

happen to represent the third person singular present indicative of the first class weak verb *ge-īecan*, then it also shows the absence of syncope typical of Anglian, though not unknown in West Saxon and early Kentish<sup>29</sup> and, a feature of Northumbrian and the Mercian dialect of Rushworth 1,<sup>30</sup> confusion of the vowels of the present tense inflectional endings.<sup>31</sup>

- (b) *aræ*: The accusative, genitive, and dative singular of *ō*-stem nouns all occur in early texts with *æ*; however, this spelling is not necessarily a guide to date, since in Rushworth 1 unaccented *æ* often appears as a variant for *e* and similar spellings are found in late Northumbrian.<sup>32</sup>
- (c) *Hadda*: If we accept this as the reading of the inscription and interpret it as a variant of *Haddan*, then this form again is typical of Northumbrian and the Rushworth 1 dialect. Loss of final *-n* in inflections occurs already in the earliest Northumbrian texts and is general in late Northumbrian, usual in Rushworth 1.<sup>33</sup>
- (d) *þi*: This is an unusual form, whether we identify it with O.E. *þe* or *þy*. It is tempting to explain the *i* as influenced by the following *i* of *þis*, although *thi* for *þy* is recorded in a proverb quoted in a letter to Boniface<sup>34</sup> and *þi* for *þe* in the Leiden Riddle, both early texts with Northumbrian connexions.

Whatever the interpretation, therefore, the inscription would seem to be non-West-Saxon in dialect. Only the version taking *gecap* as a plural form cannot be localized more nearly than this, the two others both having features suggesting either a Northumbrian dialect or one resembling that of the Mercian Rushworth 1. The latter possibility may be supported by the fact that the bone piece first came to light in Derby, but this apparent connexion with Mercia may be quite fortuitous. As for dating, since the rune forms show developments influenced by manuscript writing, the inscription must be post-pagan. However, those linguistic features that might be taken as 'early' have parallels in texts of the tenth century and do not allow a more precise dating than between about A.D. 700 and 1000.

JANET M. BATELY  
VERA I. EVISON

## MOTTE SUBSTRUCTURES

In the last number of this Journal (p. 90) I wrote of the mound and foundation in Farnham castle keep that: 'The construction must imply some traditional prototype of timber and soil, for it is an absurd method of building in stone.' The words had hardly been written before J. P. C. Kent found such a prototype in the motte at South Mimms, Middlesex.<sup>35</sup> The interior of the mound has been found to contain the collapsed cellar of a square tower, whose timber walls had rested on a flint sill. The site is a castle dated early within the Anarchy period.

The discovery, following upon that of Farnham, is another vindication of Hope-Taylor's views on the importance of the superstructure in the motte construction.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, §751.

<sup>30</sup> Tenth-century interlinear gloss on the Rushworth Gospels (Matthew: Mark i-ii, 15; John xviii, 1-3), Bodleian MS, Auct. D. 2. 19 (3946).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Campbell, *op. cit.* in note 15, §752.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, §587 and 369, note 3.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, § 617.

<sup>34</sup> *The Oldest English Texts* (ed. Sweet, 1885), p. 152, from Vienna Nationalbibl. MS. Lat. 751, f. 34, written in a ninth-century continental hand.

<sup>35</sup> Apart from the radio programme I have been able to visit the site and discuss the excavation with Dr. Kent with whose permission it is mentioned here. See also p. 318 below.

<sup>36</sup> There is no need to repeat the references given in *Antiq. J.*, xxxix (1959), 219-73, by Jope and in *Med. Archaeol.*, iv (1960), 81-94 by myself.

If we include one or two further unpublished excavations there are enough examples to make it worth while to attempt to draw up some kind of classification of such sub-structures.

1. No substructure, the superstructure erected on top of the mound.  
The examples are Abinger and Hoverberg, near Cologne.
2. Substructure erected on old ground surface and entirely buried within the mound.
  - (a) In wood. Apparently only known from Kaersgård in Denmark, but the post-holes found beneath the destroyed motte at Burgh castle, Suffolk,<sup>37</sup> may perhaps indicate an analogous structure at this site.
  - (b) In stone. Totnes is the only example, although this was not traced to the original ground surface. The superstructure was presumably of wood.
3. Substructure erected on old ground surface, its exterior only being buried, the interior retained as a cellar.
  - (a) In wood. South Mimms.
  - (b) In stone. Farnham, Ascot Doilly and possibly Wareham. Farnham with two stories below ground and the substructure enlarged over the mound is peculiar but evidently belongs to this category.
4. Free-standing tower to which a mound was later added.  
Jope demonstrated at Ascot Doilly that the mound was raised *pari passu* with the tower foundation, but where the tower base is faced with fine ashlar, as at Aldingbourne, Sussex,<sup>38</sup> or where the material of the mound covers windows in the tower, as at Lydford, Devonshire, the addition of a mound can have been no part of the builders' original intention.

The sequence is a logical one and may possibly be of chronological significance in England. As the superstructures of three of the five mottes depicted in the Bayeux tapestry are comparatively slight wooden towers, it is not an unfair assumption that classes 1 and 2 were the prevalent type in the 11th century. With class 3 we are evidently dealing with a transitional type, the superstructures of the stone examples presumably being normal keeps. One is strongly reminded of Marc Bloch's remarks on this slow transition in the recent English translation of *Feudal Society* (p. 301): 'While masonry called for specialist workers, the tenants, a permanent source of compulsory labour, were almost all to some extent carpenters as well as wood-cutters.' In the last number of this Journal (p. 88) I suggested that the mound added as an afterthought in the class 4 type, as at Lydford, had a defensive functional motive. However at Aldingbourne the large flat-topped mound in which the tower is set eccentrically must surely qualify for the title of motte.

If with Bloch we believe that in the origin of the motte on the continent the wooden tower was the primary element, the motte merely arising as a protective mound at its base, the sequence would have to be reversed, class 4 (with a wooden tower) coming first and superstructures of the Abinger type being the final stage of evolution. However, one may suspect that by the time mottes appeared in this country in *c.* 1050 this earlier evolution had already been completed. Practically every example in the table above is reasonably ascribed to the 12th century, mainly its second quarter; one of the most urgent needs in medieval archaeology is the excavation of a motte of the Conquest period (Mrs. Armitage enumerated over 60 mottes documented before 1100) in order to find out the nature of its superstructure when the motte was introduced into this country.

M. W. THOMPSON

<sup>37</sup> Ministry of Works excavation by C. Green, see p. 319 below.

<sup>38</sup> Ministry of Works excavation supervised by T. C. M. Brewster, by whose kind permission I have visited the site.