1998), p. 135; Insley and Eggers, ‘Lindsey’, p. 477.

¹²⁷ Insley and Eggers, ‘Lindsey’, p. 477; J. Insley, ‘Pre-Conquest Personal Names’, in *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde* 23 (Berlin, 2003), pp. 367-396 at p. 375; John Insley, ‘Old English Personal Names and Anthroponymic Lexika’, in *Person und Name*, edited by Dieter Geuenich, Wolfgang Haubrichs and Jörg Jarnut (Berlin, 2002), pp. 148-176 at p. 164.

well be taken to indicate that the founder of the *Wassingas*, a fort-owning 'Anglo-Saxon' group based close to Lincoln, was a locally powerful Briton who adopted the immigrant culture and language after the takeover in order to protect his status.¹²⁸

With regards to the extent of **Lindēs*/Lindsey both before and after this Anglo-Saxon takeover, the *territorium* of Lincoln – which **Lindēs* in all probability developed from – is likely to have extended for a considerable distance south of Lincoln, perhaps as far as Ancaster, if not beyond.¹²⁹ On the other hand, when we first have the means to accurately define the extent of post-British Lindsey – in the twelfth century *Lindsey Survey* – it appears (like the modern district) to only cover Lincolnshire to the north of Lincoln and the river Witham.¹³⁰ The point at which this apparent loss of territory took place is, of course, of a great deal of interest. It seems fairly clear from the evidence discussed previously that the 'country of **Lindēs*' included not only modern Lindsey but also considerable territories to the south of Lincoln, not least because the cremation cemeteries avoid Lincoln both to its north and south, the nearest being seventeen miles away.¹³¹ The name of

¹²⁸ Indeed, Washingborough seems to have been an important place in the Anglo-Saxon and immediately post-Conquest periods, see David Roffe, 'Lady Godiva, the Book, and Washingborough', *Lincolnshire Past & Present*, 12 (1993), 9-10. Another possible instance of a British landowner surviving the takeover and adopting the immigrant language might be had from Torksey, Old English *Turces ige*, 'Turc's Island'. **Turc* is otherwise unrecorded as an Old English personal name and instead clearly derives from British **torco-*, compare the Breton name *Turch*: Cameron, *Dictionary of Lincolnshire Place-Names*, p. 128; Insley and Eggers, 'Lindsey', p. 477; Insley, 'Pre-Conquest Personal Names', pp. 374-375.

¹²⁹ Jones, 'The Colonia Era', p. 124.

¹³⁰ Stenton, 'Lindsey', pp. 133-134; *The Lincolnshire Domesday and the Lindsey Survey*, edited by C. W. Foster and Thomas Longley (Lincoln, 1924).

¹³¹ As discussed above. Loveden Hill is the site mentioned, which is close to Ancaster and seventeen miles to the south of Lincoln; it should not be forgotten that, in light of the preceding discussion, this cemetery – like those in north Lincolnshire – was probably actually within the territory of the 'country of **Lindēs*', representing (initially) controlled settlement on its periphery. In this context it may be potentially significant that May has argued that the core of the pre-Roman territory of the *Corieltavi* was Lindsey, with a 'southward spread... to the Ancaster-Sleaford area' in the late-first century BC. It is increasingly recognized that some, at least, of 'the sub-Roman *civitates*... reverted to their pre-Roman tribal identities' (Snyder, *Age of Tyrants*, p. 232), and given this the likely extent of the 'country of **Lindēs*' is intriguing. Might it not be interpreted in this light too? See further Jeffrey May, *Dragonby: report on Excavation at an Iron Age and Romano-British Settlement in North Lincolnshire*, 2 volumes (Oxford, 1996), II, pp. 638-644 quote at p. 644; Jeffrey May, 'The Later Iron Age', in *An Historical Atlas of Lincolnshire*, edited by Stewart Bennett and Nicholas Bennett (Chichester, 2001), pp. 12-13; Michael J. Jones and David Stocker, 'Settlement in the Lincoln Area in the Prehistoric Era: Archaeological

the district immediately to the south of Lincoln (Kesteven) is suggestive too in this respect, being derived from British **Cēto-*, ‘wood’, plus a later Scandinavian element.¹³² As such, the loss probably occurred either during the immigrant ascendancy and ultimate transition from British to Anglo-Saxon rule of the ‘country of **Lindēs*’ – with an immigrant group based around Loveden Hill perhaps taking advantage of temporary uncertainty and instability to seize control of some of the territory south of Lincoln¹³³ – or alternatively at some point subsequent to this takeover. Unfortunately our evidence is insufficient to reach any final conclusions on this matter; however, Bassett may very well be right to suggest that the seventh-century kingdom of Lindsey continued to control at least the northern part of Kesteven, with the restriction of the name Lindsey to just the region north of Lincoln post-dating the end of the kingdom and possibly even being an Anglo-Scandinavian development.¹³⁴

Account’, in Michael J. Jones, David Stocker and Alan Vince, *The City by the Pool: Assessing the Archaeology of the City of Lincoln* (Oxford, 2003), pp.19-33 at pp. 31-33; Snyder, *Age of Tyrants*, pp. 232, 342; Yorke, ‘Anglo-Saxon *gentes* and *regna*’, pp. 396-397; Stuart Laycock, ‘Britannia: the threat within’, *British Archaeology*, 87 (2006), 10-15; Laycock, *Britannia, The Failed State*, especially pp. 134-236.

¹³² Cameron, *Dictionary of Lincolnshire Place-Names*, p. 72. Indeed, one might be tempted to speculate whether the district’s pre-Viking name derived from British **Lindo-cēton*, ‘the wood of *Lindon*, Lincoln’. An acquaintance with a Welsh remembrance of a ‘Lincoln-wood’ in the Old Welsh form **Linncoit* might help explain Geoffrey of Monmouth’s curious alternate name for Lincoln, *Kaerlindcoit*/*Kaerluidcoit*, with an unfamiliar name **Linncoit* being mistakenly corrected as above, perhaps under the influence of the better-known Welsh *Luitcoit*/*Lwydcoed* (Lichfield). Otherwise, the reason for the application of the name ‘the fortress/city of *Lindcoit*/*Luidcoit*’ to Lincoln is difficult to understand, although one can never underestimate Geoffrey’s inventiveness: *Historia Regum Britanniae*, IX.3.

¹³³ Eagles, ‘Lindsey’, p. 211 seems to suggest something similar. The area around Loveden might have been the most vulnerable area to such loss during instability and a transition in power – if the ‘country of **Lindēs*’ did represent some sort of continuity between pre- and post-Roman organization – as this region was an addition to the original ‘Lindsey’ core of the Corieltavi territory: May, *Dragonby*, pp. 638-644.

¹³⁴ Bassett, ‘Lincoln and the Anglo-Saxon see of Lindsey’, pp. 2-3 supported by Yorke, ‘Lindsey: The Lost Kingdom Found?’, pp. 147-148. Whilst all the places that Bede names as being within the kingdom of Lindsey are indeed within modern Lindsey, as has often been pointed out, it has to be recognized that he actually only names three sites other than Lincoln itself, so we cannot rely too much on this testimony. Furthermore, the *Tribal Hidage* does not seem to place any other kingdoms or sub-kingdoms in seventh-century northern Kesteven (the only remote possibility is the *Bilmiga*; however, if they were Lincolnshire-based – which is highly debatable – then they were probably a small fenland group, like the *Spalda*). Finally, it might seem odd if the chief settlement of the kingdom of Lindsey (see *Historia*

The Significance of the British Kingdom of Lindsey: History and Pseudo-history

The above, then, is what can be reasonably said of the history of the British kingdom of Lindsey, the ‘country of **Lindēs*’. That it existed seems clear but, by way of a conclusion, it is worth asking whether it had any lasting historical significance? Certainly from the perspective of the seventh-century kingdom of Lindsey it would seem to have had such significance. It can be no accident that the name of the British kingdom was retained – as was the descriptive Anglo-Saxon folk-name *Lindisfaran*, ‘the people who migrated, *faran*, to the territory of the *Lindenses*, **Lindēs*’¹³⁵ – nor that the kings of Lindsey were willing to keep a British name in the political document that was their genealogy: clearly a debt was owed to the British past, and this may also be observed in the administrative structures¹³⁶ and religious practices¹³⁷ of the kingdom. The dynasty ruling Lindsey may have

Ecclesiastica II.16) was on the very border of its territory, over-looking the lands of another kingdom. On possible south Lincolnshire kingdoms and their locations, see especially Sawyer, *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*, pp. 46-49, 219-221; Stafford, *East Midlands*, fig.36; Cyril Hart, ‘The Tribal Hidage’, *Transaction of the Royal Historical Society*, 21 (1971), 133-157 at pp. 136, 152; P. P. Hayes, ‘Roman to Saxon in the South Lincolnshire Fens’, *Antiquity*, 62 (1988), 321-326 at pp. 324-325; and Andy Crowson, Tom Lane, Kenneth Penn and Dale Trimble, *Anglo-Saxon Settlement on the Siltland of Eastern England* (Heckington, 2005), figs.1-2a and pp. 265-266, 285-286, 297. If the probably pre-Viking soke of Kirton-in-Lindsey did once include Newark then this would offer some additional support for the above interpretation: Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, pp. 54-56.

¹³⁵ Wallace-Hadrill, *Bede’s Ecclesiastical History*, pp. 234-235.

¹³⁶ Yorke, ‘Lindsey: The Lost Kingdom Found?’, pp. 141-142, who observes that the administration of Lindsey, like that of Deira and Elmet, was based around former Roman towns and forts. Hinton, *A Smith in Lindsey*, pp. 103-104, 114 discusses some possible continuity in administrative organization, in particular evidence for a major ‘early Anglo-Saxon polyfocal royal estate’ centred on the Roman fort at Horncastle, with ‘a royal residence perhaps inside Horncastle where the manor house is now’ (p. 104). It is worth noting here that the probable Roman name of this Roman fort, *Bannovallum*, seems to be survive in the name Horncastle, with Old English *horn* directly translating British **Banno*. Cameron, *Dictionary of Lincolnshire Place-Names*, p. 66. The *wīchām* (< Latin *vicus*) place-names of Lindsey may also be indicative of some sort of administrative continuity, as most recently argued by C. J. Balkwill, ‘Old English *wīc* and the Origin of the Hundred’, *Landscape History*, 15 (1993), 5-12; see Margaret Gelling, ‘English Place-Names Derived from the Compound *wīchām*’, reprinted in *Place-name Evidence for the Anglo-Saxon Invasion and Scandinavian Settlements*, edited by Kenneth Cameron (Nottingham, 1977), pp. 8-26.

¹³⁷ Yorke, ‘Lindsey: The Lost Kingdom Found?’, pp. 142, 145 discusses these briefly. See further above on religious continuity and also the votive continuity from the pre-Roman to the medieval period all along the Witham valley: David Stocker and Paul Everson, ‘The Straight and Narrow Way: Fenland Causeways and the

been Anglo-Saxon in origins but it seems to have been willing to both work with and acknowledge its British inheritance. Indeed, it may have had political reasons for doing so. We have already observed that there is evidence for Britons from the region adopting and working with the immigrant culture and such acknowledgement might be speculated to have helped the dynasty control the kingdom in light of this. This may have been particularly important in its early years but perhaps also later too, if there were still groups of unacculturated Britons within Lindsey through the seventh century. There may have been such groups in the fens of southern Lincolnshire as late as the eighth century, if the hints in Felix's *Life of St Guthlac* can be trusted,¹³⁸ and Härke and Gelling have argued generally that the assimilation of the Britons was not completed until that period.¹³⁹

Taking a wider view of the question, there is some evidence that the existence of a British kingdom based around Lincoln was not forgotten. In Wales there is, of course, the *Historia Brittonum* and its reference to battles fought c. 500 against the Anglo-Saxons *in regione Linnuiis*. Clearly the 'country of *Lindēs' was significant enough for it to be recalled in ninth-century Wales and it is just possible that the framework used in the *Historia* to historicize the folkloric or mythical hero Arthur was based around memories of this territory and its struggle for survival in one of the core areas of Anglo-Saxon settlement. There are also, however, some indications that the British kingdom of Lindsey was remembered in medieval Lincolnshire too. The most interesting evidence comes from the story of

Conversion of the Landscape in the Witham Valley, Lincolnshire', in *The Cross Goes North: Processes of Conversion in Northern Europe, A.D. 300-1300*, edited by Martin Carver (Woodbridge, 2002), pp. 271-288.

¹³⁸ John T. Koch, 'Guthlac', in *Celtic Culture, A Historical Encyclopedia*, edited by John T. Koch (Oxford, 2006), p. 857; Vince, 'Lincoln in the Early Medieval Era', p. 143; David Stocker, 'The Early Church in Lincolnshire: a Study of the Sites and their Significance', in *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, edited by Alan Vince (Lincoln, 1993), pp. 101-122 at pp. 101, 106.

¹³⁹ Heinrich Härke, 'Changing Symbols in a Changing Society: The Anglo-Saxon Weapon Burial Rite in the Seventh Century', in *The Age of Sutton Hoo*, edited by Martin Carver (Woodbridge, 1992), pp. 149-165; Margaret Gelling, 'Why Aren't We Speaking Welsh?', *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*, 6 (1993), 51-56. We have some place-name evidence for such late-surviving groups of the type discussed by Gelling – the Lindsey Walcot and the unlocated *Cumbre bole*, and perhaps Cumberworth, Walesby and Walshcroft (Wapentake): Balkwill, 'Old English *wic*', p. 11; Cameron, *Place-Names of Lincolnshire II*, p. 30; Kenneth Cameron, *Place-Names of Lincolnshire III* (Nottingham, 1992), p. 172; Cameron, *Dictionary of Lincolnshire Place-Names*, p. 134; Mills, *Dictionary of English Place-Names*, p. 99. See also Leahy, *Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, pp. 82-83 on the probably very large British element in the pre-Viking Lindsey population, despite Anglo-Saxon folk-migration into the region.

Havelok the Dane. Geoffrey Gaimar included the earliest surviving version of the tale of Havelok in his *Estoire des Engleis*, thought to have been written in the late 1130s or 1140s.¹⁴⁰ The tale has a clear and detailed Lincolnshire setting and there seems little doubt now that its origins lie in this region: not only was the later Middle English version of the tale probably composed in Lindsey, but the tale is linked to the foundation-legend of Grimsby and Gaimar himself probably wrote his *Estoire des Engleis* whilst in Lincolnshire, with his version being heavily influenced by local material and concerns.¹⁴¹ Indeed, whether or not all later surviving literary versions of the story are derivative of Gaimar's,¹⁴² there is clear evidence for the story having a secure place in Lincolnshire story-telling with versions existing other than those that survive, as witnessed by the Grimsby seal.¹⁴³ This is apparent even in the version given by Gaimar, who makes reference to both pre-existing written and oral sources when recounting the tale (for example, *Si cum dient l'antive gent*, 'as the old people say'),¹⁴⁴ although this is not to argue that the

¹⁴⁰ Bell dated the text to 1135x1140 in *L'Estoire des Engleis*, edited by Alexander Bell (Oxford, 1960), pp. li–lii, with this dating being revised to March 1136–April 1137 in Ian Short, 'Gaimar's Epilogue and Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Liber vetustissimus*', *Speculum*, 69.2 (1994), 323–343. In contrast, Paul Dalton, 'The Date of Geoffrey Gaimar's *Estoire des Engleis*, the Connections of his Patrons, and the Politics of Stephen's Reign', *Chaucer Review*, 42.1 (2007), 24–47 has argued that the *Estoire des Engleis* was probably written c.1141–1150.

¹⁴¹ See especially Scott Kleinman, 'The Legend of Havelok the Dane and the Historiography of East Anglia', *Studies in Philology*, 100.3 (2003), 245–277; *Havelok*, edited by G. V. Smithers (Oxford, 1987), especially pp. lxxviii, lxxxix; *L'Estoire des Engleis*, pp. ix–xi, li. I am highly sceptical of attempts to hypothesize an origin for the tale in the north of England purely on the basis of the name *Haveloc* and his nickname *Cuaran*, which are claimed to reflect a tenth-century Viking called *Anlaf Cviran* found in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. If this speculative connection is pursued then, in light of the fact that there are no obvious links between *Anlaf Cviran*'s life and Havelok's tale other than the name, the connection ought to be seen as simply one of a name being borrowed and substituted into a tale and cast of characters with which it had no previous relationship, as Kleinman suggests: see Kleinman, 'Legend of Havelok the Dane', pp. 264–265; Alexander Bell, 'Gaimar's Early "Danish" Kings', *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association*, 65.4 (1950), 601–640 at pp. 632–635.

¹⁴² As argued in Smithers, *Havelok*, pp. xxxii–lvi; Kleinman, 'The Legend of Havelok the Dane'.

¹⁴³ See Nancy Mason Bradbury, 'The Traditional Origins of *Havelok the Dane*', *Studies in Philology*, 90.2 (1993), 115–142, particularly pp. 119–125, supported recently by Julia Marvin, 'Havelok in the Prose *Brut* Tradition', *Studies in Philology*, 102 (2005), 280–306 at p. 305.

¹⁴⁴ *L'Estoire des Engleis*, line 93.

story that we have in the *Estoire des Engleis* is not to some degree his creation, knitted together out of such disparate pieces.¹⁴⁵

The key point here is that the setting for this Lincolnshire tale, as found in the earliest versions of the story (including the *Estoire des Engleis*, the *Lai d'Havelok*,¹⁴⁶ and the Anglo-Norman prose *Brut*¹⁴⁷), is very specific and highly intriguing: it takes place in the mid-sixth century in the British kingdom of Lindsey.¹⁴⁸ The starting point of the tale is that Edelsi, king of 'Lincoln and Lindsey' and 'a Briton',¹⁴⁹ has married his sister to a neighbouring Danish king of East Anglia, Adelbrit, with whom she then has a child. Adelbrit subsequently dies and the British king's sister and niece return to Lindsey, 'as the old people say'.¹⁵⁰ Edelsi is made regent of Adelbrit's territory but attempts to keep it for himself by marrying his half-British niece to Havelok, a cook, and the story proper develops from this point onwards. In the course of this, Havelok learns of his royal Danish origins and travels overseas to claim and win his inheritance, having numerous adventures as a result. At the very end of the tale he finally returns to Britain to win back his wife's Danish kingdom of East Anglia. The British king of Lindsey is defeated by Havelok and he dies five days later, leaving no male heirs so that the kingdom of Lindsey also passes to his niece and thus out of British control and into Danish.¹⁵¹

In the present context this is striking. Gaimar's tale clearly has its origins in twelfth-century Lincolnshire and his sole reference to a pre-existing oral – rather than written – source for part of the Havelok story occurs in this

¹⁴⁵ See, for example, Bradbury, 'Traditional Origins of *Havelok the Dane*', pp. 124-5. Kleinman, 'Legend of Havelok the Dane', seems to demonstrate that Gaimar played a key role in creating the literary tale but this does not mean that Gaimar invented the actual story, especially as he cites pre-existing written and oral tales; rather he seems to have created the literary tale out of already existing stories, materials and traditions. Laura Ashe argues for key elements of Havelok's narrative deriving from Anglo-Saxon story-telling: 'Exile-and-Return' and English Law: The Anglo-Saxon Inheritance of Insular Romance', *Literature Compass*, 3.3 (2008), 300-317.

¹⁴⁶ *Le Lai d'Havelok and Gaimar's Havelok Episode*, edited by Alexander Bell (Manchester, 1925).

¹⁴⁷ Marvin, 'Havelok in the Prose *Brut*'.

¹⁴⁸ The events of the story are claimed to have taken place in the reign of King Arthur's successor, Constantine – that is to say in the mid-sixth century, given that Geoffrey of Monmouth dates Arthur's death to 542 and Gaimar's chronological framework was based on the HRB. See *Historia Regum Britanniae*, XI.2 and Smithers, *Havelok*, p. xvii, who conveniently details some instances of influence from Geoffrey's work on the *Estoire des Engleis*.

¹⁴⁹ *L'Estoire des Engleis*, lines 48, 59.

¹⁵⁰ *L'Estoire des Engleis*, lines 77-93.

¹⁵¹ *L'Estoire des Engleis*, lines 1-816.

scene-setting account of the British kingdom of Lindsey and the events surrounding the marriage of a British princess from this to a Germanic king. As such, it is difficult to resist the temptation to view the setting of the tale of Havelok in a mid-sixth-century British kingdom of Lindsey in light of the above argument for the real existence of such a polity. Of course, no-one would wish to claim that Gaimar here is really recording ‘authentic history’, as he claims: this is romance, rather than history.¹⁵² However, it does not seem unreasonable to suggest that, at the very least, we have in this romance evidence for local Lincolnshire oral tradition remembering that there was once a kingdom of Lindsey and, furthermore, that it once had British rulers, this memory being then used by Gaimar as part of the framework for his literary tale of Havelok. Indeed, other elements of the setting of Havelok’s tale are also suggestive. In particular, the notion that this British rule of Lindsey ended in the mid-sixth century and this ending was in some way associated with a mixed marriage between a British princess and a Germanic king¹⁵³ is surely very interesting, given that the surviving early evidence is suggestive of such a mixed marriage and a mid-sixth century handover of power.

Of course, the final points above could be dismissed as mere coincidence and it might be suggested that, whilst the kingdom of Lindsey might well have been remembered, the fact it is given British rulers could also be a coincidence – due to the influence of Geoffrey of Monmouth on Gaimar, perhaps? – and not reflective of surviving traditions of the British kingdom of Lindsey in Lincolnshire. However, this would fail to take into account Robert Mannyng of Bourne’s *Chronicle* (also known as *The Story of England*), completed in 1338 in Lincolnshire, perhaps partly at Sempringham Priory in south Lincolnshire and partly at Sixhills Priory in Lindsey.¹⁵⁴ This work is essentially a translation into Middle English of Wace’s Anglo-Norman *Roman de Brut* (1155) and Peter Langtoft’s Anglo-French *Chronicle* (written c.1307, in the East Riding of Yorkshire) and – as such – has generally been thoroughly ignored by historians.¹⁵⁵ However, whilst the majority of the text is indeed a simple translation, there are some points

¹⁵² *L’Estoire des Engleis*, line 756.

¹⁵³ Gaimar consistently terms the other party in this a ‘Dane’, but we must bear in mind his political concerns with regards to legitimizing Danish rights in Anglo-Norman England: Kleinman, ‘Legend of Havelok the Dane’, especially pp. 263-265.

¹⁵⁴ See Ruth Crosby, ‘Robert Mannyng of Brunne: A New Biography’, *Proceedings of the Modern Language Association*, 57 (1942), 15-28 and Ethel Seaton, ‘Robert Mannyng of Brunne in Lincoln’, *Medium Ævum*, 12 (1943), 77 for what we can know of Mannyng’s life and movements around Lincolnshire.

¹⁵⁵ Thorlac Turville-Petre, ‘Poetry and Politics in the Early Fourteenth Century: the Case of Robert Manning’s *Chronicle*’, *Review of English Studies*, 39 (1988), 1-28.

where Mannyng deviates from his source, and when he does he seems to be often doing so due to his knowledge of local tradition: 'He has a sure understanding of what will appeal to his audience, as well as an appreciation and knowledge of stories circulating among 'lewed' men in the locality.'¹⁵⁶ Thus, for example, he inserts notice of Havelok's adventures into his *Chronicle*, which he has clearly derived from both local written sources and oral folklore.¹⁵⁷

The most important of Mannyng's deviations for us is his consistent alteration of Langtoft's Anglo-French *Chronicle* when it speaks of the eighth- and early-ninth-century Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Mercia, so that it instead refers to the kingdom of Lindsey. The kings of Wessex whose deeds he relates remain kings of Wessex, and so too do the kings of Essex retain their kingdoms. Yet whenever Mannyng comes across an early king of Mercia he makes him a king of Lindsey: so we read, for example, of 'Offa, kyng of Lyndsay' rather than the 'Offa, ray de Merce' of Langtoft.¹⁵⁸ When this has been noticed at all by historians of Lincolnshire, it has been simply dismissed as Mannyng getting 'confused', although it would seem a strange confusion and one not repeated for other kings and kingdoms.¹⁵⁹ To some degree Mannyng's unflinching substitution of Lindsey for Mercia in his account of the eighth and earlier ninth centuries can be seen as an extension and standardization of Langtoft's occasional and unpredictable use of 'Lindesey' for 'Merce' when talking about seventh-century Mercia, which is itself deserving of investigation.¹⁶⁰ However, the above seems – on its own – an insufficient explanation of why *every* early Mercian king becomes consistently a king of Lindsey for Mannyng, when they are not so in his chief source or the authoritative medieval histories that he clearly knew, such as those of Bede, William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon.¹⁶¹ One might, indeed, ask why Mannyng did not instead standardize on Mercia as the kingdom-name, given Langtoft's very irregular usage and the fact that Mercia is the name used by his other historical

¹⁵⁶ Turville-Petre, 'Robert Mannyng's *Chronicle*', p. 22.

¹⁵⁷ *Peter Langtoft's Chronicle, as Illustrated and Improv'd by Robert of Brunne*, edited by Thomas Hearne (Oxford, 1725), I, pp. 25-26; Turville-Petre, 'Robert Mannyng's *Chronicle*', pp. 22-23; *The Lay of Havelok the Dane*, edited by Walter W. Skene and K. Sisam (Oxford, 1915), pp. xvi-xvii.

¹⁵⁸ *Chronicle*, I, p. 10 for Offa and see also pp. 8, 9, 14; *The Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft*, edited and translated by Thomas Wright (London, 1866), I, pp. 294-5. The first king to be 'kyng of Merce' for Mannyng is Wiglaf, in the ninth-century, see p. 17.

¹⁵⁹ Graham Platt, *Land and People in Medieval Lincolnshire* (Lincoln, 1985), p. 292.

¹⁶⁰ *Chronicle of Pierre de Langtoft*, pp. 232, 250, 256.

¹⁶¹ Mannyng mentions Bede and others throughout his work, for example *Chronicle*, I, pp. 1, 6, 25-26.

authorities. I would suggest, given Mannyng's demonstrable interest in local tales, that a fuller explanation of this situation would involve seeing these changes as constituting further evidence for an awareness in Lincolnshire oral tradition of the lost kingdom of Lindsey, with Mannyng making the additional alterations and standardizing on Lindsey out of perhaps Lincolnshire chauvinism resulting from this and a desire to claim – through appropriation – a place in history for this local kingdom that had none of its own recorded in the extant historical sources (there are no narrative references to the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Lindsey, its kings or its deeds).¹⁶²

This suspicion of local knowledge influencing the narrative of Mannyng's *Chronicle* and its references to Lindsey is strongly supported by another of Mannyng's alterations, which is completely unparalleled in any of his sources and is of considerable significance in the present context. Not only does Mannyng make the eighth- and ninth-century kings of Mercia kings of Lindsey but he also makes it very clear that his kings of Lindsey were of British blood. Thus we find 'Eadbald... kyng of Lyndesay, He was of þe Bretons kynde'¹⁶³ and a little later on we are told of Egbert of Wessex's wars against the Britons,¹⁶⁴ with the comment that many of these oppressed Britons 'fled to Lynday, socour forto haue, To þe kyng Bernewolf, þat was Breton', that is, they fled to King Bernewolf of Lindsey for support, who was a fellow Briton.¹⁶⁵ Of course, there is no suggestion in the early sources that the Mercian kings whom Mannyng was reinventing as kings of Lindsey were Britons: this concept is entirely his own innovation. The only credible explanation is, consequently, that Mannyng did indeed know of the kingdom of Lindsey from local Lincolnshire tradition – as

¹⁶² Was he perhaps in part reacting to an Anglo-Norman tendency to ignore what little evidence there is for Lindsey as a kingdom rather than a province of Mercia? Thus Bede says that St Oswald's bones were taken to 'a famous monastery in the kingdom of Lindsey called Bardney': *Historia Ecclesiastica* III.11, translated by Bertram Colgrave (Oxford, 1994). However, in William of Malmesbury they are taken to 'Bardney, which is in the country of the Mercians, not far from the city of Lincoln': *History of the Kings of England* §49, translated by Joseph Stevenson (Felinfach, 1989). That Mannyng was not an impartial translator but rather one with agendas of his own has been demonstrated by Turville-Petre: 'Robert Mannyng's *Chronicle*'. See also Rhonda Knight, 'Stealing Stonehenge: Translation, Appropriation, and Cultural Identity in Robert Mannyng of Brunne's *Chronicle*', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 32.1 (2002), 41-58.

¹⁶³ *Chronicle*, I, p. 8. Eadbald = Æthelbald of Mercia, king 716-757.

¹⁶⁴ See *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, s.a. 815, 825, and perhaps 830, translated and edited by Dorothy Whitelock (London, 1961), pp. 39-40; William of Malmesbury, *History of the Kings of England*, §106.

¹⁶⁵ *Chronicle*, I, p. 14. Bernewolf = Beornwulf of Mercia, king 823-826; see Brooks, *Early History of the Church of Canterbury*, pp. 136-137, 352-353 on this figure and his dates.

suggested above – and that this tradition believed that Lindsey’s kings had at least some British blood in them, with Mannyng then applying this origin to the Mercian rulers he was appropriating for Lindsey.

The above is of key importance in the present context and must offer considerable support for the interpretation of Gaimar’s tale of a sixth-century British kingdom of Lindsey set out above, particularly as it is clear that Mannyng had never read Gaimar or come across his particular version of the Havelok tale with its very specific framing.¹⁶⁶ Taken together these two texts, written in Lincolnshire by authors who had access to local oral sources, indicate that both the kingdom of Lindsey and its British origins were not entirely forgotten in medieval Lincolnshire. Indeed, it seems likely that local Lincolnshire tradition not only remembered these origins but also that the later Anglo-Saxon rulers of Lindsey had British ancestors. This is, of course, of great importance to all those who are interested in the British kingdom of Lindsey and its historical significance. Indeed, one has to wonder in this light what else Lincolnshire tradition might have remembered of this era too.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁶ See *Chronicle*, I, pp. 25-26.

¹⁶⁷ For example, it ought to be remembered that names are often one of the most changeable elements of traditional stories and folklore, being created and changed to suite each audience and purpose. This certainly seems to be the case with the Havelok tradition, as Kleinman, ‘Legend of Havelok the Dane’ has demonstrated. Thus the name of the British king in *L’Estoire des Engleis* is of Old English derivation; the figure may have possibly been remembered, but his name clearly was not. However, there is one minor name (from the perspective of the ‘Legend of Havelok’) that might actually have significance, namely that of the British princess who is married off to the Germanic king and is the mother of the child that results from this union. Her name is variously given in the Anglo-Norman texts as *Orvain*, *Orwein*, *Orvenne*, *Orewain* and similar, and even though Gaimar seems to have found her in Lincolnshire oral tradition (lines 77-93) her name is not of Scandinavian or Old English derivation but instead appears to be of Welsh origin. As to its meaning, might this Anglo-Norman form not derive from Archaic Welsh **Ouruenn*, ‘white as gold’ – the root of the Welsh name *Eurwen* – borrowed before the change **our- > eur-?* See on the first element Sims-Williams, *Celtic Inscriptions*, p. 226; Peter Schrijver, *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology* (Amsterdam, 1995), pp. 271-272. Such an etymology would, interestingly, fit well with her daughter’s name in both the Anglo-Norman and Middle English versions of Havelok (*Argentille*, *Goldborow*). If the above could be sustained, one might hesitantly wonder if a case could not be made for this name always being the name of a British princess of Lindsey; that is to say, a chance remembrance in local tradition of the name of the mother of *Cadbad* in something like its sixth-century form.