

Notes and Documents

Senlac and the Malfosse

THE name Senlac for what was and is usually called the battle of Hastings was introduced by Freeman into English history solely on the authority of Ordericus Vitalis.¹ The great Anglo-Norman historian describes Harold's forces as assembling for the battle 'ad locum, qui Senlac antiquitus vocabatur',² and the battle itself as being fought 'in campo Senlac'³ or 'in epitulo Senlac'.⁴ Elsewhere he calls the battle 'certamen Senladium'⁵ or 'bellum Senladium',⁶ and states that Battle Abbey was founded by William at Senlac.⁷ Freeman remarks that Orderic 'cannot have invented the name, which evidently survives in "Santlaches", "Saintlake", &c. (in various spellings), "the Lake", "Battle Lake", and so forth, the local names for the south-eastern part of the town of Battle'. He regards 'Sanglac' or 'Sanguelac', which are known as variants, as simply a French pun on the name.

¹ *Norman Conquest*, 2nd edition, iii. 758.

² *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. Le Prévost, lib. iii, c. 14 (ll. 147).

³ Lib. vi, c. 2 (ll. 3).

⁴ Lib. vii, c. 15 (ll. 242). The strange word *epitumo* is so written in the twelfth-century Vatican MS., fo. 68^r, as appears from the facsimile (*Orderici Vitalis Angligenae, Comitis Uticensis monachi, Historiae Ecclesiasticae libri VII et VIII, a Codice Vaticano Reg. 703a phototypice descriptis, exstante Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae Consilio, cura et sumptibus Societatis Gallicae Historiae nec non et Chartarum Scholarum*, Paris, 1902). The greater part of the seventh and the whole of the eighth book are missing from the only other twelfth-century copy (Paris, Bibl. Nationale, MSS. lat. 5506 i, ii, and 10913), which Delisle considered to be Orderic's autograph. Facsimiles of two pages of this manuscript are given in the privately printed *Matériaux pour l'édition de Guillaume de Jumièges préparés par Jules Lair, Membre de l'Institut, avec une préface et des notes par Léopold Delisle*, 1910. They do not include this passage or the one in lib. x, c. 9 (iv. 60), where Orderic speaks of the pitching of Rufus's tents 'in epitinio spatioso' beyond the bridge over the Haine near Le Mans. The reading in the printed text in this case is presumably that of the autograph, and should therefore be restored in the Senlac passage. Ducange's reference to Isidore's 'epithymum Graecum nomen, quod Latine dicitur flos thymi; nam flos Graeco *thymus* vocatur' (*Etymol.* xvii. 9, 13) has led the local guide-books of Battle to say that Orderic speaks of 'the thyme-clad field of Senlac', which can hardly be his meaning.

⁵ Lib. iv, c. 7 (ll. 223); vi, c. 10 (ll. 88).

⁶ Lib. iv, c. 19 (ll. 294); viii, c. 3 (ll. 233); ix, c. 10 (ll. 612).

⁷ Lib. iv, c. 1 (ll. 163).

It is natural to connect the local name at Battle with Senlac, and there is nothing improbable in the supposition that Orderic has recorded the English name of the site of the great battle. He was born in England, his name was that of his English godfather, Ordric the priest of Atoham, in Shropshire; he spent the first ten years of his life in this country, and was taught for the latter half of that period by an Englishman named Siward, who must have instructed him in English, for Orderic, in his pathetic account of his life, describes how, on his arrival in Normandy as a *tenellus erul* at the age of ten, he heard a tongue that he did not understand.⁸ He called himself *Angligena*, shows sympathy and admiration for the English, and visited this country on two occasions in later life. Monks of his monastery at St. Évrout, which derived much of its revenues from possessions in England, made frequent journeys to this country. His monastery was the retreat of many old soldiers, including veterans of William the Conqueror's campaigns. We know that he was keenly interested in men and countries, and that he was a man of restless curiosity.⁹ Freeman has noticed the delight that Orderic seems to take in repeating the name Senlac. It was a name that did not occur in the earlier Norman historians of the battle, William of Poitiers, whose work was before him when he drew up his account of the battle of Hastings, and William of Jumièges, whose work he transcribed in his own beautiful hand.¹⁰ It was an addition to their facts upon which he evidently prided himself.

Dr. Round, however, regards the name as a 'fad', not to say an invention, of Orderic's. In his dashing onslaught upon Freeman's description of the battle he lays great stress upon the un-English appearance of the name. He writes:

To any one acquainted with 'Old English', it must instantly occur that 'Senlac' is not an English name. Mr. Freeman glided over this by simply ignoring the difficulty, but was he aware that the name in question, as 'Senlecque' (or 'Senlecques') is actually found—in France? . . . How came a French 'Senlac' in 'Old English' Sussex? The name is as obviously foreign as 'Senlis' itself, and the occurrence, in later days, of 'Saintlache' as a local field-name, cannot avail against this fact, or prove that this open down, in days before the Conquest, could have borne such a title.¹¹

The validity of this argument obviously depends upon two assumptions, (1) that Senlecques and Senlac are identical names,

⁸ Lib. v, c. 1 (H. 301); xiii, c. 44 (v. 134, 135).

⁹ See Delisle's account of his life in the fifth volume of Le Prévost's edition, p. xxxii seqq.

¹⁰ A facsimile of this manuscript is given in full in the *Matériaux pour l'édition de Guillaume de Jumièges*.

¹¹ *Quarterly Review*, July 1862, p. 9, reprinted in *Federal England*, 1896, p. 339.

(2) that they are both French local names of Romance origin. The second assumption is at once ruled out of court by the presence of the *k*-sound. The French *lac*, with which one at first sight connects Senlac, is of learned origin, and therefore not likely to be found in local names. The Latin *lacus*, from which it is derived, was represented in Northern French by its popular descendant *lai*, and we know that this was the Norman form.¹² If Senlecques can be shown to be a local name of Germanic descent the argument that Senlac is a French, and therefore an impossible English, local name will fail entirely. No one will seriously maintain that the Kentish Sandgate must be branded as French and not English because there is a name of precisely the same formation in Sangatte near Calais.¹³ I do not know the etymology of Senlecques, but its geographical position makes a Romance origin improbable and a Germanic one all but certain.¹⁴ This village lies on the borders of Picardy and Artois, in a district where Flemish has been gradually receding before French for many centuries. In the thirteenth century the southern limit of Flemish was a line drawn from Boulogne to St. Omer.¹⁵ Senlecques is only six miles south of this line. In the section (xvi. 6) of the French government map containing Senlecques there are sixty or seventy names of unmistakably Germanic type. It is in a district in which Frank, Saxon, Frisian, and Dane have left their mark upon the local nomenclature, and in which names ending in *-iga-ta* occur, a formation found elsewhere only in England.¹⁶ These names, if they do not actually record settle-

¹² Thus Wace, in reproducing Geoffrey of Monmouth's account of Loeh Lomond, *Hb. ix*, c. 6, calls it *li lac* (*Roman de Brut*, 9662). The common word for 'lake' in Norman local names is *mare*, Latinized as *maris*, a word of Germanic, possibly of Scandinavian, origin. William of Jumièges, *Hb. ii*, c. 20, speaks of '*lacus, quem usu quotidiano loquendi maris vocamus*'. For Norman names see C. Joret, *Des Caractères et de l'Extension du Patois normand*, Paris, 1883, pp. 75 seq., and his *Mélanges de Phonétique normande*, Paris, 1884, p. 36. Orderic substitutes it, in true Norman fashion, for O.E. *mare* in *Ellesmere*, *Hb. xiii*, c. 37 (v. 111), *Ellesmere*, Shropshire.

¹³ It occurs as *Sensgate* in 1118 and *Sensgate* in the thirteenth century (Joret, *Des Caractères*, p. 28, n. 4).

¹⁴ The final *s* of the name is, of course, the Old French nom. sing. sign, which was retained until a very late period in Picard. The same suffix occurs in *Sperlecques*, in the same department as Senlecques. The older forms of this name are *Sperlake*, *Sperlake*, Latinized *Sperlake*, *Sperlake* (*Cartulaires de l'Église de Tournai*, publiés par Thomas Druet et A. Giry, St. Omer, 1881; *Les Chartes de Saint-Bertin*, ... publiées par M. l'abbé Daniel Huguier, St. Omer, 1886). The name *Laquesdel*, in the same arrondissement as Senlecques (Joret, *Des Caractères*, p. 173), affords strong presumption of the Germanic origin of *lecques*. Joret, p. 172, claims these and similar local names in the north of France as of Germanic origin by reason of the *k*.

¹⁵ Professor Sechter, in Gröber's *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, 2nd edition, i. 720.

¹⁶ Heinrich Leo, *Rectitudines Singularum Personarum; nebst einer einleitenden Abhandlung über Lautenscheidung, Landbau, gutsherrliche und bürgerliche Verhältnisse der Angelsachsen*, Halle, 1842, p. 26 n.; Georg Waitz, *Das alte Recht der salischen Franken*, Kiel, 1846, pp. 53 seq.; Godefroid Kurth, *La Frontière linguistique en Belgique et*

ments by the conquerors of South Britain, must be derived from invaders more closely related to them than any of the Germanic tribes recorded in the local names elsewhere on the continent.

Senlac cannot, on these grounds, be a French name. There remain only two ways of explaining it. It is either an invention, and a motiveless invention, of Orderic's, or it is an English name spelt according to the Norman system of sound-representation. Arguments to disprove the former must be mainly of a subjective nature, and it is not necessary to consider them, for the evidence in favour of the second explanation is, I think, conclusive. Orderic usually spells English names in Norman fashion,¹⁷ just as do the scribes of the Domesday Survey in the vast majority of cases. The latter yields evidence that Norman scribes occasionally wrote *lac* for *lace* as the final member of an English compound local name,¹⁸ and the same spelling is even used by our English Eadmer,¹⁹ the friend and confidant of Anselm. The omission of the final syllable of *-lace* arises either from its weak pronunciation by English speakers, or, more probably, from the fact that an *e* in a similar position in Anglo-Norman was already ceasing to be pronounced as early as the twelfth century. It is retained by the late twelfth-century writer of the Battle Abbey Chronicle, who writes *Santlache* and, in a latinized dative singular, *Santlacheas*. As he uses Norman spellings, in which *ch* represented the *k*-sound,²⁰ we can restore his *-lache* to *-lake*, which can only be the O.E. *lace*, the dative singular of O.E. *lacu* 'stream, watercourse',²¹ a native Germanic word not borrowed from the Latin *lacus* that is still in dialect use in the south of England. As the Battle Abbey

dans le Nord de la France, I. 530 seq. ('Mémoires couronnés et autres Mémoires publiés par l'Académie Royale . . . de Belgique, collection in-8vo, vol. xlviii').

¹⁷ He spells *Exite*, *Attingesham*, and *Scrobbesberie* (Norman spelling *Scorpeberie* in Domesday), places wherewith he was connected as a boy, in the English fashion.

¹⁸ *Fiscles* (Fishlake, co. York), I. 373 b, col. 2 (*Simeslac*, *Poslac*, and other names in this county are not derived from *lace*; see ante, xxvii. 15 n. 66); *Adelach*, co. Oxford, I. 161, col. 1 (a lost name). In 1207 Standlake in the latter county appears as *Simeslac* (*Rot. Litt. Class.* I. 170 a). Many other instances could be quoted, but only those derived from publications printed in record type can be trusted on this point, since final marks of abbreviation are usually and unfortunately ignored in those printed in modern type. In Old and Middle English pronunciation there was no such distinction in pronunciation between *lac* and *lake* as now exists. The only difference between the two was the presence or absence of an obscure vowel at the end.

¹⁹ *Historia Novorum*, pp. 70, 145, 196, where Mortlake is spelt *Martelac*, as compared with *Mortelape* in Domesday.

²⁰ *Chronicon Monasterii de Bello*, (ed. by J. S. Brewer), London, 'Impensis Societatis' (Anglo-Christiane), 1846, from Petrie's transcript. The scribe writes *Cāas* (Kens), p. 29, *Charmardi* (Carmarthen), p. 55, *Chosham* (Cosham), Wiltshire, p. 51, and *Chapenore*, p. 19, for a place in Battle parish that is always called *Copnore* in the later documents.

²¹ By the time of Domesday the nom. *lacu* and the dat. sing. *lace* had become indistinguishable in pronunciation, but the dat. sing. (locative) is always the most probable in an O.E. local name. The word is recorded in the Sussex local names Lakehurst Wood (in Dullington), Rushlake Green (in Warbleton), and in Shiplake Hundred.

scribe unvoices the English *d* after *l* in *Gilthalla* for O.E. *gild-heall*,²² we may assume that he has done the same in *Sant*,²³ and accordingly restore the full name to O.E. *Sand-lace*, which must mean a sandy brook or a brook that brings down sand.²⁴ As the Norman scribes frequently omitted the *d* in English compounds in *sand*,²⁵ it is obvious that *Sandlace* might be written by a Norman scribe *Santlache* or *Sanlac*. From the latter to Orderic's *Senlac* is a short step, and the Old French confusion of *an* and *en* may be called upon to justify it.²⁶ Orderic himself latinizes *Dene*, the Forest of Dean, as *Dana*.²⁷

It cannot be mere coincidence that the name of Sandlake thus extricated from *Senlac* and *Santlache* occurs as a name of part of the town of Battle. It may be found scores of times in deeds ranging from the twelfth century downwards in the sale catalogue of the Battle Abbey muniments.²⁸ It occurs as *Sanlake* in an undated thirteenth-century charter, and as *Seynlak* in one of 1343.²⁹ It is not clear whether the compiler of the catalogue always follows his originals in spelling the name Sandlake in the other cases. In charters of 1480, 1500, and 1522 we read of lands 'in the Tything of Sandlake within the borough of Battle.'³⁰ Sandlake was not, therefore, merely 'a local field-name', as Dr. Round describes *Santlache*, but an important administrative division of the parish of Battle.

²² p. 21.

²³ Compare the spellings of the continental *Saugotte*, above, p. 294, note 13.

²⁴ This name occurs as that of a brook at Brightwell, co. Oxford (Birch, *Carterianum Sacrosanctum*, II. 568).

²⁵ *Domesday* has *Sanbec*, Cheshire, *Saxford*, Hampshire, and elsewhere, and *Sanber*, co. Gloucester (*Sandhurst*).

²⁶ Anglo-Norman is distinguished by keeping these sounds separate in rhyme, although *-en* had become *-an* in French as early as, if not earlier than, the eleventh century (Sachier, *Altfranzösische Grammatik*, Halle, 1903, p. 68; L. E. Menger *The Anglo-Norman Dialect*, New York, 1904, p. 54). But in *Domesday* and other records with Norman spellings English names in *-en* are frequently written *-an*, and this spelling has influenced the modern form and pronunciation in such cases as *Wendsworth* (O.E. *Wendles-wærd*), *Hensley* (O.E. *Hæn-lea*), &c. Benoit de Sainte-Maure writes *Hensley*, and also *Sens* for *Sens*, *Lans* for *Lans*. Instances of *-en* for *-an* are much commoner than those of *-an* for *-en*, but they sufficiently prove that the two sounds were confused, at any rate graphically. The *Domesday Cranesford*, II. 306 b, represents an O.E. **Cranesford* (now *Cranesford*), as it is written in seven other instances *Cranesforda*, *Cranesford*, &c.

²⁷ Lib. iv, c. 5 (II. 192). The village from which the forest is named is written *Dene* in *Domesday*, I. 167 b, col. 1.

²⁸ *Descriptive Catalogue of the original charters . . . constituting the Muniments of Battle Abbey . . . On sale by Thomas Thorpe, No. 33 Bedford Street, Covent Garden, London, 1838.* The collection, which was bound in ninety-seven folio volumes (M. A. Lower, *The Chronicle of Battle Abbey from 1068 to 1176, now first translated*, London, 1851, p. 215), was purchased from Thorpe by Sir Thomas Phillipps, Bart., and is still in his collection at Cheltenham.

²⁹ pp. 13, 72. The former may be merely an editorial or typographical error.

³⁰ pp. 123, 130, 137.

The Battle Abbey chronicler summarizes the Domesday entry of the $6\frac{1}{2}$ hides that the abbot 'habet in suo rapo',³¹ and he states that all these lands are 'infra leugam', that is, within the 'leuga' that the church (i. e. abbey) of Battle 'tenet circa se'.³² He gives the boundaries of the 'leuga',³³ which seem to correspond with those of the parish of Battle. Some of these Domesday lands are in the parish of Battle, and some are names of parishes that impinge upon it. Sandlake is not mentioned. But the places that can be identified as still existing within the parish are on the outskirts of the parish. The conclusion seems evident: the names in the centre of the parish had been obscured by the abbey and the town that grew up round it.

It is noticeable that the compiler of the Chronicon identifies the word 'rape' with *leuga*. Dr. Round thinks that this need not imply a rape of Battle, but may merely mean 'in the rape of Hastings in which his (the abbot's) abbey stands, as opposed to the rape of Pevensey, in which the rest of his endowments lay'.³⁴ The chronicler's identification affords a more satisfactory explanation, which also accounts for half a hide being quit of geld (i. e. geld due from the *leuga*) 'quia foris rap'. The form *rope* quoted in the *New English Dictionary* from the Parliament Rolls, iii. 96b, in 1380, favours the derivation of this unexplained word from O.E. *rāp* 'rope'. As the old courts of the rape ceased to be popular assemblies, the word would naturally sink down to a merely legal word used only in written documents, and hence the old form would become fossilized instead of undergoing the normal development to 'rope'. A similar instance may be found in the word 'soke', which has arisen from the latinized *soca* of legal documents, since the O.E. *sōcn*, which was thus represented, had the same vocalic grade as the related 'sook' in 'forsook'. Lowland Scotch uses the correct descendant 'sucken'. In early Germanic law the place where the popular open-air courts assembled was enclosed with great solemnity to define the limits of the 'peace' of the court. For this purpose stakes and ropes were used.³⁵ Brunner has advanced the suggestion that the Sussex rapes derive their names from 'rope' by an extension of that word from the material for enclosing the place of the court to the court itself, and then to the district over which it exercised jurisdiction.³⁶ In his *Forschungen zur Geschichte des deutschen und französischen Rechtes*, Stuttgart, 1894, p. 737, in an article reprinted from the *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, 1883, germanische

³¹ Domesday Book, i. 17 b, col. 2.

³² *Chronicon de Bello*, p. 10.

³³ p. 33. The statement in the *Victoria History of Sussex*, i. 374, that William 'gave all the land within a measured circle round the (abbey) church (of Battle) of three miles radius; this circle constituted the "Lowey" or "Leuga" of Battle', takes the word *leuga* as a definite measure and ascribes to it too wide an extent. The *leuga* of Battle is not a circle, but a very irregular-shaped figure, which may be due to exchanges of lands within and without it.

³⁴ *Victoria History of Sussex*, i. 373.

³⁵ H. Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, Leipzig, 1887, i. 144; R. Schröder, *Lehrbuch der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte*, ed. 5, Leipzig, 1907, p. 43.

³⁶ Brunner, i. 145, n. 8; H. 145, n. 20.

Abtheilung, iv. 235 seqq., reviewing J. A. Fruin's *De oudste Rechten der stad Dordrecht en van het baljuwschap van Zuidholland*, 1882, he supports this view by citing the Dutch form of pleading recorded at Dordrecht, in which the plaintiff had to allege that the cause of action had arisen 'binnen den reep van Zuydholland'. The Dutch *reep* is of the same origin as the O.E. *rāp*, and it is certainly curious that the related Old High German *raiffa* is found glossed by 'territorium'. The Battle entry suggests that the word 'rāp' in the sense of 'court' or 'jurisdiction' was still in use in Sussex at the time of Domesday. The abbot was 'ausa ecclēsiæ et leugæ circumiacentis iudex et dominus' (*Chronicon*, Appendix, p. 189).

The places stated in the *Chronicon* to be within the *leuga* should be within the parish of Battle, if the parish and the *leuga* are identical. The first name in Domesday is *Bocekham*, which is identified with Buckholt in the adjoining parish of Westfield in the *Victoria History of Sussex*, i. 394. It is really Uckham, a *borga* in the north-east of the parish of Battle, for the manuscript of the *Chronicon* has *Uckham* written over *Bocekham* in the same hand; it is misprinted *Vockekham*. The details given by the *Chronicon* confirm this identification. The next, *Bee*, identified in the *Victoria History* with Beech, in the adjoining parish of Whatlington, is said in the *Chronicon*, pp. 10, 18, to be 'extra villam infra leugam', which agrees with an entry in the 'Lidger Book' in 1516-17, fo. 25^r, that *Esbeche* in the *burga* of Middleborough was outside the liberty of the borough of Battle, which terminated near Caldback Hill.²⁷ This place must therefore be Beech near Caldback Hill.²⁸ *Waringate* is identified in the *Chronicon* with *Bodherstegate*, which lay near the Great Wood on the east of the parish, which still bears the name Bathurst in the old Ordnance Survey. *Nirefeld*, explained by the *Chronicon* as *Redrefeld* (printed *Nedrefeld*) appears to be Netherfield, in the north-west of the parish. Penhurst, Catsfield, Crowhurst, and Hollington are adjoining parishes. The remaining five are parishes that do not impinge upon Battle. Probably the explanation is that the lands in the adjoining manors were really within the *leuga*, and have become merged in Battle parish. The portions belonging to the five remote places may have been originally detached portions lying within the *leuga*, just as detached portions of Battle parish now lie in Sedlescombe and Whatlington. The former is probably the land in Sedlescombe that in the rentals is described as being within the *borga* of Sandlake. If these suggestions are correct, the lands belonging to the remote manors or parishes would bear a strong resemblance to the *Denbere* of the Kentish charters, which were portions of woodland often at some considerable distance from the manor to which they belonged. In the same way the wood called 'Penge' belonged to Battersea.²⁹ Penge is still in Battersea parish.

²⁷ Compare also the *Westboc* of the *Chronicon*, p. 11. For the *Lidger Book*, see below, p. 300 and note 47.

²⁸ Compare Thorpe's *Catalogue*, pp. 20, 21, 30, 42, 60, 68, 69.

²⁹ *Ordnance Survey Foca. III. II*, plate 3; *Cert. Sar. III*, 189, dated 937, a late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century facsimile charter, not 'nearly contemporary', as stated by Birch.

The chronicler gives an interesting list of the *mansurae* held by the townsmen, who 'ob eiusdem loci permaximam excellentiae dignitatem, burgenses vocantur'.⁴⁰ These *mansurae* were obviously, from the indications given, in the main street, now called 'Upper Lake' and 'Lower Lake', which skirts the abbey precincts on the north and east. The chronicler then proceeds to give an account of the lands 'extra villam infra leugam'.⁴¹ Herein we read 'Santlachae usque ad domum infirmorum habentur xxxⁱⁱ acrae et una, qui locus Dune vocatur'.⁴² A notice of eleven acres 'iuxta villam in parte orientali' of the fee of Uckham, called 'Cook's Land' (*terra Coci*), is followed by the entry 'post illas iacent v. acrae usque iuxta Santlache, quae similiter v. denarios reddunt. Ibi est et(iam) i. acra, ubi domus, quae Gilthalle vocatur, stat.'⁴³ A little lower down we read 'Duae etiam Gilthallae sunt in eadem villa, una, ut supradiximus, in Santlache, quae vocatur Gilda Sancti Martini. Alia vero in parte occidentali villae, qui locus vocatur Claverham. <T>ertia autem est extra villam iuxta vivarium, quod est supra Quarrere, ad opus rusticorum, qui sunt extra villam.' The guildhall in Santlache is here said to be 'infra villam', that is, within the area covered by houses adjoining the abbey precincts, and it was dedicated to St. Martin, the patron saint of the abbey. This guildhall must have been very close to the abbey.

In a collection of Battle rentals written in the second quarter of the thirteenth century we have a list of rents in 'borga de Sandlake', and in other *borgae*, and of the 'census Burgi de Bello'.⁴⁴ The latter is the word 'borough'; the former is obviously a latinization of O.E. *borg*, familiar in the compound *frith-borg*, and here, as in Kent, meaning the district of a *frith-borg*. In the 'Liber Regius Monasterii de Bello', written about the end of the century, we have entries of lands in 'Sandlake', including a messuage 'iuxta la Quarrere' and a tenement 'iuxta Hospitale'.⁴⁵ This must be compared with the entry in the Battle chronicle: 'Est terra quaedam, quae iacet inter pomarium, quod est contiguum curiae, et vivarium, quod est a parte australi, quae vocatur Quarrere, et sunt ibi iiii. acrae. Ex alia parte viae iuxta pomarium, quod est coniunctum domui, quae vocatur Hospitalis, sunt duae acrae in Herste.'⁴⁶ That is, the land in Quarrere, in Sand-

⁴⁰ pp. 12, 17.⁴¹ p. 17.⁴² p. 19.⁴³ p. 20.⁴⁴ Public Record Office, Augmentation Office, Miscellaneous Books, no. 18, fo. 20.⁴⁵ Public Record Office, Augmentation Office, Miscellaneous Books, no. 57, ff. 10, 11.⁴⁶ pp. 19, 20. The place called 'Herste' is mentioned at p. 7, where it is said that the monks wished to erect the abbey there instead of on the site of the battle, it being 'in humiliori non procul loco versus eiusdem collis occidentalem plagam'. If this is the same Herste, it must have extended south of the abbey to the Hospital. This can hardly be the 'domus peregrinorum, quae Hospitalis vocatur' of p. 12, as that was

lake, lies between the orchard adjoining the court (not the later Court House) of the abbey and the stew to the south. This proves that land immediately south of the abbey buildings was in Santlache or Sandlake. The second entry may be compared with the 'Lidger Book of Battle', which contains a rental dated 8 Henry VIII (1516-17):⁴⁷

Sanglake, videlicet infra burgh(um) ville de Bello.—Ex parte occidentali regie strate burge de Sanglake, incipiens ad mesuagium quondam Roberti Umfrey. Et sic de eodem mesuagio, et quolibet mesuagio et qualibet parcella terre ab ultimo confinio usque ad murum abbatiæ.

Another rubric occurs at fo. 14 :

Ex parte orientali de Sanglake, incipiens ad Hospitale. In cuius parte dicunt, quod dominus non habet aliquem redditum inter dictum hospitale et tenementum Benedicte Berge, quondam Thome Leyr, quia pertinet sacrist(ano) et elemos(inario).

Here again we have property in Sandlake abutting upon the abbey wall. Whether the abbey itself was in Sandlake does not appear. Such evidence could hardly find a place in an abbey rental. The abbey itself would naturally be exempt from the *borga* or tithing. It is certain that the *borga* of Sandlake marched with the abbey precincts from the south-east corner to a spot opposite the parish church on the north,⁴⁸ and that some part of the *borga* was south of the abbey. Even if the abbey-site was never within the *borga* of Sandlake, these facts prove that the spot where Harold fell and where the high altar of the abbey was erected was within a few yards at most of the limits of the *borga* of Sandlake. Surely this alone is sufficient to justify Orderic's statement that the site of the battle and of the abbey was known as Senlac, or, as we must write it in English, Sandlake.

But was he justified in saying that it was so called before the battle? Here we have no evidence beyond probabilities to fall back upon. Uckham alone of the *borgae* of the *leuga* of Battle is mentioned in Domesday,⁴⁹ and that lay to the north-east of Sandlake. If we take the three *borgae* that alone came into the town, there can be no question that that of Sandlake bears the oldest name. The west of the town was mainly in the *borga* of Montjoy, which certainly cannot be a pre-Conquest name. Between it and Sandlake lay the *borga* of Middleborough, which can

to the west of the abbey near the abbey gateway. The Hospital seems clearly to be the 'domus infirmorum' of the *Chronicon*, pp. 19, 20, to the east of the town.

⁴⁷ Public Record Office, Augmentation Office, Miscellaneous Books, no. 36, fo. 10^v.

⁴⁸ In the survey cited above, fo. 17, Middleborough' commences on the north side of the street of the said *borga* at a messuage opposite the wall of the cemetery of the abbey. So in Thorpe's *Catalogus*, p. 147, in a later rental of 1594 the borough of Middleborough begins on the north side of the street at the west end of the church.

⁴⁹ See page 298, above.

hardly have received such a name until after the creation of Montjoy. It therefore seems probable that the hill where Harold fell and where William raised his great abbey was in a tithing, or hamlet, or possibly a higher or manorial organization, bearing the name of Sandlake, and that Sandlake itself, and consequently the brook from which it derived its name, was contiguous to the site of the abbey. There is a possibility that this land belonged to Harold's family, for Domesday records that Boccheham, which the abbey chronicler identifies with Uckham,⁴⁰ the tithing adjoining that of Sandlake, was owned by Earl Godwine. The adjoining manors of Whatlington and Crowhurst were owned by Harold himself, according to Domesday.

The corruption of the name Sandlake to Sanguelac is an old one, and was due to the fact that after heavy rain the ironstone causes the water of the little river Asten to be coloured red.⁴¹ According to the Duchess of Cleveland, 'after heavy rains, a "gutter of blood" is always to be seen at the foot of the east side of the old abbey wall, where it fronts the church and the Upper Lake.'⁴² This is referred to in the twelfth century by William of Newburgh in an indignantly patriotic passage.⁴³ Lambarde testifies to the belief in Elizabeth's time by the natives that 'Santlake, a place neare to Battel', derived its name from the streams of blood that were shed in the great battle.⁴⁴

Senlac suggests Malfosse, the site of the serious Norman loss during the pursuit after the battle. The name should be written Malfossé, for it is spelt *Malfossed* in the manuscript of the Chronicon, an older form of *fossé* with retention of the *d* (i. e. *ð*) into which the *t* of the Latin *fossatum* developed in Old French. In the printed text this has been misunderstood as *Malfos* followed by the Latin *sed*, although in the manuscript (fo. 9^v) it

⁴⁰ See page 292, above.

⁴¹ Lower, *Chronicle of Battle Abbey*, p. 7, n. 13; *Contributions to Literature*, London, 1854, p. 71, where he states that 'but a few years since, the springs of chalybeate water hereabouts—the sources of the little river Asten—were believed to have received their redness from the blood of the slaughtered Saxons'.

⁴² *A Guide to Battle Abbey*, by C. L. W. C. (Her Grace the Duchess of Cleveland), Battle, s. s., p. 22, n. 2.

⁴³ *Chronicles of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II and Richard I*, ed. Howlett, i. 22 (Rolls Series). He dilates upon the blood-guiltiness of William 'cuius rei argumentum est quod a testibus fide dignis accepimus. In loco siquidem ubi victi Angli occubuerunt constructum est a victoribus monasterium nobile beati Martini de Bello nuncupatum; quod scilicet et ad homines aeternus foret Normannicae victoriae titulus, et ad Deum propitiatio pro effusione tanti sanguinis Christiani. Denique in eodem monasterio locus ille, ubi Anglorum pro patria dimicantium maxima strages facta est, si forte modico umbre maduerit, verum sanguinem et quasi recentem exsudat, ac si per ipsam rei evidentiam dicatur, quod adhuc vox tanti sanguinis Christiani clamet ad Deum de terra, quae aperuit os suum et suscepit eundem sanguinem de manibus fratrum, id est Christianorum.'

⁴⁴ *An Alphabetical Description of the Chief Places in England and Wales*. Now first published. London, 1730, p. 350.

is written clearly enough *Malfos-sed*,⁴⁴ with a hyphen as here given at the division of the name at the end of a line.

The various modern attempts to identify the Malfossé assume that it was the name of some natural feature, for which some justification may be found in the *Chronicon*, which describes it as 'miserabile quoddam in proximo spatioso protentum, ex naturali telluris hiatu, vel forsan ex procellarum concavatione, praecipitium vaste patens, licet uti in vastitate dumis vel tribulis oblitum oculis minus praevideretur'.⁴⁵

Lower has remarked that there is no place near Battle that can be so described.⁴⁶ It is difficult to believe that *fossatum* could be applied to any such natural feature, and one is therefore not surprised to find the site of the Norman check thus described by William of Poitiers, the contemporary historian of the Conquest: 'Rediit tamen fugientibus confidentia, nactis ad renovandum certamen maximam opportunitatem praerupti vallis et frequentium fossarum.'⁴⁷ Freeman suggested the reading *valli* for the ungrammatical *vallis*.⁴⁸ The unique manuscript of William of Poitiers is lost, and we have therefore no means of directly proving this correction of Duchesne's text. But the reading *valli* occurs in Orderic, who embodies William of Poitiers' account of the battle in that of William of Jumièges,⁴⁹ whose work he had himself transcribed.⁵⁰ In the following quotation from Orderic, the italic portions are the words of Jumièges, the clarendon those of Poitiers, and the roman Orderic's own.⁵¹

Normanni, dum Anglos fugere viderunt, tota nocte Dominica eos ad sui detrimentum obviare persecuti sunt. Nam crescentes herbas antiquum aggerem tegebant, ubi summo opere currentes Normanni cum equis et armis ruebant, ac ecce, dum unus super alterum repente cadebat, vicissim exinguebant. Ibi mirum fugientibus Anglis rediit confidentia. Cementes enim opportunitatem praerupti valli et frequentium fossarum, in unum collecti sunt, inopinato restiterunt, et Normannis magnam stragem fortiter intulerunt.

An echo of this is found in William of Malmesbury's 'fossatum quoddam praeruptum'. Freeman doubts Orderic's 'antiquum aggerem', overlooking the fact that we have the contemporary authority of William of Jumièges for it. Orderic adds to the matter derived from this writer and from William of Poitiers the statement that Engenulf of Laigle was one of the victims of

⁴⁴ The form *fossed* is an archaic spelling that did not correspond to the pronunciation of the latter part of the twelfth century.

⁴⁵ *Chronicon*, p. 5.

⁴⁶ *Chronicle of Battle*, p. 6, n. 12; *Contributions to Literature*, p. 55.

⁴⁷ Duchesne, *Historiae Normannorum Scriptores Antiqui*, Paris, 1819, 203 C, D.

⁴⁸ *Norman Conquest*, III, 503 n.

⁴⁹ Duchesne, p. 257 C.

⁵⁰ See above, p. 293, n. 10.

⁵¹ *Lit.* III, c. 14 (II, 149).

this reverse. Laigle is only a few miles from St.-Évroul, and Engenulf's family were benefactors of the monastery. It is therefore probable that Orderic had talked over the events of the battle with members of the Laigle family or with some of their men. The accounts of the check of the Normans thus endorsed by Orderic seems to imply that its site was some old fortification. From William of Poitiers, who refers this reverse in a marked manner to the night following the battle, it would seem to have occurred at some distance from the hill of Senlac or Sandlake. This rules out the location of the Malfossé (if that was the name of the place where the events recorded by the Norman writers took place) in the valley below the church of Battle, the site adopted by Freeman from Lower, since that is merely the northern side of the hill of battle.

The Hon. F. H. Baring has suggested a site for Malfossé near Saxon Wood in Battle,⁶² which is about half a mile distant from the abbey, and he thinks that this is supported by the occurrence of Mansers Shaw, which he connects with the *Manfosse* mentioned in Thorpe's *Catalogue*. But this must obviously be read *Maufosse*, and *Manser* probably represents an owner's name, that being an Anglo-French form of the name *Manasser*.⁶³

W. H. STEVENSON.

Some Irish Cistercian Documents

IN a bundle of Cistercian documents preserved at Dijon (Archives de la Côte-d'Or, Monastères Anglais, H. 407) are or were contained (*inter alia*) five documents from Ireland relating to the order. Four of these are grants from Irish kings and chiefs made in the early part of the thirteenth century to the house at Cîteaux, and the fifth is a letter from certain titular Cistercian abbots in Ireland to the abbot of Cîteaux dated 1628. The four thirteenth-century deeds were printed by M. D'Arbois de Jubainville in the *Revue Celtique* (vii. 81-7), but no attempt was made to identify the names of the witnesses, and the transcripts seem to have escaped the notice of writers on the subject. Mr. William Brown, F.S.A., has supplied me with independent transcripts of two of the early documents (nos. i and ii), which he made at Dijon in

⁶² *Ibid.*, xlii. 69.

⁶³ For the identity of *Manser* and *Manasser*, see the *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, 1247-58, where Isaac son of Manser of p. 439 is called son of Manasser at p. 442. A Manasseh de Herst (perhaps the Herst in Battle of p. 299, n. 46, above) occurs as a witness in a deed relating to Sedlescombe in Thorpe's *Catalogue*, p. 20, and a William son of Manser de Herst at p. 25, and a Manserus de Scotagney at p. 43. Lower, *Contributions*, p. 137, mentions a Manser family as engaged in the iron trade in Sussex. Cf. *Mansers* (Bourne Place), near Tunbridge.