

## Anglo-Saxon Hampshire

David Hinton, January 2007

### *1. Introduction: nature of the evidence, history of research and the role of material culture*

This survey aims to comment on some of the issues, both old and new, facing archaeologists, and on publications and discoveries, particularly those made since 2000 when a survey of Hampshire was last undertaken (Russel 2002; see also Welch 1996). Themes include the complexities of seeking to define social identities and of explaining observable behaviour patterns. Material culture can no longer be assumed to stem directly from matters mentioned in documents: even the validity of migration as an explanation of the changes in the immediate post-Roman period is in question because of uncertainty about the numbers who could have crossed the North Sea and whether a few people, albeit successful warriors, could have produced so much change to the ways most of the population lived, to the things that were worn and carried, and to language. Yet the possibility of searching for the Jutes whom Bede assures us controlled part of southern Hampshire cannot be ignored. Similarly, changes created by the introduction of Christianity thanks to the bishops of Winchester and to military and militant kings; the seemingly inexorable rise of Wessex, culminating in the deeds of King Alfred against the viking hordes; and the pitiful behaviour of Ethelred the Unready foreshadowing the imposition of the Norman yoke in 1066 remain matters to be explored both through archaeological and documentary material (Yorke 1995 is the best survey of the historical literature).

Hampshire at the beginning of the twentieth century had boundaries largely established during the Anglo-Saxon period, reconstructable from the late eleventh-century Domesday Book (Munby, ed. 1982); it begins the twenty-first without a substantial part of its south-western corner, having lost Christchurch, the ancient Twynham, to Dorset. Its origins remain uncertain, but have to be post-Roman, as whatever territory was controlled by the Roman *civitas* at Silchester must have shared a boundary with Winchester somewhere across the shire, conceivably along the chalk scarp east from Walbury to Caesar's Camp (Creighton 2000, fig. A.1 puts this line as very approximately the boundary of his Southern region of Iron Age coin distribution). The western boundary was rearranged in 1895 by the inclusion of Martin into the shire, so the use of Bokerley Dyke and several stretches of bank called Grim's Ditch belong mainly to the stories of Dorset and Wiltshire. Places with names that straddle the borders, such as the Tidworths and the Deans in the west, and the Stratfields and Mortimers in the north, hint at a boundary slicing through earlier territorial units. The shire's name derives from *Hamptun*, and its first use in the eighth century may mean a territory dependent upon what was then the new *wic* in the Kingsland area of modern Southampton, not necessarily the whole of the later county, which may have been formed in the second half of the ninth century in response to the viking raids.

Without a university until the 1950s, Hampshire did not attract a great deal of antiquarian interest. The first resumé on the Anglo-Saxon period was, as for many counties, written by R. A. Smith of the British Museum for the Victoria County History (Doubleday, ed. 1900). Smith's work still sometimes strikes a chord: 'It

cannot be too often insisted on that the supposed annihilation of the native Britons is as unsupported by archaeology as by probability and historical experience' (1900, 376). His discussion was hampered by the paucity of evidence of cemeteries and grave-goods on the mainland – in contrast to the Isle of Wight – and that some objects, such as those from Micheldever, had been lost (ibid. 391). Surprisingly, since they were in the British Museum, he did not mention the two gold objects from Preshaw, a bracteate that is still the only example from the county, which was apparently worn on a necklace together with a domed garnet in a gold setting (Kendrick and Hawkes 1937; Meaney 1964, 99; Geake 1997, 154-5).

Although noted in the first half of the twentieth century for a number of distinguished practitioners of archaeology, such as Heywood Sumner, J. P. Williams-Freeman and O. G. S. Crawford (Cunliffe 1976 and Whinney 1985 for a summary of archaeology in the county; it is appropriate here to record the sad loss in 2005 of Chris Currie, foremost of a new generation of Hampshire fieldworkers), post-Roman evidence relied on the occasional recovery of material found during building work, such as the important grave outside Basingstoke at West Ham, scabbled out by workmen extending a railway line in 1899 (Meaney 1964, 98), and the wide range of things recovered at Droxford in the following two years, also by railway constructors (Meaney 1964, 97). Systematic excavation of a cemetery seems to have had to wait until after the Second World War, when one of its veterans, Group-Captain Guy Knocker, was responsible for following up reports of discoveries made during road building at Horndean in 1947 and on Portsdown Hill in 1948-9 and 1956. The influence of a 'rescue' budget created by the Chief Inspector of Ancient Monuments, Brian O'Neill, began to be felt with the financing by the Ministry of Public Buildings and Works of these and subsequent excavations, in the mid 1950s at Winnall, outside Winchester (Meaney and Hawkes 1970) and in the early 1960s at Worthy Park (Hawkes 2003) and Alton (Evison 1988), and various small-scale investigations were done. Subsequent cemetery excavations have included work in the Meon Valley (Stoodley and Stedman 2001, where previous work is referenced), at Portway during the expansion of Andover (Cook, A. M. and Dacre 1985; also now Stoodley 2006), and Droxford, when the railway line that first revealed the cemetery was abandoned (Aldsworth 1978). Others worked on in the 1990s and 2000s, such as Itchen Abbas, Littleton and Breamore, await publication.

When Hampshire moved into the archaeological limelight in the 1960s, it was for the work that took place on settlements rather than on cemeteries. Martin Biddle's work in Winchester, a judicious blend of rescue and research excavation, set new standards; subsequent publication has mostly been of documentary evidence, though the first volume in the Winchester Studies series drew on the excavated evidence in its analysis of the post-Roman city (Biddle ed. 1976), the Lankhills Roman cemetery volume appeared soon afterwards, and has implications for the post-Roman period (Clarke 1979), and a two-volume artefacts survey followed (Biddle 1990). In a different series, the excavated sculptural fragments from the minsters have been fully catalogued (Tweddle, Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle 1995). The great importance of *Hamwic*, the mid Anglo-Saxon trading area around St Mary's in Southampton, was first appreciated in the 1840s and was pursued by Maitland Muller in the 1940s, but received a new impetus in the 1960s with both excavation and published syntheses by Peter Addyman and David Hill (1968, 1969). With several further publications, including a site-by-site review of the evidence by Alan Morton (1992), excavation

reports by Philip Holdsworth (1980), Philip Andrews (1997), Matt Garner (1994, 2001), Vaughan Birbeck (2005) and others, and various studies of the artefacts, the *wic* has been relatively well served.

It was not only urban settlements that attracted attention in the 1960s. Barry Cunliffe perhaps did not expect to find substantial evidence of Anglo-Saxon usage within the Roman shore fort at Portchester (1976), but his initiation of the large-scale excavation of the ridge-top site at Chalton was certainly a deliberate targeting of a rural settlement, something previously only excavated in rescue circumstances in England; summaries have appeared (Cunliffe 1972; Addyman, Leigh and Hughes 1972; Addyman and Leigh 1973; Champion 1977), but no final report. Meanwhile rescue work revealed a number of other settlement sites of various types and sizes, the largest being Old Down, near Andover (Davies 1980), Abbot's Worthy outside Winchester (Fasham and Whinney 1991), Cowdery's Down near Basingstoke (Millett 1983), Swaythling (Crockett 1996) and most recently two further sites arising from the continued expansion of Basingstoke and Andover, Riverdene (Hall-Torrance and Weaver 2003) for the former and Charlton for the latter (Wright 2004). Research excavation was pursued at Northbrook, Micheldever (Johnston 1998) and in the north-west of the county at Faccombe-Netherton (Fairbrother 1990).

Several ecclesiastical sites have been excavated in the county (below). Work has also been done on surviving structures, notably at Titchfield, reopening an Anglo-Saxon window and revealing part of the masonry at the east end of the nave (Hare 1992), at Breamore (Rodwell and Rouse 1984), and elsewhere (Potter 2006; Russel 2002). Sculpture has been described, discussed and photographed by Dominic Tweddle (1995, with Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle on the Winchester pieces).

The tradition of fieldwork established by Williams-Freeman and others has been taken up by the work of the Avon Valley Archaeological Society, directed by Tony Light, with the collection of pottery scatters that show occupation sites along the river terraces (Light, Schofield and Shennan 1995). The Meonstoke project has had some success, but has not yielded much Anglo-Saxon pottery (Stedman *et al.* 2005), and Shennan's East Hampshire survey was even less revealing for the period (1985, 89), unlike Cunliffe's 1960s collecting around Chalton (1972). Air photography has not been particularly useful for finding new settlement or cemetery evidence. Geophysics has begun to be fruitful, as at Wherwell (K. Clark in Roberts 1998, 150-2). Opportunism is unfortunately the main key to success, as Abbot's Worthy showed; the settlement site down in the Itchen valley would never have been revealed but for earth-moving for a motorway, as it was too deeply buried under a mixture of alluvium from the stream and colluvium from hill-wash. It proved that not all the occupation sites were on hill-tops and ridges. The other new technique is the harnessing of the metal-detecting hobby to the end of recording finds, particularly important for locating probable cemeteries, as at Breamore (below) and Micheldever (Johnston 1998, 93-9), and the 'prolific sites' that may show where internal trade exchanges took place in the mid Anglo-Saxon period (Ulmschneider 2000).

Documentary sources have been elucidated in a number of publications. Brief details of Hampshire's Anglo-Saxon charters were catalogued in chronological order by H. P. R. Finberg (1964, 27-68), and the early ones, such as they are for Hampshire, have been detailed further (Edwards 1988). The later ones from Winchester have now been

considered by Alex Rumble (2002). Various studies of individual charters and the archives of individual churches have been made. No volume on place-names was produced by the English Place-Name Society, and J. E. B. Gover's typescript remains the only detailed source (1961); Richard Coates has published a settlement name gazetteer (1989), but this does not consider field-names. Domesday Book 'in the raw' was edited and translated by Julian Munby (1982) and a de luxe replica edition includes an introduction by Brian Golding (1989).

The first summary of the post-Roman evidence for Hampshire after Smith's work (1900) was an undergraduate dissertation, not published but drawn upon by many students; it placed charter evidence in the context of the county's geology, stressing for instance the importance of the valleys and bournes, many of them flowing only in winter, and of the routeways that followed and crossed them (Aldsworth 1973). A paper on the land-units and estates that might be recognisable in Hampshire drew on continental evidence of *territoria* (Biddle 1976, 334-5). Some of those conclusions were challenged (Hinton 1981), but that author did not notice the medieval boundaries of Pamber Forest, which at least show that the curious inclusion of Silchester within Hampshire, although it causes a northwards protrusion, was not an entirely nineteenth-century creation (Stamper 1983). Martin Welch provided a brief overview of where research should go (1996), and Andrew Russel gave a millenary update (2002). The county did not get a 'Making of the Landscape' volume in the 1970s series, though it has of course been considered in various overviews of the south and south-west, by Joe Bettley (1986), Barry Cunliffe (1993) and Barbara Yorke (1995). There have been many papers on different subjects within the county, mostly published by the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society in its annual *Proceedings* or its *Newsletter*.

## 2. *Inheritance*

Old questions do not die; they simply fade away - and reappear in different guise. An old problem is what happened in the fifth century in an area that from its geographical position would not seem likely to have been susceptible to raids by the northern Picts, or by the Irish from the west, or to have been in the forefront of Germanic and Scandinavian influence, 'Anglo-Saxon' for short. Its relative proximity to Gaul and the rest of the continent might have meant that its contacts with the Empire and aspects of '*Romanitas*' would have survived longer than in other areas. Yet even in Hampshire, definite evidence of the fifth century remains elusive. Nor did it receive any of the imported pottery that shows renewed contacts with the Mediterranean in the second half of the fifth century in western parts of Britain.

Urban life may have survived through to the end of the fourth century at the two *civitas* capitals, Winchester and Silchester, but thereafter occupation, if it existed at all, was at such a low level that it is not clearly recognisable; the upper layers of excavated sites have not produced the timber buildings that Wroxeter has provided, or the maintenance of drains seen at Verulamium, or the hoard of coins, ingots and plate (assuming that they were indeed coeval) at Canterbury. In Winchester, the 'Dark Earth' layers above Roman levels in the city were probably already forming in the suburbs by the 360s (Biddle 1983, 112; Scobie *et al.* 1991, 31; Birbeck and Moore 2004, 77-110). Similar organic-rich layers at the extra-mural Lankhills cemetery may be later, though dating of the latest graves there is not complete - there have been

excavations in the 1990s and 2000s augmenting the published work (Clark 1979; James 1997, 36). Even if this cemetery was still used long into the fifth century, however, it was not necessarily because people were still living within the town walls, as it may have served a local rural catchment. A few pieces of pottery and a bone comb seem to show some sort of activity in the fifth century by people using things that were 'Anglo-Saxon' rather than 'late Roman', but they may have been no more than visitors, or farmers raising crops in small patches of soil amongst the ruins (James 1997, 39).

In Silchester, the sequence in Insula IX has been adjusted to allow for radiocarbon dates that rather unhelpfully can support arguments for occupation as early as A.D. 130 or as late as 540; an ogam stone is seen as inscribed for a fourth-century Irish house-owner, not a fifth-century attacker, and its deliberate placing in a well on a pewter flagon as an act of site closure (Fulford *et al.* 2002). Pottery of distinctively fifth-century character has not been found, but there is a little glass, notably a piece with distinctive incised decoration not known on vessels in Romano-British contexts (Price, J. 2000, 25-6). Buckle-frames and pins may extend into the fifth century, but Anglo-Saxon material such as a sixth-century button-brooch from somewhere in the area and a seventh-century palm-cup are too slight to be taken as evidence of a political takeover of a still-influential centre (Boon 1959; Evison 2000, 68). As in Winchester, the extensive modern excavations have failed to find any of the fifth-century coins that might throw light not just on dating but on the now much-mooted possibility of the continuation of at least some low-level regional marketing, possibly facilitated by an occasional imported coin. Thus an old find said to be from Silchester is a sixth-century copper Justinian *folles*, but even if it was indeed found there, it need not have arrived in the sixth century, as a copper coin of the same eastern emperor was excavated in *Hamwic*, Saxon Southampton, where there was no occupation at that time (Boon 1959, 84; Abdy and Williams 2006, 35). Other walled sites in Hampshire are the two Roman forts at Portchester and Bitterne, both of which have sixth- if not fifth-century artefacts, and could have remained in use; the latter has now been found to have post-Roman burials, though radiocarbon dates start in the sixth not the fifth century (Welch 1976, 205-11; Southern Archaeological Services 1998).

The four gold *solidi* reported as metal-detectorist finds from Horndean include one of the fifth century, but others are seventh, so the possibility that it was in Hampshire soon after its minting can effectively be discounted; indeed, without further information about the findspot it is not possible even to discuss the coins sensibly as a hoard, let alone as demonstration of a mid-Saxon 'productive site' (Abdy and Williams 2006, 21). Hoards like Otterbourne's that are likely to be fifth-century are also likely to contain clipped silver *siliquae*, which, although minted before 410, may have been deposited well after that date if the practice of clipping did not begin until new supplies of those coins became unobtainable; on that view, it should not be seen as evidence of the break-down of Roman authority, but of the continued ability of an authority to maintain a substantial if declining currency (Guest 2005, 110-5; Abdy 2006, 84-8). This argument would, however, be more convincing if there were a few examples in places like Winchester and Silchester where tax-paying and trading is most likely to have continued.

If the clipped *siliquae* are indeed evidence of authority, they would also be evidence that that authority could not maintain contact with Gaul and acquire supplies of new

coins, something that the absence of imported pottery seems to support, a slight contrast to east Sussex (Lyne 2003). As for native pottery, again the fifth-century evidence is far from prolific. The Alice Holt manufactory died away, its output reduced yet its distribution widened, as though new markets were desperately sought at the end. 'Portchester D' ware may have gone on a little longer (Lyne 2003, 149).

That there was an unbroken thread of use of the protecting walls within the fort at Portchester was shown by Cunliffe to be a possibility, though equally there may have been a hiatus in occupation, as the artefacts do not include 'late Roman' buckles, which are seen by some as echoes of official insignia falling into a transitional period. They include the animal-headed buckle-frames attached to long, variously decorated plates such as one at Portway (Cook, A. M. and Dacre 1985, 36-7, 95-6 and fig. 61). Mark Corney and others are working on corpora of these, and it remains to be seen if there are significant numbers in Hampshire. Their origins were in military dress, but they came to be worn by civilians, though still official – and male; the other things in the Portway grave, however, suggest that the buckle there was buried with a young woman. Openwork belt-fittings associated with the same corpus are not common either, though again there is one at Portway – and also in a woman's grave, but this time very worn and broken when buried (Cook, A. M. and Dacre 1985, 38 fig. 63; Ager 1996a, 207 and 209). Another has been found recently in a cremation grave at Weston Colley, Micheldever, as have some other items of fifth-century manufacture – two in a child's grave (N. Stoodley, pers. comm.). None of the late Roman and early post-Roman material lends much support to ideas about *laeti*, *foederati* or mercenary soldiers being active in fifth-century Hampshire

Aspects of the decoration of the 'late Roman' buckles are incorporated in the 'quoit-brooch' style. An early example is said to have come from Silchester (Ager 1985, fig. 4), and the decoration is well displayed on a belt-mount from Meonstoke (id. 1996b). Considering that it derives from late Classical ornament and techniques, more examples might be expected from Hampshire if the area had remained beyond the earliest Anglo-Saxon penetration, but Kent and Sussex have many more. A Kingsworthy copper-alloy mount indeed has workshop similarities to some belt-plates in the former, but does not prove that it was made there (Inker 2000, 48), and the same cemetery had a grave with a rather unexciting brooch that is quoit-brooch by shape rather than decoration, and was probably not buried until the end of the fifth century or the early sixth (Ager 1985, 1, 17 and fig. 21a). Droxford had a belt-frame and plate in the rare version in which silver was inlaid into iron (Aldsworth 1978, 170 and fig. 48, 11). A Portway brooch also has a late date in the sequence, and characteristics that enable it to be seen as something akin to objects from northern Germany and Scandinavia (Ager 1985 9, 19 and fig. 18, 5; id. 1996a, 207). Although such comparisons suggest that the style had moved out of the Roman cultural world into the Germanic, and from male to female costume, the Portway brooch was in the same grave as an old Roman bow-brooch, which illustrates how cross-cultural styles and customs had become.

Another example of cross-cultural fusion is the burial of an elderly lady at Alton with several Romano-British objects (O'Brien 1999, 152; Russel 2002, 20; the burial is from a later campaign than Professor Evison's, published in 1988); Stoodley (pers. comm.) has noted that two buckles were being worn on her shoulders, in Anglo-Saxon style. A man wearing hob-nailed footwear is reported from Itchen Abbas

(Russel 2002, 20; AHBR), also suggesting a continuation of Roman costume, and perhaps custom, here in a cemetery said to have objects datable to the mid/late fifth century and which may indeed have come into use in the Romano-British period, as well as continuing at least into the seventh century. Although only a few graves were excavated in 1984, subsequent work was done, including a geophysical survey, but nothing on all this has yet been published; it is said to have 'several hundred' graves, including cremations (AHBR; the graves at Cowdery's Down assigned to the late Roman period on the basis of hob-nails could perhaps be revisited: Millett 1983, 182). These indications of intermixing of existing modes with new rites in the second half of the fifth century in Hampshire make an interesting contrast with neighbouring Dorset, in which cemeteries of the period suggest resistance to the new. Hampshire has less 'overlap' evidence than another neighbour, Wiltshire, as it does not seem to have any G-type penannular brooches of 'British' type (Dickinson 1982, figs 1 and 2). 'British' hanging-bowls all seem to be from seventh-century contexts (below).

Itchen Abbas is the only cemetery where intermixed 'Romano-British' and 'Anglo-Saxon' burials have been claimed in Hampshire. Snell's Corner had a small group of graves, 100 feet to the south-west of the majority; as one grave contained coins of the very end of the fourth century (Knocker 1956, 119), at least some of them may have been dug in the fifth. But none of the weapons and other objects in the larger group need pre-date the seventh, so at least one century and probably intervened between the two, though the second's non-interference with the Roman group could suggest that those graves were still marked or remembered, and respected, unlike some earlier Iron Age burials that were disturbed (O'Brien 1999, 152).

The Meonstoke area is proving one of the most interesting areas for the study of questions of continuity, the material culture becoming more Anglo-Saxon, with a supporting-arm fifth-century brooch amongst reported finds, and sunken-featured buildings cut into the ruins of the great villa; one author would even see the villa being deliberately demolished so that the incomers could not use it (Dark 2000, 58). As at Portchester, the sequence will probably never be dated precisely enough to establish uninterrupted use of the site at least as some sort of farm, but a nearby cemetery with weapon-burials that began in the late fifth century and was still in use in the second half of the seventh, when a man was buried with a shield and that most important of weapons, a sword (Stoodley and Stedman 2001), suggests a centre of rather more importance, close to a ford. Ongoing reconsideration by Mark Stedman of the Portsmouth harbour south-coast zone will bring this into sharper focus.

At Micheldever, the excavated Anglo-Saxon sunken-featured buildings at Northbrook were close to a Roman villa but not dug into it; the villa itself has not been investigated, however, so there may be more continuity than mere contiguity demonstrates (Johnson 1998). The occupation on that site must also be adjacent to a cemetery, one of the objects found by metal-detecting being part of an equal-arm brooch, mid to late fifth century, and the first from Hampshire (Iles 1998, 96-8; Brans 2003). Subsequent excavations at Weston Colley have located graves with the fifth-century material mentioned above. Other work in the area suggests that the Dever valley may also have overlap between the Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon periods, influenced by a river crossing like Meonstoke (N. Stoodley, pers. comm.).

What were once seen as clear markers of cultural distinction are now in question. Organic- (formerly grass-) tempered pottery seems now to belong to a slightly later time-period, but cannot be regarded as exclusively Anglo-Saxon, having been found so far to the west as Gloucestershire (Price, E. 2000, 137-8, 143). Rather, it may typify fusion and adaptation. Its discovery during fieldwalking is variable; little in the Meonstoke valley, but rather more to the north around the settlement site (Entwistle *et al.* 2005). The long-term fieldwalking campaign in the east of the county, in the Avon valley, has also produced zones where Roman and post-Roman pottery are found together (Light *et al.* 1995), as Cunliffe's did around Chalton (1972). Such overlap could mean survival of elements of a 'bipartite' manorial system of domain and tenant land from Romano-British organisation (Sarris 2004), archaeologically unrecognisable, and now geared to providing for consumption by overlords and producers, not for sale or for the Roman *annona*. Also perhaps up for debate is the sunken-featured building, long seen as typically 'Anglo-Saxon', as one recent commentator has noted that the one at Bentley Green had no culturally Anglo-Saxon material in it, so could be British, as it is only 500 metres from a villa (Dark 2000, 65) – rather a loose connection, however. The distinction between such *Grubenhäuser* and Romano-British cellared buildings, like those being investigated in the Avon Valley at Godshill, is still quite sharp (Tipper 2004, 8).

The possibility that vestiges of Romano-British estate boundaries might also have survived becomes more plausible the more that overlap is favoured, although no coherent picture can be drawn. The great villa at Rockbourne, for instance, was in use to at least the end of the fourth century, as coins testify (RCHM 1983, 140-1, 144). The two burials in its ruins may be of any date, but are more likely to be earlier than the eighth century than anything else. An estate extending to the River Avon could be postulated, the control centre passing to Whitsbury Camp, where some scattered evidence of post-Roman use has been found (Ellison and Rahtz 1987), accounting for the cemetery at Breamore (below) and the fine church built there around A. D. 1000 on an estate that was royally owned at least at the time of the Domesday survey, as was Rockbourne (Munby ed. 1982, 1-36, 37; Whitsbury does not have an entry, and was in Wiltshire until 1895, which seems totally anomalous: Page ed. 1911, 594-5).

Whether paved Roman roads were maintained as the provincial administration fell apart cannot be known, but presumably they remained passable if anyone wanted to use them. Some eventually fell out of use (Aldsworth 1973, 37-9). The decline of Silchester would have meant that routes to it, such as the Portway south-west to Old Sarum, no longer served long-distance communications; locally, however, stretches may have remained in use, as around modern Andover (Stoodley 2006, 63). Andover as a market town in the Middle Ages had a Roman predecessor at East Anton. Alton replaced Neatham, and Havant overlies a Roman site (Hughes 1976, 71). These re-emergences may hint at continuing low-level market functions, using local roads and tracks, some named in charters as 'army-paths' and 'ways' (Aldsworth 1973, 70); again, the Andover cemeteries provide an example, being even closer to the Harroway than to the Portway (Stoodley 2006, 64).

Some 'inheritance' is therefore simply a matter of everyday continuity and adaptation, based on the need to keep some sort of agricultural economy running. 'Romano-British' customs may have elided more into 'Anglo-Saxon' than was once thought, but the occasional new instance of it is similar to place-name evidence, in which more

'Celtic' names may be hidden amongst 'English' ones than had been appreciated, but they remain a small minority (cf. Gelling 1978 with Coates and Breeze 2000).

Other 'inheritances' are prehistoric; the 'Devil's Ditch' earthwork across the Portway road east of Andover might have been brought back into use as a barrier, like Bokerley Dyke; if so, it would have been against an enemy in the west, but such short-term use would leave next to no evidence (Williams-Freeman 1915, 33, 239-4). Other linear earthworks are equally ambiguous (Hinton 1981, 61). West of North Tidworth, the county boundary follows another dyke attributed to the devil, which may also have crossed the Portway. Whether it was in use as a boundary when the shire was established, or was merely a convenient marker line, in abeyance as a frontier for many generations, is again unknown. A short stretch makes some use of a Grim's Dyke north of Rockbourne. The boundary follows a Roman road for a while east of Silchester, but otherwise seems to follow topographical features in the absence of antiquities to provide coherence, so there are differences between its different parts.

'Inheritance' encompasses reuse as well as continuity, appropriation of the visible past legitimising new ownership. Thus prehistoric barrows were dug into to insert new graves, as at Bevis's Grave at Bedhampton on the Portsdown Ridge, and, less certainly, both the cemeteries further west on the same prominent ridge in Cosham parish (Meaney 1964 94, 99; Corney *et al.* 1967, 20). One of those is only known from old records, but the other two are likely to be seventh-century impositions, late in the Anglo-Saxon burial tradition. Oliver's Battery, south-west of Winchester and certainly one of Hampshire's richest burials, is also seventh-century; although not actually a barrow, the earthworks there may have looked like one to the Anglo-Saxons viewing it from below (Meaney 1964 98-9). Others, like Preston Candover, may be the same (*ibid.* 99; O'Brien 1999, 149-55). More ambiguous is the probably late sixth-century creation of the Snell's Corner cemetery, where the barrow was visible, but the excavated graves were 150 feet and more south of it; it is not clear from the report if the ground in between was investigated. Although all of the graves were aligned so that the bodies point towards the barrow or its ditch, they were not radial as though focused upon it (Knocker 1956, fig. 2). The late sixth-century and later Bargates cemetery at Christchurch had burials in the ditches of two barrows and in their interiors, so it seems likely that at least that one of the two was still visible, not already ploughed flat (Jarvis 1983, 132-3). A low mound in the river valley at Breamore is thought to be Bronze Age, and had burials in it; the date-range of these is not yet published, but may be earlier than Bargates (below). Portway East is some 80 metres from a barrow group, perhaps too far to indicate that barrows were already a focus by the end of the fifth century, whereas seventh-century Portway West had graves both in and inside the ditch of one (Cook, A. M. and Dacre 1985, 2-3; Stoodley 2006, 64-5). Hampshire does not seem to have any instances of burials with grave-goods inserted amongst Roman villa and other ruins, like Wessex as a whole (Williams 1997, 21).

Also an 'inheritance' were Roman sites such as Winchester that were chosen by the Church for seventh-century bishoprics, as were Roman towns in other counties, probably because they had been, or were thought to have been, Romano-British diocesan centres. Different from those is the use of Roman villa or other stone building sites for churches; Hampshire has only two claimed examples of this phenomenon (Bell, T. 1998, fig. 3). One, however, seems likely to be Romsey Abbey,

where excavation has shown no evidence of anything but timber-built Roman structures a couple of hundred yards away (Scott 1996, 41-2); like Titchfield, Roman masonry may have been brought to it, but unlike Titchfield, to which stone was probably shipped from Portchester (Potter 2006, 149), no obvious source is known locally. The other is West Dean (Roxan and Morris 1980, 203), actually just in Wiltshire. The county has no observed examples of the incorporation into churches of Roman carvings, altars or inscriptions, such as have been found in other counties. In this way, Hampshire almost stands out for its absence of interest in such *spolia* and their meaning (Eaton 2000 cites no Hampshire cases). Hase argued for a negative correspondence between the older, minster churches and Iron Age or other earthwork enclosures (1994, 55), as the distances and statistics seem unconvincing (Blair 2006 condemns the idea by his silence). Similarly, that any Hampshire churches were built on barrows, to christianise the past, is unlikely – Farnborough and Aldershot have both been claimed, but are in areas with very few barrows. Corhampton is on a mound, but there is no evidence that it is artificial. The frequency with which sarsen stones were used for foundations is interesting (Gallop 1994), but that they were chosen to show Christianity trampling over pagan stone-worship is unlikely since they do not seem to occur in the earliest ‘minsters’ where such demonstrations would have been most appropriate. That Hampshire had a well-developed ‘minster’ system in the mid Saxon period has been cogently argued by Hase (1988).

### 3. Chronology

Some of the problems of archaeological dating have already been referred to. Radiocarbon is often very useful, but a dating range like that obtained at Silchester (above) shows that it is not precise enough for many purposes. Others may be correct, if rather special circumstances applied: the recent sequence obtained from five skeletons in the Bevis’s Grave cemetery, Portsdown, has a late sixth-century starting-point that is entirely acceptable, but should its late tenth-/early eleventh-century final point simply be discounted, or is it from a grave that was a very late addition into an otherwise disused cemetery (AHBR, from University of Sheffield)? The only other dating for the site is an eighth- or ninth-century strap-end (Hinton 1981, 62), so the cemetery was used well into the mid Saxon period. Late Saxon use can be explained if the site was used for an execution burial, as Reynolds has shown happened occasionally (below). But the strap-end’s very wide date bracket is an illustration of the equally intractable problem of much artefact dating, particularly of things rarely if ever found in graves, and even with those the question arises of their age when buried. Coins have different problems, discussed above, but become invaluable again with the introduction of the silver *sceattas* at the end of the seventh century, since they begin the return to a working currency, though never in the quantity of the Roman base-metal issues that fed a market economy.

Pottery like Portchester D, as Lyne has suggested (above), may be a late Roman type carried on into the fifth century, but the distinctive wheel-thrown mass-manufactured wares disappeared. Organic-tempered pottery is not only very good at failing to survive, but has a date-range that has become broader, from the sixth to the eleventh centuries. *Hamwic* provides a series of locally made wares for the mid Saxon period, all unglazed, scarcely decorated, and probably not very highly regarded by their users, who may have rated the glossy black and pale imports more highly. In the late Saxon period ‘Winchester-ware’ was at least glazed, but is infrequent – and may not have

been made in Winchester, though Hampshire's only known kiln-site at Michelmersh seems not to have made it, nor the less investigated Jack O'Lanterns site, Boarhunt, or somewhere adjacent, that may have been supplying Portchester (Whinney 1981). Some of the late Saxon pottery is wheel-made and quite well decorated, so a Hampshire sequence has been blended from Southampton, Netherton and Portchester; imports from the continent are very few (Brown 1995).

What, then, of the documents? Yorke has shown how the early part of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* has to be seen as a series of myths and stories given annalistic veracity in the ninth century. It is heavily biased in favour of the memory that the Wessex kings then wanted to be perpetuated, which was that of their own line of the claimed descendants of Cerdic who by hook and by crook had emerged as the dominant one (1993, 45-6). The land charters are often discredited either in whole or in part, being later copies if not outright forgeries. King Ine's law-code issued late in the seventh century shows more of his wish to impress his contemporaries than the details of social customs and control systems in Hampshire and his other territories. Church history, from Bede onwards, is much fuller in some aspects, but even the date of the foundation of the see of Winchester is a matter of dispute – one in which no one but the two protagonists has dared to join (James 1997, 40). The twenty lines of text that make up the various versions of the late ninth- or early tenth-century *Burghal Hidage* have occasioned a dozen articles and a book for each line.

In outline, the fifth century saw disruption continuing from the fourth, and in its second half new modes and places of burial, probably directly reflecting changes in the brooches and costume styles worn by women, and the need for higher-status males to be ready to defend their kin, symbolised by the weapons that accompanied some of them to their graves. The southern part of Hampshire became more closely tied to a south-coast system that stretched loosely from Kent to Wight than to one that looked north. The northern chalklands and the Silchester clays were more affected by developments in the Upper Thames Valley. The seventh century saw more tension; new cemetery sites and more demonstrative burials suggest greater emphasis on elites. Christianity began to have an effect, one which partly led to the new trading possibilities indicated by the establishment of the *wic* at Southampton. A coinage specific to Wessex shows both commerce and royal control in the eighth century; the population may have expanded. These issues are explored further below.

Viking raids had less direct effect on Hampshire than some other areas, but they disrupted the system that had been drawing England into closer ties with the Carolingian. Measures to strengthen the kingdom's defences are documented, including maintenance of defended places. Winchester's re-emergence as a town, and its use as the principal store-house of the royal treasure, made it pre-eminent in the county; Southampton took a long time to recover, the *wic* being largely abandoned during the ninth century. Stabilisation followed; coinage was systematised again, the Church flourished and manor-houses began to show a land-holding elite dependent upon the produce of their estates for their income and prosperity, not success in war. Many of them were to have a rude shock when Ethelred failed to protect them, first against Sweyn and then Cnut; Hampshire certainly felt the force of the Second Viking War. Recovering, it suffered again when the Normans first ravaged parts of it and then taxed all of it heavily. William I and his barons changed cathedrals, abbeys and churches, and imposed new and more military-based structures.

#### 4. Landscape and land use

Geologically, Hampshire is a mixture of clays, sands, gravels and chalk, of varied but rarely outstanding agricultural potential (Allen 1996). It has little else to offer. Surface deposits of sandy ironstone and ferruginous concretions were probably the sources for smelting, rather unrewardingly, at Romsey (Scott 2001, 154-5), probably at Christchurch (Jarvis 1983, 37) and Winchester (Winchester Museum Service, unpaginated) and possibly at Riverdene in the mid Saxon period. The demand for nails and washers for the ships that landed at Southampton may have added to agricultural and weaponry demands. Wood for the charcoal needed for the forges was plentiful, but its production leaves no trace. Pottery production similarly has not left direct evidence except at Michelmersh, where pits for kilns were dug (Addyman, Hopkins and Norton 1972); at other times and places, surface bonfires may have sufficed. Little good-quality building stone except Greensand in the north can be quarried in Hampshire, and such masonry buildings as are known used flint, ferruginous sandstones and chalk for walling, depending on Wiltshire and the Isle of Wight for dressed stones or carvings, even going as far afield as Bath and the Cotswolds (Hinton 1997, Potter 2006 – Hannington seems to have oolite from the last, p. 144), except when reusing Roman ruins, like Titchfield (above). Obtaining timber for buildings and ships was unproblematic, though the beginnings of protection of woods for game may have begun in the Saxon period. The creation of the New Forest by William I, whose love for deer was greater than that for his fellow-beings, is notoriously documented in Domesday Book, but the extent of settlement disruption, as opposed to loss of grazing rights, is hard to sort out (Golding 1989, 15-9). Salt was produced along the south coast, at least in the eleventh century (Keen 1988).

Agriculture was therefore by far the predominant use of the land, yet not a great deal is known for certain. The large quantities of animal bones in *Hamwic* are the best evidence for the quality and range of stock reared; size and robustness were much as in the Romano-British period, so no deterioration in quality is discernible and the animals were kept to a good age; adequate meadow and hay must have been available. A few pigs and fowl were reared in backyards and alleys, but there are not nearly enough bones of young cattle or sheep to indicate that a breeding stock was being kept (Bourdillon 1994). *Hamwic* also shows that surpluses of cattle and sheep were enough to feed what was presumably not primarily a community of agriculturalists – the number of people there was in the thousands, though without knowing more about density, estimates can vary from 2,000 to 10,000. These people's origins are unknown, but many if not most probably came from the same catchment area as the farm animals (Morton 1999, 57). Pottery with chalk inclusions must have been made at least 15 kilometres away from the *wic* (Timby 1988, 110), and is the best indicator of the extent of this local zone, which would have included the Isle of Wight even though Ulmschneider has shown that its mid-Saxon economy was not solely dependent upon Southampton (1999, 33 and 37-8).

Green's work on crops has shown that most of the wheat grown was the free-threshing bread/club type, that requires less manual labour to process than the Roman emmer (Green 1994, 85; Moffett 2006, 48-9). Barley was presumably both eaten in bread and pottage, and brewed for ale. Oats may have been both human and animal

food, and a little rye was grown, surprisingly, somewhere near Romsey in the tenth/eleventh century. Although the ratios of different crops and pulses vary at different sites, it is unlikely that any specialised very heavily in one rather than another (Green 1994, 84-6). Whether much Roman arable reverted to grassland, or to scrub or wood, is not known in Hampshire, though the first is likely enough. Pollen sequences from near the Cowdery's Down site outside Basingstoke show an increase in open conditions, however (Waton 1983, fig. 9, top: the printed publication contains three figures showing pollen-diagram results, but all the discussion is on microfiche, now almost impossible to read). The only other informative pollen diagram is from a peat-valley site outside Winchester at Winnall Moors; it shows no significant cereal decline, but has only a single radiocarbon date so is not very precise (Waton 1982). The south generally may have been little affected by such climate and weather changes as may have occurred; the 'cold' period in the fifth and sixth centuries may still have meant equable conditions. No direct evidence for the '536 event', a comet strike that blanketed out the sunshine, has been observed, but unlike Ireland there is no dendrochronological data (Baillie 2000, 30 and 74-8). Rising sea-levels were not detected at Langstone Harbour (Allen and Gardiner 2000, 217), so were presumably minimal if they occurred at all.

Early Anglo-Saxon farming units and field systems remain elusive. If there are distinctive oval enclosures recognisable in field lay-outs, implying early units, they have not been recognised; nor do place-names or maps suggest that there were many large greens (cf. Oosthuizen 2005), though this could repay further study. Infield/outfield may have been practised, leaving large areas for grazing. If there were communal arrangements, as references to 'folkland' might imply, they were soon subsumed into tenant/landlord relationships, and carried the duty of providing *feorm* and service to the king (Faith 1997, 39-40), arrangements that may in other cases have survived in adapted form from the Roman period (Sarris 2004, cited above). Later medieval documents show that settlements around the Forest of Bere had rights within it that may well have early antecedents; long-distance transhumance is not evidenced there (Pile 1989, 117), nor directly in the New Forest, though the links between some Forest-edge manors and the Isle of Wight could indicate some sort of system allowing stock to be carried across the Solent.

It is even possible that overexploitation was as much a reason for some ridge-top abandonments as a wish to exploit more productive valley bottoms; Chalton may have had insufficient animals to keep its infield in good heart, and it has even been suggested that its name could derive from *cealc*, in which case it may have been distinctive because erosion had worn away the soil and exposed the underlying chalk (Cole 1988-9). This is in line with the Winnall Moors pollen sample, which showed that even in the valley half the species were from chalkland (Waton 1982). On the other hand, the only valley-bottom occupation area investigated, Abbots Worthy, had evidence of mixed farming, not of a heavy dependence on arable.

Occasional references in tenth- and eleventh-century charters to 'acres' may imply that by then ploughing extended right up to the edges of some estates, but still do not prove large open fields divided into strips, such as may have been created in the Midlands during the period (Hall 1995; Ine's late seventh-century law-code talks of common meadow and obligations to fence it, but need not imply the open-field system: Whitelock ed. 1979, 401). Ploughed open strip-fields may have developed

alongside the manor at Faccombe Netherton in the late Saxon period (Fairbrother 1990, 37), but a direct relationship can only be inference. Hampshire's soils did not lend themselves to the creation of ridged strips with deep furrows between, because the fertile chalk is well drained, as are the gravels, and the clays are so heavy that arable on them may have been impractical, even with heavy ploughs. Vestiges claimed as surviving north of Southampton were subsequently shown to be very modern (Currie 1995, 121; Russel 1996, 21-2). Hampshire has not produced archaeological evidence of Anglo-Saxon mills, unlike some counties; Domesday Book reveals that there were a good many, just as it records fair numbers of ploughlands (Welldon Finn 1962, 304-10 and 345-8). Similarly, whether heavier ploughs came into use, making arable on the clays more viable, is not certain, though names ending in *-ley* may indicate clearings generally. Grain-drying, either for barley or for parching the grain before milling, is evidenced at late Saxon Chalton Manor Farm (Cunliffe 1973, 33), and perhaps in an oven found below the defensive bank at Christchurch, though there was little carbonised grain and a lot of iron slag in it (Jarvis 1983, 37). In other words, it is likely that Hampshire was like other counties in seeing a process of 'cerealisation' during the period, but it is difficult to prove.

Other resources of the land include wild game, deer in particular; bones at Netherton and Portchester show that venison was a bigger contributor to the food eaten at high-status sites than it was in *Hamwic*, but even there it was not more than a small percentage of the totals. Portchester had a wide range of birds amongst its bones, indicative of netting of seasonal visitors to the coast. Hawking is suggested at Netherton as well as Portchester by some of the species, but again the meat would have provided variety rather than a substantial part of the diet (Eastham 1976; Grant 1976; Sadler 1990). Sea-fish like plaice which live close to the shore were eaten in *Hamwic*, but deeper-living species were few (Bourdillon and Coy 1980); Bishop Wilfrid's relief of a famine in neighbouring Sussex by showing the people how to cast nets may have a ring of truth behind it. By the eleventh century, salted and dried herrings and stock-fish were probably already arriving in some quantity, forerunners of the later medieval trade. Artificial ponds for breeding and storing fresh fish were almost certainly a later development, though the mills must have had weirs which would have provided eel-traps. Remains of hurdling in Portsmouth Harbour could be from some trapping device for salmon and eels, for which river estuaries were widely used (Hampshire and Wight Maritime Trust for Archaeology, pers. comm.). King Ine's laws include both salmon and eels amongst the food-rent expected from a ten-hide estate at the end of the seventh century (Serjeantson and Woolgar 2006 and Serjeantson 2006 for recent overviews). Four hundred years later, Domesday Book supplies a little more evidence, but seems to underestimate the amount of sea-fishing that could be expected by then (Welldon Finn 1962, 341-2). Portsmouth Harbour sites like Emsworth and Rowner were presumably engaged in it, and in salt-making (Bradley 1973; Lewis and Martin 1973). Oysters, too, were collected, some perhaps already protected within timber 'parcs' (Allen and Gardiner 2000, 217); they were frequently consumed in *Hamwic* (Winder 1980).

##### 5. *Social organisation*

The transition of power from Imperial Rome to petty kings like Cerdic is not documented. Some of those who were magistrates and other office-holders may have been so entrenched in their power-structures that they were able to ensure that

taxation continued to come in to them, but that even less left it. Taxes transmuted into rents in kind, subsidy payments and tribute. The British ‘prince’ Nathan mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* has re-emerged recently as a real person rather than a myth derived from a place-name (Breeze 2000), and may have ruled an enclave in the south-west of the county. If the Rockbourne-Whitsbury sequence has any validity (above), it may show such power-transfers to new centres, but no other Hampshire hillfort has produced even that sparse evidence. There is nothing in the fifth- to seventh-century evidence at Portchester to suggest anything special, and even less in Winchester. Some isolated finds hint at more: metal-detecting at Breamore has produced a mid fifth-/mid sixth-century bridle mount, made of gilt copper-alloy with cells holding coloured red glass that was probably made in Italy or south-western France – or even further afield (Eagles and Ager 2004; Ager 2006, 20-1; other objects from Breamore have been reported to the PAS). This seems to have been an isolated find, as subsequent geophysical investigation and limited test-pitting did not reveal graves. It is a unique object in southern England, however, further evidence of a focus of interest at Breamore.

The ‘Anglo-Saxon’ objects in later fifth- and sixth-century graves include some quite good-quality gilt copper-alloy brooches and so on, suggesting that some women were better placed than others. Similarly, spears and shields with a minority of the males suggest superiority to the weaponless (Stoodley 2006, 75 for a table showing that between a quarter and a third of graves were unaccompanied), but Hampshire graves seem to contain almost no swords (Lucy 2000, fig. 5.7d; Itchen Abbas is said to have one in a fifth-century grave) until the later sixth and seventh centuries, when a few men were given them. None of the graves at Droxford excavated in the 1970s contained swords, but some were found in the railway work and are in the British Museum, undatable by context or fittings (Aldsworth 1978, 164); the only one from Meonstoke was in a seventh-century grave (Stoodley and Stedman 2001, 161 and 163). Whether cremations (discussed further below) can be used to deduce a strand of people differently regarded from the rest, or were preferred by a few families who chose different burial traditions but were no better or worse off than their contemporaries, is unclear. Status is indicated by the reported provision at Itchen Abbas of ring-ditch surrounds for some (Whinney 1991).

‘Social organisation’ must also consider that the people in early Anglo-Saxon Hampshire were not part of a unitary authority. The Silchester *civitas* area may not have been divided up until the eighth century, when Mercia was in conflict with Wessex over Berkshire (Gelling 1976, 88-9). Place-names like *Basingas stoc* indicate by the *-ing* element that there was a group who were the folk or family of someone named Bassa – they may have had rights in London, a memory of which is preserved in the name Basinghall Street (Hinton 1986). If so, their allegiances may have lain northwards. Nick Stoodley has pointed out (pers. comm.) that the Alton cemetery is in the Wey valley, so the natural outlook of the people in that area would have been northwards also. In the south were another group, the *Meonwara*, or ‘folk of the Meon’, according to Bede, who says that they were Jutish, and originally from Jutland in modern Denmark. Place-names suggest that their territory may have been the whole of the present county’s south coast (Yorke 1989, 84-6). The objects that people were buried with in that area are not notably different from those in the rest of Hampshire, but may have been worn differently, in a costume style more like that of Kent (Stoodley, forthcoming). Another group may be revealed in the place-name

'Exton', for 'farmstead of the East Saxons' – a village very close to Preshaw where the two gold pendants came from. If there were land-units such as names like the Wallops could suggest, people there might have seen themselves as distinctive, in that instant as British by origin since it could be a Celtic name (Coates 1989, 168-9), but they get more and more elusive to track down (see Yorke 1995, 40-3 for further discussion). So this sort of social organisation could have seen people defining themselves as family, kin or clan units, as ethnic folk, or as dwellers in a land area, and the archaeology need not reflect any of these.

A man in the Alton cemetery was in a larger than average grave, and had a full set of weapons including a sword; he also had a silver and gold buckle that may have originated in Kent but had been damaged and crudely repaired, so must have been buried well into the seventh century (Evison 1988, 18-20 and fig. 27). One of the county's other outstanding seventh-century graves seems to have been on its own, on the summit of Oliver's Battery outside Winchester, where the man had a bronze hanging-bowl, a spear and a long knife usually now called a *seax*, with a silver pommel (Youngs 1989, no. 33; Bruce-Mitford 2005, 132-6). The West Ham man seems to have had a shorter knife and no sword – but two spears, as though making up in quantity what was lacking in quality. That such men exercised a degree of power can be assumed, but not that isolated burials were necessarily more prestigious than one like Alton within a community; the sword-burial at Meonstoke was also in a cemetery, not on its own (Stoodley and Stedman 2000).

The seventh-century was also a time when a few women were given distinctive burial treatment. Their necklaces stand out, as inside Winchester at the Brooks, where a young woman had gold and garnet pendants, silver-wire rings and one of gold, gold *bullae* and glass beads (Hawkes 1990). Recent work at Weston Colley, Micheldever, has located another example of a woman with wire rings and beads, buried in a wooden chamber inside a ring-ditch (Stoodley 2006, 73 and pers. comm.). Which, if either, of the two Micheldever cemeteries was the source of glass claw-beaker fragments will probably never be known: Evison 1982, 58 and 68). The owner of the Preshaw gold bracteate and a garnet pendant was presumably also female (Hawkes and Kendrick 1937, 324 for discovery by a cart-wheel; Geake 1999, 154-5 cites B. Arrhenius for the opinion that the carved garnet was Sassanian). A metal-detectorist's recent find 'near Winchester' of a gold *solidus* minted in Byzantium between 491 and 518 is likely to have been a hundred years or more old when fitted with a gold strip so that it could be worn as a pendant (Harris 2003, col. pl. 25; Abdy and Williams 2006, 24). Other seventh-century necklaces have come from the stadium site at Southampton (below), but brooches are much rarer.

The seventh-century special graves are very obviously distinguished from their contemporaries, by range and quality of goods if not always by isolation. It would seem that as the century progressed, social differentiation was more explicitly expressed, and presumably mirrors the social reality of bigger political groupings giving a successful few a greater opportunity to draw in more and more resources to themselves. Most other people were buried in what are called 'Final Phase' cemeteries, in which most graves have no accompanying grave-goods, and those few that do have objects nearly always have fewer of them – a knife and small copper-alloy buckle, perhaps a pin or two; Winnall II is the best-known in Hampshire, but there are others (Stoodley 2006).

Precisely how wealth is to be assessed from grave-goods has been much discussed; gold was more available in the later sixth and first half of the seventh centuries, so those who stand out for its possession need not have been relatively richer than earlier people with gilt bronze (e.g. Geake 1999, 4). The association of a silver-pommeled seax and a hanging-bowl at Oliver's Battery certainly suggests distinction, as does the grave at West Ham, Basingstoke, also with a hanging-bowl and with gaming-pieces that could put the burial into the same category of Mound 1 at Sutton Hoo – except that other miscellanea are not in the same league (Youngs 1983 for the gaming-pieces). How then to rate the escutcheons that had been removed from their bowls, a pierced one with a Bevis's Grave burial and a loose one in the Chalton settlement? Those are comparable to escutcheons on bowls in other exceptional graves – Loveden Hill and Benty Grange, for instance (Bruce-Mitford 2005, 127-36). But how would their owners have compared to whoever mislaid or buried the hoard of nearly a hundred gold coins, probably in a bag with gold and garnet clasps, in the north of the county at Crondall (Hinton 2005a, 51 and 67)? Other above-average objects include a belt-suite of iron inlaid with silver, which is very unusual in England and is a very good example of the illustrious Style II ornament, yet was found in a pit at Monk Sherborne, definitely not in a grave (Marzinzik 2005). A silver disc-brooch set with garnets and probably made in Kent in the late sixth or early seventh century was found in Ampfield without any trace of a burial (Denford 1986; a forebear of the same design, made in gilt-copper alloy, has been reported from Over Wallop: Geake 2006, 282-3).

Although none of the Bargates cemetery graves contained jewellery, a high proportion contained weapons, and although none had a sword or a *seax*, one was within a penannular ditch, an enclosure which seems to have marked out a few people as particularly worthy of note. Other Hampshire cemeteries with examples are Cook Street in *Hamwic*, and Portway West; the people buried inside them were being distinguished from the bulk of society without displaying their rank through the objects that accompanied them in their graves (Stoodley 2006, 77). The *Hamwic* ones were of people who were presumably buried at Cook Street in the early eighth century, and therefore officially at least Christian. Different social ranks may be the reason for such differentiations, but a harbour-mouth location might be an explanation for so many weapons at Bargates. Consequently, to make the leap to equating particular graves with the social grades of *ealdormen*, *gesiths*, *geneats*, *ceorls*, *esnes* and *geburs* of King Ine's laws is to succumb to undue temptation. A place would have to be found also for the Welsh who were valued at only half the going rate of a *ceorl*, yet could be substantial land-holders and do riding service for the king. The young lady with her necklace in Winchester was clearly rich, yet the other graves around her did not have objects in them. Were they poor, or had they become communicants who were learning that grave goods were no use to them in the Christian afterlife? Such a person might be a *geneat* with sixty hides of land to back his oath, according to the law-code (Whitelock ed. 1979, 398-407).

The houses that people lived in are another status demonstrator to be considered. In Hampshire, there are several excavated settlements, further discussed below, in which there are sunken-featured buildings that do not lend themselves to interpretation in terms of social hierarchy. The site at Cowdery's Down is different, however; there, a phased sequence was established, though not one that can be precisely dated (Millett

1983, 193-7). Even in its first phase, a large structure was attached to a fenced enclosure with another building inside it, and another enclosure and building sharing a party fence; the next phase had another building astride this fence, showing single ownership, and another and larger structure in the second enclosure. This was remodelled into a single compound, with new buildings, in the third phase. By then, however, the settlement as a whole was expanding, with even larger buildings. The interpretation of the site as one always of high status but also showing increasing ostentation in its buildings still seems valid. The other seventh-century site in the county is Chalton, where there is a two-phase sequence of enclosures and buildings, but in that case with lesser buildings grouped round a square, as though signalling a 'chief' with dependents and labour force (Millett 1983, 247-9). Although the buildings are smaller than the largest at Cowdery's Down, it is Chalton that yielded a hanging-bowl escutcheon (Bruce-Mitford 2005, 131-2).

Also of the period and developing into the eighth century are substantial structures at Portchester. The fort was owned by the bishop of Winchester in the early tenth century, which does not prove earlier possession, but could be an indicator that someone of more than average importance had an interest in, and may occasionally have visited, it. Only part of the interior has been available for excavation, so may not be representative of what happened throughout the fort, but the clearance in the ninth century is certainly consistent with remodelling, either when it was a defended place against the vikings – it is recorded in the *Burghal Hidage* – or when the king acquired it from the bishop in 904. Ninth-century artefacts, notably coins including a gold one from Carolingia, metalwork and glass, seem to suggest higher status than most settlements, though the recognition since the 1970s of mid Saxon 'prolific sites', apparently trading-places rather than residences, raises the likelihood that the old fort was a landing-place and perhaps a mart (Cunliffe 1976 for the excavations; Ulmschneider 2000, 50-2 for sceattas and 'prolific sites'). Most of Portchester had been rented out by the time of Domesday, and the fort may have been the *aula* of one of the three free men who was dispossessed for the benefit of a Norman, William Mauduit. By then, it contained buildings such as an aisled timber hall and a stone-footed tower, and is always quoted in association with the Old English text that cites the expectation that a thegn's residence would contain a *burh*-gate and a bell.

The food resources commanded by Portchester's owner were beyond the norm (above) as they were at the other Hampshire site that has produced evidence of an aisled hall, Facombe Nether-ton. The crucibles and hearths for metalworking there suggest that some of the good-quality cast copper-alloy items were made on the site, probably by a peripatetic smith serving a wealthy patron. At one time, the estate was owned by a lady whose will shows how well-to-do and well-connected she was (Fairbrother 1990; 87-93 for the hall). A third excavated example of a high-status Hampshire site, not so fully explored as the other two, is Waltham (Lewis 1985). In fact, much more is known of these sites than of others in rural Hampshire in the late Saxon period; the few post-holes and pits at Swaythling are all that we have of what may have been a working farmstead (Crockett 1996). Each site is different, but overall the impression gathered is of a countryside dominated by manor-houses and estate centres.

Urban Winchester certainly had rich late Saxon visitors, led by the king. Some of the cast copper-alloy strap-ends and so on from the town are of the highest quality. If the

textiles now in Durham Cathedral were made in one of the Winchester churches, they show embroidery of the same standard, using gold thread and silk. Such resources are a tribute to the wealth of the country as whole rather than of the county, however. Other high-status things have been excavated in the New Minster cemetery – two silver hooked tags, late ninth-century, a gold and a silver gilt strap- or belt-fitting, both tenth-century. The grave-markers show amongst other things that stone was carved in the same style as was painted in manuscripts. Another distinguished grave-marker is the double-sided stone at Whitchurch commemorating Frioburga (or Frithburga), clearly a lady of ninth-century consequence, and other sculptures from that century and later, some at quite minor churches like Steventon, show the patronage that lay owners could bestow on the churches that they or their families had presumably founded (Tweddle *et al.* 1995, 250-73; the Whitchurch stone is Upper Greensand, and may be the first example of its use in medieval Hampshire; it was quarried around Kingsclere: B . Worssam in *ibid.*, 271).

Organisation of a slightly different sort is shown in the landscape, not so much by agricultural systems (above) as by the overt display of royal government shown by execution sites and burials, such as the one on Stockbridge Down that included the grave of someone who had managed to hide a small stash of pennies from his executioners in around 1065. Another had been put in the grave without his head, as had a dog. Polite 1930s interpretation saw this as man and hound punished for illicit hunting; the cruder 1990s saw it as punishment for bestiality (Hill, R. 1937, 254; Reynolds 1999, 105 and 105-10 generally; also Aldsworth 1978, 175-9). Littleton and Bevisi's Grave also seem from radiocarbon dates to have execution burials (AHBR and above). Another way that late Saxon government can be explored through the landscape is the meeting-places of the hundreds, which is difficult in Hampshire as barrows were less often used than in some other counties, and reorganisation was more frequent, at least if the Domesday record of their names and the likely nature of their meeting-places is reliable. Some hillforts may have come back into play at this period, as has been argued for Grateley, which gave its name to a tenth-century law-code that was agreed there (Lavelle 2005).

## 6. Settlement

Once the Roman towns and markets had been abandoned as urbanised dwelling-places, rural settlements were the norm until the establishment of *Hamwic* around A. D. 700. That some settlements were established at or very close to Roman villas has been noted above, as has fieldwalking evidence in the Avon valley and around Chalton for contiguity of some lesser farming sites. Excavation of such Romano-British places has not so far shown any use that can be taken far if at all into the fifth century. The higher chalklands are a slight contrast in this to Wiltshire, where use of at least one downland site into the sixth century has been shown recently (McOmish *et al.* 2002, 157). In Hampshire, the current excavation at Tidgrove, north of Overton, is probably the highest Romano-British site to be excavated, but it has no post-fourth century evidence (Strutt 2006, 3-4). Considerable retraction as well as shift of settlement can be deduced. (See also Section 4, above.)

Precise dating is problematic partly because pottery is not very datable and partly because even sunken-featured buildings do not always have very much if anything in them, as at Bentley Green (above). That those structures were already in use in the

fifth century is shown by Portchester (Cunliffe 1976, 14, 16); Riverdene takes them into the eighth, if the radiocarbon dates are preferred to the objects' (Hall-Torrance and Weaver 2003, 99). Their use remains unknown. The most recent study makes cogent arguments in favour of their having been floored over, as so few have traces of wear on their bases and none has steps down from wherever the contemporary ground surface was (Tipper 2004, 181-4). The idea that they were for cool storage, particularly for grain, has advocates who point to the absence of Iron-Age style pits and of north German four-post structures, thought to be raised granaries. Against this is the decree of an environmental archaeologist that they would have produced warm, moist conditions in which grain would germinate and spoil (M. Robinson in Hey 2004, 67; Iron Age pits are much more compact. They create an outer layer that is indeed wasted but which forms an air-tight crust.). The notion that they were used for weaving springs partly from a belief that slightly damp conditions keep the threads in better condition, and partly because large numbers of loomweights have been found in them. The first has been discredited, and the second is vitiated by the realisation that the weights are rarely where they would be expected if they had merely collapsed, and had probably been deliberately deposited (Tipper 2004, 164-9; Hamerow 2006, 18-9). If the weights were allowed to dangle between the floor-boards, of course, a longer cloth could be woven, but that seems an inadequate explanation for the very large number of the *Grubenhäuser* known.

Early Anglo-Saxon settlements tend not to have many rubbish-pits, so presumably most waste went straight out on to fields and gardens. Even if the loomweights in the sunken-featured buildings were deliberately placed in them, they are at least evidence that weaving was taking place, just as a few spindle-whorls show the earlier process in textile production, which was ubiquitous; the most recently published site, Riverdene, had two of the neatly made bone pin-beaters thought to have been used for thread-pulling. It also had iron slag that might be more than just smithing debris. Otherwise, settlement-site activities focused directly round farming, slaughtering stock and processing grain, with some searching out of scrap from Roman sites to collect coins, glass sherds and other small items, perhaps to recycle, perhaps as amulets, the sorts of things that sometimes ended up in 'bag collections' in women's graves, as at Winnall II and Weston Colley, Micheldever (Hinton 1996a, 103; Stoodley 2006, 80); certainly the concept that the fills of the buildings contained some 'special deposits' would help to account for what seem rather high numbers of such things. This concept could also reconcile the seventh- and eighth-century radiocarbon dates of the seventh and eighth centuries with the rather earlier dates attributed to much of the pottery at Riverdene, if the fills included 'curated' items. A little definitely mid Saxon material would be welcome as substantiation, however, since it is a little difficult to see where people stored their 'curated' bits and bobs, particularly in view of the tendency to impermanence of such sites.

Hampshire has only one site that has contributed significantly to this particular debate; Old Down Farm outside Andover is one of the few excavated where sunken-featured buildings have been located, but not ground-level buildings with post-holes, despite a large area having been investigated. It is worth repeating that the same site had evidence of Iron Age stake-hole structures, so substantial post-holes like those at Chalton or Cowdery's Down would not simply have been missed (*contra* Tipper 2000, 24; see Davies 1979 for the original report, and Wright 2004 for another, nearby but smaller). It seems ironic now to remember that when Chalton was found

nearly forty years ago, it was the first Anglo-Saxon site other than Yeavinger where such post-holes had been recognised. It also had structures where continuous trenches had been dug, posts placed in them, and the slots backfilled around them. This mixture of techniques was also used at Cowdery's Down, but whether it has any chronological significance is still not clear. The amount of timber required and the sizes of the post-holes imply substantial investment of time, effort and resources.

The ground-level buildings are usually called 'halls', and indeed many do have evidence of the opposed entrances in the middle of the long walls that seem to give credence to the Northumbrian priest's metaphor of the sparrow that flies into the king's presence at one door and out at the other, as recounted by Bede. More prosaically, some might have been barns with threshing-floors, the doors allowing the wind to blow out the chaff, but those attached to fenced enclosures seem to suggest something more formal, and the possibility that their 'annexes' were small shrines, not necessarily roofed over, is an intriguing extra dimension (Blair 1995, 19; also below).

That so many sites are available for excavation has disproved the old theory that every modern village was established in the early Anglo-Saxon period. Whether any began then is now a question for Hampshire; Berkshire's Wraysbury and others have shown, not total replacement, but mobility within a restricted area. Many reasons for abandonment have been proposed. High-status places like Cowdery's Down might have been dismantled at the death of their owner, a form of ostentatious commitment to memory as profligate as an elaborate personal burial. Chalton could have been because of erosion (above), but the river-valley location of Abbots Worthy shows that no single process of removal from one type of location to another is plausible. The fenced enclosures at Chalton and Cowdery's Down herald a new sense of property rights, giving physical expression to private ownership; as this extended to ordinary domestic dwellings, individuals' legal possessions became more fixed and another reason for stability of location (Reynolds 2003 for overview).

At present, evidence is insufficient to show what late Anglo-Saxon settlements looked like; Swaythling is simply too small and scattered to be taken as representative, an enclosure at Easton Lane had no structures inside it, only pits, though a quern fragment suggests something more than a stock enclosure (Fasham *et al.* 1989, 75-6), and a small complex at King's Somborne is only a couple of pits (Pine and Preston 2004, 142). At the end of the eleventh century, rectangular structures at Hatch Warren look as though the slots and post-holes held substantial timbers (Fasham and Keevil 1995, 83-90), but these may have been buildings of more than basic farmhouse level, as they were adjacent to the church there, and could have belonged to a manorial complex, since churches and manor-houses so often went together. The indeterminate features at Milton could have begun to appear at the same time, though show nothing much beyond the existence of small enclosures in their first phase (Hurst and Hurst 1967, 51-4; the 'sunken-featured building' in Period 2 sounds like no more than a shallow scooped-out hollow).

Nucleation of settlement around manor-houses is certainly one likely process, with churches adding a further stabilising element; the division of 'minster' parishes into smaller units is particularly well-documented for the south-west because of Twynham's arrangements (Blair 2006, 514-9), and land charters show the same sub-

divisions of larger units. This is as true of the north of the county, where there are several contiguous estates confirmed in the tenth and eleventh centuries (Aldsworth 1973, fig. 14) as for the south (Currie 1995). Reconstruction of earlier blocs of territory, 'ancient hundreds' in some terminology, have not been entirely convincing to other commentators (Hinton 1981, 56-9; Klingelhøfer 1991; Brooks 2003, 166-73), but that the attempt can be made is at least demonstration of the reorganisation that must have taken place. While many late Saxon charters set out boundaries that lasted into the present era as estate or parish delineations, challenges to Currie's work on the Southampton area has shown that there can be disagreement where no such continuity existed (cf. Currie 1995; Morton 1996; Russel 1996).

In river and stream valleys, it was probably in the mid and late Saxon periods that the beginnings of the ribbon-patterns of houses along a street first formed, but how the land around them was exploited needs further exploration. The extent of open fields in the county requires much more work; at present the best evidence is the post-medieval enclosure record, as it is of commons and meadows (Chapman and Seeliger 2001, 67-9). The higher chalkland and the clays and gravels are more likely to have been areas of dispersed settlement, but how representative the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century maps are of later Saxon and subsequent medieval settlement patterns is debatable (Hinton 2005b).

Urban settlement is better understood. *Hamwic* has elements that suggest a firm controlling hand, regulating streets and perhaps creating an enclosure, though that the stretches of ditch found south of St Mary's Church are much less deep than the length investigated on the west side at Six Dials makes some doubt that it was a unitary feature, let alone a defensive one (Morton 1992, 31). Within the new town were houses set in fairly generous plots, some defined by gullies; they had back-yards and gardens for rubbish-pits and a few hens and pigs. Small burial-sites were surprisingly frequent; one at least seems to have had a timber church/chapel associated with it. St Mary's was a 'minster' by the tenth century and may already have had quite a large enclave round it, if the Cook Street area where the penannular ditches were found (above) was within it (Morton 1999, 56).

The diminution of *Hamwic* during the ninth century probably left a small core functioning around St Mary's, but the tenth and eleventh centuries saw the development of the present-day 'Below Bar' area, at first a small ditched enclosure, probably with a market-place blessed by St Michael's Church. This may have been to the south of an existing aristocratic enclave, first claimed long ago on the basis of a coin of King Offa, and enhanced by excavation of another mid Saxon coin (Kavanagh 1998; there was late Saxon occupation in this area as well, so the dating and function of a large ditch remain to be seen). Blacksmithing was also practised, and a 'post-in-trench hall' was listed as a pre-castle phase, but frustratingly without further information (Oxley ed. 1988, 47). This enclave, rather than the Roman fort at Bitterne, could have been the *burh* recorded as being only a small place in the *Burghal Hidage*, though against this is that the inner wall-line of the fort fits very closely with the document's extrapolated measurement (Brooks 2003, 160-1 refutes the relevance of the Bitterne fort's wall length that led Hill, D. 1967 to advocate it as the Saxon *burh*). The Norman castle may have been built over an aristocratic nucleus used from the mid Saxon period onwards, rather than inserted into an already-expanding town. Indeed, it may have been a reason for it, if the Domesday Book

reference to French people in Southampton actually means that they were very recent immigrants and that they were settled, not merely passing through (Golding ed. 1989, 7-8), and if the castle is a little earlier than the excavators suggested (note the two William I 1080s coins, Oxley ed. 1986, 67; Oxley 1988 for the iron).

Winchester's physical appearance in the mid Saxon period was presumably that of a place dominated by a new stone building, the Old Minster, with other structures around it. Whether the king as well as the bishop had a house within the walls before the end of the ninth century is a moot point, as is the condition of the streets, gates and Roman ruins. A number of small enclosures owned by members of the Wessex aristocracy is a possibility (James 1997, 40-1); the lady with the necklace may have lived and been buried in one of them, where a small stone building was erected after burials ceased. Alternatively, the whole of the lower part of the city formed the minster enclave. Although slightly more signs of activity have been found for this period recently, the contrast of the length of the list of recorded coins with that of *Hamwic* at least points up the likely differences in types and levels of activity in the two places.

As Southampton sank, Winchester rose, though the degree of overlap between the two remains open to debate; there are signs of reorganisation, and perhaps a street grid, but whether it was all planned in the late ninth century must remain uncertain until more is published, particularly a definitive record of the Staple Gardens cemetery and its relationship to one of the streets. The *Burghal Hidage* has Winchester as one of the largest places to defend, but that does not reflect urban population or conditions. Nor, directly, does the importance of its mint. The artefact list for that period is brief, but a coin of Alfred the Great has now joined one of Edward the Elder and an Arabic dirham as evidence at least of relics of late ninth- and early tenth-century commerce being brought into the city (James 1997, 42). The Norman castle, which unlike Southampton's is mentioned in eleventh-century records, is a measure of Winchester's importance. Other documents record the structure of property ownership (Biddle ed. 1976).

Hampshire's third *burh*, Twynham (now Christchurch) was like Southampton a small one. It used to be assumed that it was chosen solely because of the minster, but the Bargates excavation shows that the river-mouth was attracting attention before the foundation of the church. Excavation within the town has traced the defences, but have also shown that it was slow to develop; the market may have come at the time of the defences, and the gate leading out from it could have been late Anglo-Saxon, but pottery, coins and other data do not demonstrate significant urban life. Domesday Book records markets at three other places, and the clusters of sites around Andover and Basingstoke suggest that those were places where local and regional trading was likely to have happened well before the end of the eleventh century. Also now to be considered are the possible mid Saxon 'prolific sites' (above).

### 7. *The Built Environment*

Problems of interpretation of early Anglo-Saxon sunken-featured buildings and ground-level halls have been discussed above. The former may have had earth-material outer walls, and have been quite solid, depending on posts only to support the ridge of the roof (Dixon 1993 – but see critique by Barford 1995, 104-6; Tipper

2004). The post-hole numbers and sizes at Chalton and Cowdery's Down show thick, close-set timber uprights, which may have supported planked walls, possibly painted; exactly how the posts held up what must have been heavy roofs is a complex matter, dependent on whether the curved timbers known as crucks were a thirteenth-century innovation, or an ancient tradition (Millett 1983 for the latter, Alcock and Walsh 1993 for the former). The aisled halls at Portchester and Netherton do not suggest, however, that there was a well-established mode of spanning room spaces with curved timbers, as the point of those in the thirteenth century seems to have been to make aisle-posts unnecessary. Consequently it is possible to take the view that throughout the whole timespan of the Middle Ages new technology, adaptation and social change was constant, and that 'conservatism' cannot be assumed in anything.

The stone building in the Brooks at Winchester is probably the first new masonry structure other than churches in the post-Roman period; indeed, were it not for the evidence that a goldsmith made use of it in the eighth century, there would be no reason to assume that it was not originally built to serve as what it became, a church. The remarkable deposit of window-glass attributed to the late ninth century found in one of the Brooks excavations shows that glazing was expected (Scobie *et al.* 1991, 37) Hampshire has a few churches with substantial Anglo-Saxon parts surviving, such as Corhampton and Boarhunt, as well as those already mentioned (Taylor and Taylor 1965; Potter 2006). The other pre-Conquest stone building known is the one at Portchester – at least, it had stone footings, but might have supported a timber superstructure, quite possibly a tower (Cunliffe 1976, 49-52).

Otherwise, timber buildings remained the norm. What still needs to be considered is whether the towns will show evidence that the late Saxon houses were much like those in *Hamwic*, or were already showing the distinctiveness of the twelfth century, when richer merchants were building in stone, with ground-floor warehouses. Neither Winchester nor Southampton has produced excavation evidence like that from York, Lincoln and London of late tenth-century timber-lined cellars for storage, although *cellarii* are mentioned in documents (Biddle ed. 1976, 337-40).

#### 8. *Ceremony, ritual and religion*

The archaeology of the Anglo-Saxons was until recently the archaeology of their early cemeteries and their later churches, and excavation and re-evaluation of the former remains of fundamental importance to a wide range of questions. Those concern social order and belief, as well as one older one of chronology, and the widening of another from identification of named migrant communities to concepts of identity, be it to kin, tribe, folk, people, province or kingdom, or to belief in overseas origins, as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* stresses for the royal dynasty, with its landing-places of Cerdic, Cynric, Port, Stuf and Wihtgar – though the first if he existed probably came from the Upper Thames Valley and the last is eponymous (Yorke 1995, 33, 36, 49-50). One realisation that is fairly new is that cremation was a standard rite in Hampshire, never as frequently practised as inhumation, but a choice not confined only to certain areas. Most of these issues have already been touched on above, and the major cemeteries referred to; this section will therefore only consider new work since the last survey (Russel 2002).

Despite the time and expense of full analysis and radiocarbon dating of human skeletons and conservation of artefacts, a few targeted excavations have taken place recently at Meonstoke and Micheldever (Stedman and Stoodley 2001; Stoodley 2006, 73). Other work has continued to take place because of building development, such as at Littleton (AHBR). In one case, a cemetery has been partly investigated because of the interest created by a metal-detectorist's discovery at Breamore of a sixth-century eastern Mediterranean bucket, an exotic otherwise known locally at Chessel Down on the Isle of Wight (Harris 2003, 167-9). Various geophysical surveys and a trial excavation were undertaken, but it required the resources of Time Team for a slightly fuller investigation (for posterity's benefit, that was a popular television programme of the 1990s that continued into the 2000s); the graves excavated contained remarkable assemblages, including no less than six wooden buckets, one of which when emptied in the English Heritage laboratory was found to have a glass vessel within it. This cemetery remains to be published; meanwhile, among its notable characteristics are a profusion of spears and shield-bosses; so far, no sword has been reported, which throws in doubt the degree of status attributed to those people excavated. Absence of cremations may be a consequence of limited investigation or could reflect a difference from the rest of Hampshire. The riverside location by the River Avon is surprising – it is not on a ridge or hillside like most of its contemporaries, an exception being the Christchurch Bargates, at the mouth of the river. The graves there contained more spears and shields than usual, but nothing like the vessels at Breamore; it had a few cremations. These two cemeteries seem different from each other but also different from those elsewhere in Hampshire.

Breamore is very close to Charford, a name that at least by the tenth century was associated with Cerdic, who despite being a West Saxon founding father had a recognisably British name (Parsons 1997). This remarkable correlation of a name and a cemetery becomes even more intriguing with the reinstatement to credibility of Cerdic's British-named opponent, Natan 'the prince' (Breeze 2000); retellings of stories led to the preservation of these names in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and that a 'prince' or two lay in Breamore's burial-ground is entirely plausible. The Byzantine bucket has an inscription that might have been intended to flatter such a person, even though he could not read it, and have been a diplomatic gift (Harris 2003, 179-80), though a direct link from the Byzantine court to Hampshire may be unlikely.

Two of the Breamore burials were doubles, one with a child. These are unusual but not unique. More surprising was a multiple of four males in a single and seemingly isolated pit at South Tidworth; four spears and three shield-bosses, and one of the skeletons having blade injuries, is justification for seeing them as victims of a battle or raiding-party skirmish (Härke and Entwistle 2002). That the burials were contemporaneous is beyond doubt, so it is sobering to note that the dates of the objects could extend from the late fifth to the early seventh century, though there is just enough overlap to make a deposition in the 520s-50s acceptable. After these excitements, the posthumous publication of Sonia Hawkes's excavation of the cemetery at Worthy Park seems mundane, though it is good to know that there were cremations in it as well as about 100 inhumations. These were more or less evenly balanced between male and female; those who lived beyond 18 years could reasonably hope to live to 36-40; but there was at least a one in three chance of not getting out of the teens – unlike a lot of cemeteries, there were a number of infant and young child burials, but even so they may be underrepresented. The artefacts are

published without any commentaries, but the quoit-brooch style objects have been mentioned above. There were a few spears, but no sword, though one was reportedly found there in the 1940s (Hawkes with Grainger 2003). Apart from the quoit-brooch style objects, 'overlap' with British ways does not seem signalled. The scatter of objects reported now as being found in the Itchen valley south of Winchester at St Cross and Shawford, such as a supporting-arm brooch, hints at 'Anglo-Saxon' culture arriving well back in the fifth century even in an area previously thought to lack any such evidence (Stedman 2003; id. 2004). It may not be the objects themselves, however, that define identity so much as the way that they were worn; Stoodley considers that there is enough variation between the women's graves in north and south Hampshire to show that the latter had stronger links to east Kent, giving credibility to the 'Jutish' affiliations of the area known to Bede (Stoodley in prep.).

Whether there were set places for religious practices to take place was discussed by Blair (1995), but Hampshire did not contribute to his review except for the possibility of shrines attached to 'halls', with a totem-post inside, as at Cowdery's Down. Portway East had features indicating a structure, however, possibly a shrine (Stoodley 2006, 1-2). Cowdery's Down also had a pit with a complete cow in it, not merely a diseased creature disposed of uneaten, as some butchery had taken place on it before burial; the pit was not filled like an ordinary rubbish-pit, but had distinct and seemingly deliberately placed layers in it, with part of a pig's jaw near the base. The pit was right beside an entrance into one of the buildings (Millett 1983, 221; Maltby 258-9; Hamerow 2006, 11-12). This recent development in Anglo-Saxon studies results from realisation that the people did not make such a hard-and-fast distinction between their ritual beliefs, as exemplified in their burials, and their daily living, as modern English Anglicans tend to do: there is more evidence of burials not being so far away from settlements as was once thought, as though to isolate the dead and any malign spirits that might emanate from them.

Precisely what religion or religions might have been practised in places that might have been shrines is unsurprisingly unrecorded by Christian writers who preferred to draw veils over their forebears' beliefs and behaviour. The 'quoit-brooch' style animals are still clearly descended from a Classical repertoire, and do not suggest that they were regarded as something more than decoration, but the curious, 'exploded' Style I creatures on saucer-brooches and the like in the sixth century certainly lend themselves to interpretations that see them as animistic spirits living alongside the human living. *Beowulf* has the tale of the dragon guarding its treasure in the barrow which has lent itself to seeing Style II snake-like creatures as *wyrms*, a warning against theft and symbols of protection of whatever they adorned. Such beliefs may have been concurrent with the burgeoning stories of Woden, founder of the West Saxon dynasty amongst many others, Thor and Tîw. A small plaque showing the bearded face of a man wearing a horned head-dress, on which animal-headed terminals can just be discerned, was found recently at Soberton; it may represent a Woden worshipper (Geake 2003, 205-6).

Formal Christianity arrived in the middle of the seventh century; its most potent image, the Cross, begins to appear on jewellery soon afterwards, as on one of the pendants at the Stadium site in Southampton (Hinton 2005a, col.pl. C2). Just how quickly the new religion impacted on behaviour can be debated. Cemeteries make a slow transition from those with both inhumations and cremations, very often with

grave goods, to late sixth-/seventh-/eighth-century inhumation-only 'Final Phase' cemeteries, the term used to avoid the implication that they can be claimed as direct evidence of Conversion, since they seem to start well before Christianity is likely to have had direct impact on a region like Hampshire. Winnall II provided a classic example, being only 400 metres away from an earlier, though little explored, cemetery (Meaney and Hawkes 1970). Outside Andover, the graves investigated at Portway West are clearly only part of a large group, very different in arrangement and contents from Portway East, though whether the one was closed when the other opened, or there was an interim before Portway West came into use, cannot be demonstrated from the limited evidence, as is true of the two Winnalls. At least one of the Portway West burials was within a penannular ditch, a fairly widespread practice seen at the Christchurch Bargates cemetery (Stoodley 2006). They were presumably for the communities' higher-status people. The practice did not die out when Christianity appeared, as it took place in *Hamwic*, at the Cook Street site, so must have continued into the eighth century. Another 'Final Phase' cemetery has been excavated but not published at Bevis's Grave, Portsdown, with one of the graves most unusually containing a strap-end (above).

Another important cemetery to be excavated in the last decade was found on the edge of the settlement area of *Hamwic*, at the new football stadium; an unusual method of preservation of part of it was caused by the laying of the raised playing pitch which required no groundworks under it, which has the consequence that the excavation could not be total. Admirably prompt publication (Birbeck 2005) has shown that cremation must have continued long into the seventh century, if not even into the eighth, with mostly undecorated and underfired urns containing people of all ages from infants upwards, with enough traces of objects such as an ivory bag-ring to show that they were not noticeably poorer than those who were inhumed amongst them. The inhumations included two males in a single grave-pit - aligned north-south, unlike the majority, and apparently isolated slightly from the others. There were a few children, several males with a range of weapons, and females with some very fine jewellery - and possibly some with weapons, which would be highly unusual (Stoodley 2005, 74, 79). One grave had coins very unlikely to be earlier than the 680s, or as late as 700, and most of the datable objects fall within the second half of the seventh century, though a Roman brooch gives a reminder that much older things can get onto sites as curios, amulets or merely recyclables. Also Roman is a silver ring set with an intaglio gem; this was definitely valued, as it was part of a woman's necklace that also had a gold and garnet pendant disc, with filigree Style II animals. Another woman had a small gold crescent-shaped pendant, not especially remarkable to look at, but directly paralleled only at a royal site in Frisia. Frisian/Frankish associations were also indicated by scabbard fittings otherwise seen *in situ* in England at Ipswich, another *wic* (Hinton 2005a, 71-5). Another unique find, a skein of gold thread for embroidery, was found in a pit, though could have been from a disturbed grave (Walton Rogers 2005).

The significance of the new *Hamwic* cemetery is what it tells about the origins of the *wic* site that was one the most important trading centres in England in the eighth and ninth centuries. Although some individual objects from the site have always been dated to the seventh century, it was assumed that they had been brought to it when no longer new, as there were no late seventh-century coins amongst the two hundred known. The cemetery suggests that there were people being buried, and presumably

living, in at least part of what became *Hamwic*. Furthermore, they clearly included an elite element; king's reeves overseeing and being involved in the founding of the port and its potentially valuable toll income, probably following the example of London, and contemporaneously with Ipswich. If so, they seem to span the period when the area passed from the control of the Isle of Wight to that of the West Saxons, without an obvious change in burial customs. They also span the period when Christianity was introduced (Yorke 1995, 54; Stoodley 2005, 79-81).

As 'Final Phase' cemeteries began before the formal introduction of Christianity, they must relate to new social patterns and new settlement locations. They probably overlapped with enclosed churchyard burial in many areas – no Hampshire churchyards have produced any evidence that they had furnished fifth- to seventh-century burials in them, so total replacement is likely. Patronage probably made the building of manorial chapels a first stage, followed by family burial – Whitchurch may be an example (above) – and then by a communal graveyard, so that the dead lay remembered amongst the living. This sequence would have been encouraged by the receipts of soul-scot that could be diverted to the advowson-holder (above). The timber building in one of the cemeteries in *Hamwic* might have been a similar private enterprise, or have been dependent upon a 'minster' at St Mary's.

The Christian archaeology of Hampshire has been relatively well-served. Churches have been excavated in Winchester: the Old and New Minsters (Biddle 1975a, 127-40), the west end of the Nunnaminster (Winchester Museums Service 1993, unpaginated) and two lesser urban parish churches in the Brooks, revealing development sequences from the Anglo-Saxon period onwards at St Mary's and St Pancras, the former starting perhaps earlier but never having the space to extend (Biddle 1975b, 312-21), and neither having graveyards around them because of the Minsters' prerogatives. A third small Winchester church excavated is extra-mural St Maurice (Qualmann 1978). The piece-meal investigation of Romsey Abbey has been drawn together by Scott; there were certainly graves, and probably buildings, earlier than the stone church of which parts of the footings are still visible. The great rood and the smaller crucifixion panel were probably associated with it (Scott 1996). What was not established, and perhaps never can be, is whether the earlier remains were of a nunnery, or of a 'minster' converted by the king to female religious use during the Benedictine Reform movement (Hinton 2008 for further discussion. Geophysical survey at Wherwell hints that the first, late tenth-century phase there included an eastern apse (K. Clark in Roberts 1998, 152).

Excavations in lesser churches have also taken place, Yateley following an arson attack and revealing the small nave that was the original Anglo-Saxon element there (Hinton 1983), similar in size to that excavated at Hatch Warren (Fasham and Keevil 1995, 76-83), but at Little Somborne it was shown that the nave had actually been reduced in length at the west end (Webster and Cherry 1976, 182). Yateley was not a parish church in the Middle Ages, but was dependent upon Crondall, where recent work has shown that there too the south aisle arcade was on a mortared flint wall, possibly also part of an Anglo-Saxon structure (Graham and Graham 2000). Absence of direct dating evidence from such work is typical, as also at Otterbourne, where the footings could as well be Anglo-Saxon as Norman or later (Hinton 1991). The late Saxon period must have been the period when many parish churches and private chapels were built, encroaching on the prerogatives of the 'minsters' (Hase 1988),

many probably being timber predecessors of later medieval stone buildings. The stone foundations at Portchester may have supported a timber tower, and the burials around it suggest the bell which the *Duties of Men* considered appropriate for a thegn's residence, implying ecclesiastical use, even if as a private chapel not a parish church (Cunliffe 1976, 49-52, 303). Many churches may have started as single-cell structures, with chancels added later, though only St Mary's, Winchester, can be cited, and that may not have had ecclesiastical use before its enlargement (Biddle 1975b, 313); unfortunately, the chancel at Yateley was not available for excavation (Hinton 1983).

As noted above, other sculptures and carvings show the scale of patronage bestowed on some churches in Hampshire, but until the tenth century, the county, indeed the Wessex kingdom as a whole, were not in the forefront of cultural developments. Then, the 'Winchester School' of manuscript art held sway for some fifty years during the Reform (Hinton 1996b). In art, the Ringerike and Urnes styles may show viking influence, though that is less certain than it once seemed (Hinton 2005a, 157). Hampshire has no examples of viking burials, though it is not impossible that the belt-fittings excavated in the Old Minster cemetery belonged to a follower of Cnut, one of the people whose names impact on Hampshire's eleventh-century land-owners.

### 9. Defences

If Whitsbury Camp hillfort was reused because of its earthwork defences, it may have been the only one in Hampshire, as no others have produced any evidence at all. The Devils Dyke linear earthworks and others discussed above could have been reused as barriers or merely served as convenient markers. The dyke at the head of the Meon valley may have been constructed by the Meon people, Bede's Jutish *Meonwara*. If 'Jutish' territory extended across the whole of southern Hampshire (Yorke 1989, 84-6), something a bit longer to protect the Itchen and Test might have been expected. Otherwise, and entirely typically for the period, no Anglo-Saxon settlement has produced evidence of any formidable enclosure. Even at Cowdery's Down all that the lines of post-holes imply is a fence-line, perhaps dignifiable with the name 'stockade'. But, despite all the *Chronicle's* talk of raids and wars, remarkable openness is the norm for settlements, until the debated ditch and bank at, if not around, *Hamwic* is encountered in the beginning of the eighth century (above). Attention was paid to the Roman circuit at Winchester, the south gate being blocked up and another entrance to its east being opened, not necessarily at the same time (Biddle 1972, 116-9). Portchester and Bitterne may have been occupied in various ways as much because their Roman walls gave prestige and a sense of enclosure as because of their actual defensive capability.

*Hamwic* may have learnt the need for proper defences the hard way; the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* has it as the location of a successful battle against vikings, probably in 840, but a continental source, talking of what may be the same event but under the year 842, makes no mention of an English success and records burning to the north (Rumble 1980, 9 and 11; Morton 1992, 27). It probably suffered again in 860 when a viking army 'came inland and stormed Winchester', but was beaten back. The strengthening of royal power seen in the estate charters' definition of the need for land-holders to perform bridge- and fortress-building service as well as military is presumably evident also in the *Burghal Hidage*, the late ninth- or early tenth-century

list of places in Wessex that needed to be defended and maintained. Portchester and Winchester in that list are certainly the old Roman sites. Winchester was ascribed 2,400 hides for its maintenance, which equates to a wall-length that is within 1% of the length of the Roman wall. Portchester had 500 hides, enough to provide cover for its three landward sides, but not the one facing the sea. 'Hamton' had only 150 hides, enough either for the length of the inner wall of the Roman fort at Bitterne, or for a small and undiscovered enclosure either north of the present Bargate or below the castle (Hill, D. and Rumble ed. 1996 for summaries; Brooks 2003, 160-1). The enclosure mentioned above, in the Below Bar area, is too long to fit the document's equation.

Southampton fell victim again in 980, early in the Second Viking Wars. Winchester in 1006 was strong enough for an army to avoid it, but whether the old forts were being kept up systematically, and the vikings were setting out to destroy them, or England was simply not prepared for attack, is uncertain. Elsewhere, Netherton was given a bank and ditch, but not an earthwork combination that looks as if it was really formidable (Fairbrother 1990, 62-7, 231-3). The 'viking dock' at Longparish will never pass out of folklore, but has no other existence. Otherwise, military provision was aimed at army maintenance rather than fortresses, until the Normans arrived and introduced their castles. Even some of those may have been sited for other than strategic reasons, though Portchester was probably to control one of William's crossing-points to Normandy. Winchester's provided a sheriff with a strong-point from which to rule the county as well as to overawe the citizens. Christchurch and Southampton may not have been built until well after the Conquest (Hughes 1989 for the county's castles generally).

Hampshire's rivers do not seem to have any collections of weapons which have led to revival elsewhere of the old idea that they were not battle losses, but deliberate votive depositions, or at least a means of disposing of someone's property that could not go into a churchyard. There are some of the recently recognised stirrup mounts and fittings that show that riding was more widely practised in the tenth and eleventh centuries than had been appreciated, but that does not mean that people were using horses for other than peaceful purposes.

### *10. Material Culture*

Until the 1960s, artefacts were almost the only archaeological data used to reconstruct ideas about early Anglo-Saxon Hampshire, and as has been shown above, they remain very important as evidence for a wide range of social as well as chronological questions. Increased reporting by metal-detectorists has enabled Stedman and others to present new interpretations. The Portable Antiquities Scheme is therefore proving its worth (though its website is difficult to use). Some records are vague – how near to Basingstoke are the many things said to be from 'near Basingstoke'? – and without authentication by archaeologists the reported findspots cannot be taken as reliable. Another new source is the Cambridge Corpus of Early Medieval Coins, which is subject to the same caveats (but has a friendlier website).

Apart from the reported example at Horndean (above), no seventh-century gold *solidi* or *tremisses* have been found other than in hoards, so the impression remains that Hampshire was drawn into a money-using economy slowly and in the early part of the

eighth century, with the silver *sceattas*. The numbers lost fluctuate, but show a decline in the middle part of the eighth century. The introduction of the new type of penny towards its end led to a slow revival. Losses peak around the middle of the ninth century, as in general do hoards. These figures more or less conform to the pattern in *Hamwic*, where coins were clearly being used more frequently (Metcalf 1988; subsequent excavation finds have not varied the picture substantially, e.g. id. 2005 ). From around 840, losses of bullion to the vikings and the need to raise taxation to counter their raids had an effect until stability returned towards the end of the ninth century. Growth was slow, but viking problems that again disturbed trading in the late tenth and early eleventh centuries did not have such a dramatic effect upon coin losses as in the earlier period; indeed, after about 990 losses increased, probably reflecting the greater quantity of silver available in northern Europe when the Harz Mountains deposits were discovered and exploited. Losses declined again after the Norman Conquest, but whether because of taxation or scarcity of silver remains uncertain.

Coins were almost certainly struck in early eighth-century *Hamwic*, but the evidence is the number of finds, particularly of the *sceattas* with a head on one side and a whirling bird on the other classified as Series H Type 49. That other types were struck in the *wic* is less certain (Metcalf 1988), and travelling moneyers may have used their dies at places where the king demanded. Winchester came into the picture in the ninth century, and although Southampton retained or revived a small output, it seems to have ceased production in the 1020s; no other Hampshire mints are known, a facet of Winchester's local dominance before and after the Conquest (Metcalf 1998, 241).

The coins suggest overall a modest prosperity for the county, which other artefacts generally bear out. In the fifth and sixth centuries there are gilt copper-alloy objects, but not in great profusion, and the seventh-century gold and other objects are not so impressive when set beside Taplow, Buckinghamshire, or Sutton Hoo. The metal objects found in *Hamwic* suggest no more than modest wealth (Hinton 1996a), particularly if the gold skein came from a grave rather than from occupation debris, but the impressive amount of vessel glass offers a different picture (Hunter and Heyworth 1998). Also discussed above is the modesty of the record from other sites, including ecclesiastical ones. The ninth century can claim the large gold finger-ring found long ago at Bossington (Hinton 1974, no. 4), but little else of consequence except for the pair of silver tags from the Old Minster cemetery in Winchester and a few losses in Portchester.

In the tenth century there are gold and silver-gilt objects from Winchester such as the belt fittings mentioned above, but much more significant are the objects of cast copper alloy, the finest of which is probably a large strap-end with birds, animals and acanthus leaves excavated in Winchester at the Old Minster cemetery (Hinton 1990a, 494-500). This and others may very well have been produced in the city, which was a focus for them, as a recent discovery from Headbourne Worthy seemed to demonstrate (Hinton 1996b). Acanthus leaves occur again on the back of the late tenth-century seal of a man named Aelfric, found in Weeke; he was probably a leading figure in the kingdom, quite possibly the ealdorman of Hampshire killed in battle in 1016 (Wilson 1964, no. 104; Heslop 1980, 4).

## *11. Crafts, trade and industries*

With agriculture as its main activity, Hampshire was never noted in the Middle Ages for other production. Spinning and weaving are indicated by a few finds of spindle whorls and loomweights in early Anglo-Saxon settlements; these, and iron-smelting, have been discussed above. Smithing must have been widespread, though whether making knives, buckles, spears and shield-bosses were separate specialisms is not obvious. Particular skill was needed by sword-blade makers using the pattern-welding technique (Lang and Ager 1989, 95 include one of Droxford's swords as the only Hampshire example that they analysed). The recent report of the discovery at Over Wallop of a gilt copper-alloy sixth-century disc-brooch of a type made in Kent in silver leads to the intriguing possibility of a bronzesmith making localised variants, possibly on an itinerant basis (Geake 2006, 282-3), but not necessarily within Hampshire, which has as yet no direct evidence of production in the shape of pieces of moulds, crucibles or anvils in the early centuries.

A touch-stone and a gold droplet show that at least one goldsmith worked in mid-Saxon Winchester (Oddy and Tylecote 1990), perhaps an itinerant visitor. Sedentary specialisation becomes apparent in eighth-century *Hamwic*, where evidence of the working of gold – if only for gilding – silver and copper alloy has been found (Bayley 1996; there have been subsequent finds), and where a mint can be safely assumed. Other crafts must have included textile production, though the numbers of loomweights and so on from the *wic* are not enough to suggest either exceptional volume or exceptional quality in the output, putting the gold skein to one side. Tanning is another craft that has produced a little evidence of itself there, but again without hint of specialisation. A few roves indicate ship building or repairing, and there is smithing evidence, though again the quantity is not of itself enough to suggest a thriving specialist activity. Glass may have been melted down and reformed into beads, and possibly into vessels (Hunter and Heyworth 1998, 60-1). Antler and bone were worked into pins, combs and the like.

Distribution from *Hamwic* of the luxuries like wine that are assumed to have been its main imports is unidentifiable; the glass fragments that are frequent in the town have not been found in the rest of Wessex. Lava querns from the Rhineland may be one of the more basic commodities, but tying them to import specifically through the Hampshire *wic*, rather than through London, would be difficult. The same is true of imported pottery, though French wares are more likely to have come through the southern route. Sherds are, however, few in number outside the port. Of things produced within it, the Series H *sceattas* are the one thing that can almost definitely be recognised, but these are not found profusely outside it – a recent one in a collection of three coins from the Itchen valley adds another (Hinton 2005a, fig. 3.6; DCMS 2007, 184). An attempt to claim production of a particular brooch type in *Hamwic* foundered pathetically on the discovery of a mould for making them in London (Hinton 2005a, 92), and bone items and the like are similarly too widespread for a particular maker to be identified. Trade into the *wic* is as hard to distinguish as trade out of it, though the chalk-tempered pottery mentioned above must have come at least 15 kilometres and is quite prolific, so the catchment area of the agricultural produce consumed was probably no less wide.

Late Saxon Winchester had a range of crafts, though street names are a better guide to their range than the archaeological data so far published (Biddle ed. 1976, 427-39). Metalworking probably by an itinerant smith at Faccombe had been mentioned above;

textile production at Portchester while it was a manorial centre is a possibility, but again the number of finds is suggestive rather than conclusive. Too little of tenth- and eleventh-century Southampton has been excavated and published for the degree to which urban craft specialisation developed there yet to be assessed, but without flowing fresh water, textiles could not be fulled nor hides soaked there, and for the rest of the Middle Ages it was always a trading rather than a manufacturing town. As discussed above, pottery seems to have been a rural craft, even with sophisticated firing techniques, as practised at Michelmersh. Salt was produced along the coast, but is known only from documentary evidence (Welldon Finn 1962, 343-4; Keen 1988).

Apart from the international trading in the *wic*, which brought in metals, glass, pottery and probably invisibles such as wine, silk and other things unlikely to survive archaeologically, the markets that had developed by the time of Domesday Book, above, had the beginnings of a network that could channel rural produce around and beyond the county. Coins suggest trading at other places, notably Pitt outside Winchester (Ulmschneider 2000, 160), though the great fair on St Giles's Hill is a later development, only granted as a three-day privilege to the bishop by the king in 1096 (Biddle ed. 1976, 287-8).

## 12. Transport

As Aldsworth showed (1973), some Roman roads remained partly in use and a network of tracks is revealed by charter references. How much maintenance took place must have depended most of the time upon the king's authority; the 'bridge-building' that became one of the three necessary duties is taken to mean roadworks generally, not just bridges and causeways. The condition of the surfaces was no barrier to carts getting to London from Southampton and back in only five days in the fifteenth century, so may have been perfectly satisfactory earlier on. Packhorses as well as carts may have been used. The proliferation of objects related to horse harness and stirrups has been mentioned above, and shows that riding was not confined to the aristocracy by the eleventh century.

Water carriage is more problematic. The demonstration by Edwin and Joyce Gifford at Breamore in 2000 that their half-size replica of the Sutton Hoo seventh-century ship can sail perfectly well in stretches of the River Avon does not prove that ships came up from Christchurch in the Anglo-Saxon period, but shows that possibility, with allowance for hauling over shallower stretches and inconvenience when water levels were low in summer and early autumn. The Test up to Romsey and the Itchen up to Winchester could have been used in the same way; all that is missing is evidence. The latter may have had some canalisation in the late Saxon period, as a charter refers to 'the old Itchen ... the new *ea* (river)', but that may simply mean that the river was known to have changed channels (Biddle ed. 1976, 270-1; Currie 1995, 121; id. 1997; Russel 1996, 21). A log-boat radiocarbon-dated to around A. D. 500 raised from Portsmouth Harbour (Hampshire and Wight Maritime Trust for Archaeology, pers. comm.) is a reminder of the simple craft that could carry small amounts of produce between islands and the mainland, ferry people and goods across Southampton Water and the Solent when wind and tide allowed, and up and down rivers, though the network in Hampshire was much less extensive than in the east of the country.

### 13. Legacy

That cooperative villages were not established by incoming, freedom-loving Anglo-Saxons who pulled down Roman villas because they were insufficiently democratic and threatened the imposition of feudalism is now a well-rehearsed song. But many of the settlements that are at the core of today's sprawls of housing estates and overprotected rural gems do have Saxon origins, albeit ones that came later during the six hundred years between the end of the Roman Empire and the imposition of the Norman yoke than used to be thought. The mid Saxon trading system based on the *wic* at Southampton did not survive ninth-century pressures, but the core of today's network of markets, towns and cities is a late Saxon legacy, as is the royal prerogative of striking coins and the government's of taxing in them. So too is a system of parish churches dependent upon the authority of the diocesan cathedral, though the minsters and monasteries have gone (today's team ministries have a little of the old minster system about them).

So what else? Little survived into the nineteenth century that could claim Anglo-Saxon origins; field systems had been swept away by then, most of the open downland was enclosed, and great country houses and parks had been built where before had been open country; woods were in danger of becoming conifer plantations; and towns were dockyards unless they were as genteel as Winchester and, in the eighteenth century, Southampton. Soon to come were railways, army garrison towns, horticulture, and a variety of largely temporary manufacturing enterprises.

The real legacy is therefore a social one; not of ranks descending from *ceorls* and *gesiths* – though *ealdormen* survived into the late twentieth century, and Hampshire still has a *scir-gerefan* in the guise of the sheriff. The legacy lies in the social belief that the past matters and that it is important to preserve what can be preserved of it, to study its meaning – and to use it, sometimes improperly, to create a sense of belonging to a place in the modern world. No longer is an outline of events or of the origins of institutions the ultimate goal of historian or archaeologist, but elucidation of the processes that affected and shaped societies in the past and what it meant to live at the time. The microcosm of a county elucidates the processes that shaped the kingdom and the nation-state.

### 14. Research Themes

Publication, especially of excavations in Winchester, Chalton, Lower High Street and Above Bar, Southampton

Integration into the AHBR of data from the unitary authorities (Winchester, Portsmouth and Southampton), the PAS and the EMCC

'Grey literature' to be supplied to the AHBR on disc and to be made available electronically

All the usual things about the fifth century, urbanisation etc.

## **Hampshire framework references**

Abdy, R. and Williams, G. 2006, 'A catalogue of hoards and single finds from the British Isles c. 410-675', 11-74 in Cook and Williams ed.

Addyman, P. V. and Hill, D. H. 1968, 'Saxon Southampton: a review of the evidence, Part I: history, location, date and character of the town', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 25, 61-93.

Addyman, P. V. and Hill, D. 1969, 'Saxon Southampton: a review of the evidence, Part II: industry, trade and everyday life', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 26, 61-96.

Addyman, P. V. and Leigh, D. 1973, 'The Anglo-Saxon village at Chalton, Hampshire: second interim report', *Medieval Archaeology*, 17, 1-25.

Addyman, P. V., Hopkins, B. G. and Norton, G. T. 1972, 'A Saxo-Norman pottery-kiln producing stamped wares at Michelmersh, Hampshire', *Medieval Archaeology*, 16, 127-30.

Addyman, P. V., Leigh, D. and Hughes, M. J. 1972, 'Anglo-Saxon houses at Chalton, Hampshire', *Medieval Archaeology*, 16, 13-32.

Ager, B. 1985, 'The smaller variants of the Anglo-Saxon quoit brooch', *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*, 4, 1-58.

Ager, B. 1996a, 'A Late Roman buckle- or belt-plate in the British Museum, said to be from northern France', *Medieval Archaeology*, 40, 206-11.

Ager, B. 1996b, 'A Quoit Brooch style belt-plate from Meonstoke, Hampshire', *Landscape History*, 9, 110-4.

AHBR: Archaeology and Historic Buildings Record, Hampshire County Council.

Alcock, N. W. 1993, 'Architecture at Cowdery's Down: a reconsideration', *Archaeological Journal*, 150, 403-9.

Aldsworth, F. R. 1973, 'Towards a pre-Domesday geography of Hampshire – a review of the evidence', University of Southampton B. A. dissertation.

Aldsworth, F. R. 1978, 'The Droxford Anglo-Saxon cemetery, Soberton, Hampshire', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 35, 93-182.

Allen, M. J. 1996, 'Landscape and land-use: priorities in Hampshire 500,000 B. C. to A. D. 1500', 55-70 in Hinton and Hughes ed.

Allen, M. J. and Gardiner, J. 2000, *Our Changing Coast: a survey of the intertidal archaeology of Langstone Harbour, Hampshire*, York: Council for British Archaeology Research Report 124.

- Anderton, M. ed. 1999, *Anglo-Saxon Trading Centres: beyond the emporia*, Glasgow: Cruithne Press.
- Andrews, P. 2005, 'Ironworking', 136-7 in Birbeck.
- Andrews, P. ed. 1988, *The Coins and Pottery from Hamwic*, Southampton Finds Volume One, Southampton: Southampton City Museums.
- Andrews, P. ed. 1997, *Excavations at Hamwic Volume 2: excavations at Six Dials*, Council for British Archaeology Research Report 109, York: Council for British Archaeology.
- Aston, M. and Lewis, C. ed. 1994, *The Medieval landscape of Wessex*, Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Baillie, M. 1999, *Exodus to Arthur: catastrophic encounters with comets*, London: Batsford.
- Barford, P. M. 1995, 'Re-interpreting Mucking: countering the Black legend', 8, 103-10.
- Bassett, S. ed. 1989, *The Origins of Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms*, Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Bayley, J. 1996, 'Crucibles and cupels', 86-92 in Hinton.
- Bell, M. and Limbrey, S. ed. 1982, *Archaeological Aspects of Woodland Economy*, Oxford: British Archaeological Reports International Series 146.
- Bell, T. 1998, 'Churches on Roman buildings: Christian associations and Roman masonry in Anglo-Saxon England', *Medieval Archaeology*, 42, 1-18.
- Betty, J. 1986, *Wessex from A. D. 1000*, Harlow: Longman Group.
- Biddle, M. 1972, 'Excavations at Winchester, 1970: ninth interim report', *Antiquaries Journal*, 52, 93-131.
- Biddle, M. 1975a, '*Felix urbs Winthonia*. Winchester in the age of monastic Reform', 123-39 in Parsons ed.
- Biddle, M. 1975b, 'Excavations at Winchester 1971: tenth and final interim report: Part II', *Antiquaries Journal*, 55, 295-337.
- Biddle, M. 1976, 'Hampshire and the origins of Wessex', 323-41 in Sieveking *et al.* ed.
- Biddle, M. 1983, 'The study of Winchester: archaeology and history in a British town, 1961-1983' *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 69, 93-136.

- Biddle, M. 1990, *Object and Economy in Medieval Winchester*, Winchester Studies 7.ii, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Biddle, M. ed. 1976, *Winchester in the early Middle Ages. An edition and discussion of the Winton Domesday*, Winchester Studies 1, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Birbeck, V. 2005, *The Origins of Mid-Saxon Southampton. Excavations at the Friends Provident St Mary's Stadium 1998-2000*, Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology.
- Birbeck, V. and Moore, C., 'Preservation and investigation of Roman and medieval remains at Hyde Street, Winchester', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 59, 77-110.
- Blair, J. 1995, 'Anglo-Saxon pagan shrines and their prototypes', *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*, 8, 1-28.
- Blair, J. 2006, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon England*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blair, J. ed. 1988, *Minsters and Parish Churches*, Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology 17.
- Boon, G. C. 1959, 'The latest objects from Silchester, Hampshire', *Medieval Archaeology*, 3, 79-88.
- Bourdillon, J. 1994, 'The animal provisioning of Saxon Southampton', 120-5 in Rackham, ed.
- Bourdillon, J. and Coy, J. 1980, 'The animal bones', 79-120 in Holdsworth.
- Bowden, M. *et al.* 1988, 'The archaeology and history of Amery House, near Alton', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 44, 49-65.
- Bradley, R. 1973, 'A late Saxon site at Emsworth', *Rescue Archaeology in Hampshire*, 1, 29-38.
- Breeze, A. 2000, 'Netley Marsh', 97-9 in Coates and Breeze.
- Brooks, N. 2003, 'Alfredian government: the West Saxon inheritance', 153-73.
- Brown, D. H. 1995, 'Pottery and late Saxon Southampton', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 50, 127-52.
- Bruce-Mitford, R. 1983, *The Sutton Hoo Ship-Burial, Volume 3*, ed. Evans, A. C., London: British Museum Publications.
- Bruce-Mitford, R. 2005, *A Corpus of Late Celtic Hanging-Bowls*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bruns, D. 2003, *Germanic Equal Arm Brooches of the Migration Period*, Oxford: British Archaeological Reports International Series 1113.

- Butterworth, C. A. 1995, 'Archaeological excavation and watching briefs at Ellingham Farm, near Ringwood, Hampshire, 1989-1991', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 51, 59-76.
- Campana, S. and Forte, M. ed. 2006, *From Space to Place. Second international conference on remote sensing in archaeology*, Oxford: British Archaeological Reports International Series forthcoming.
- Champion, T. C. 1977, 'Chalton', *Current Archaeology*, 59, 364-71.
- Chapman, J. and Seeliger, S. 2001, *Enclosure, Environment and Landscape in Southern England*, Stroud: Tempus.
- Clarke, G. 1979, *The Roman Cemetery at Lankhills*, Winchester Studies 3.ii, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Clayton, P. A. 1989, 'The Otterbourne hoard of Roman silver coins', *Seaby Coins and Medals Bulletin*, 838, 35-8.
- Coates, R. 1989, *The Place-Names of Hampshire*, London: Batsford.
- Coates, R. and Breeze, A. 2000, *Celtic Voices, English Places*, Stamford: Shaun Tyas.
- Cole, A. 1988-9, 'The distribution and usage of Old English place-names', *English Place-Name Society Journal*, 21, 45-55.
- Cook, A. M. and Dacre, M. W. 1985, *Excavations at Portway, Andover, 1973-1975*, Oxford University Committee for Archaeology Monograph 4, Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.
- Cook, B. and Williams, G. 2006, *Coinage and History in the North Sea World c. 500-1250. Essays in honour of Marion Archibald*, Leiden: Brill.
- Collis, J. 1978, *Winchester Excavations Volume: 1949-1960. Excavations in the suburbs and western part of the town*, Winchester: Winchester City Museum.
- Corney, A., Ashbee, P., Evison, V. I. and Brothwell, D. 1967, 'A prehistoric and Anglo-Saxon burial ground, Ports Down, Portsmouth', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 24, 20-41.
- Creighton, J. 2000, *Coins and Power in Late Iron Age Britain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crockett, A. 1996, 'Excavations at Montefiori new halls of residence, Swaythling, Southampton, 1992', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 51, 5-57.
- Cunliffe, B. 1972, 'Saxon and medieval settlement-patterns in the region of Chalton, Hampshire', *Medieval Archaeology*, 16, 1-12.

- Cunliffe, B. 1973, 'Manor Farm, Chalton, Hampshire', *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, 7, 1-29.
- Cunliffe, B. 1976, *Excavations at Portchester Castle Volume II: Saxon*, Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London No. XXXIII, London: Society of Antiquaries.
- Cunliffe, B. 1993, *Wessex to A. D. 1000*, Harlow: Longman Group.
- Currie, C. K. 1995, 'Saxon land charters and landscape evolution in the south-central Hampshire Basin', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 50, 103-26.
- Currie, C. K. 1997, 'A possible ancient water channel around Woodmill and Gater's Mill in the historic manor of South Stoneham', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 52, 89-106.
- Dark, K. R. 2000, *Britain and the End of the Roman Empire*, Stroud: Tempus.
- Davies, S. M. 1979, 'Excavations at Old Down Farm, Andover. Part I: Saxon', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 56, 161-80.
- DCMS 2007, *Treasure Annual Report 2004*, London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
- Denford, G. T. 1986, 'A keystone garnet disc brooch from Ampfield', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 42, 160-1.
- Dickinson, T. M. 1982, 'Fowler's Type G penannular brooches reconsidered', *Medieval Archaeology*, 26, 41-68.
- Dickinson, T. M and Härke, H. 1992, *Early Anglo-Saxon Shields*, *Archaeologia* 110, Society of Antiquaries of London.
- Dixon, P. H. 1993, 'The Anglo-Saxon settlement at Mucking: an interpretation', *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*, 6, 125-47.
- Doubleday, H. A. ed. 1900, *A History of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, Volume One*, Westminster: The Victoria History of the Counties of England.
- Eagles, B. and Ager, B. 2004, 'A mid fifth-century to mid sixth-century bridle-fitting of mediterranean origin from Breamore, Hampshire', with a discussion of its local context', 87-96 in Lodewicjks ed.
- Eastham, A. 1976, 'Bird bones', 287-96 in Cunliffe.
- Eaton, T. 2000, *Plundering the Past. Roman stonework in medieval Britain*, Stroud: Tempus.

- Edwards, H. 1988, *The Charters of the Early West Saxon Kingdom*, Oxford: British Archaeological Reports British Series 198.
- Ellis, C. J. and Rawlings, M. 2001, 'Excavations at Bawksbury Camp, Andover, 1995-97', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 56, 21-94.
- Ellison, A. and Rahtz, P. 1987, 'Excavations at Whitsbury Castle Ditches', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 43, 63-81.
- Entwistle, R., Raymond, F. and Stedman M. 2005, 'A surface collection project and finds from metal detecting at Shavards farm, Meonstoke, Hampshire', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 60, 136-53.
- Erskine, R. W. H. ed. 1989, *The Hampshire Domesday*: London: Alecto Historical Editions.
- Evison, V. I. 1982, 'Anglo-Saxon glass claw-beakers', *Archaeologia*, 107, 43-76.
- Evison, V. I. 1988, *An Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Alton, Hampshire*, Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society Monograph 4.
- Evison, V. I. 2000, 'Glass vessels in England, A. D. 400-1100', 47-104 in Price ed.
- Fairbrother, J. R. 1990, *Facombe Netherton. Excavations of a Saxon and medieval manorial complex*, British Museum Occasional Paper 74, London: Department of British and Medieval Antiquities, British Museum.
- Faith, R. 1997, *The English Peasantry and the Growth of Lordship*, London: Leicester University press.
- Fasham, P. J. and Keevill, G. 1995, *Brighton Hill South (Hatch Warren); an Iron Age farmstead and deserted medieval village in Hampshire*, Wessex Archaeology Report 7, Salisbury: Wessex Archaeology.
- Fasham, P. J. and Whinney, R. J. B. 1991, *Archaeology and the M3*, Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society Monograph 7.
- Fasham, P. J., Farwell, D. E. and Whinney, R. J. B. 1989, *The Archaeological Site at Easton Lane, Winchester*, Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society Monograph 6.
- Finberg, H. P. R. 1964, *The Early Charters of Wessex*, Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Ford, S. 1997, 'Excavation of Saxon structures and Bronze Age features at Bentley Green Farm, Bentley, Hampshire', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 52, 59-75.
- Fulford, M., Handley, M. and Clark, A. 2000, 'An early date for ogham: the Silchester ogham stone rehabilitated', *Medieval Archaeology*, 44, 1-24.

- Gallop, P. 'The survey of sarsen stiones – Hampshire' *Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society Newsletter*, 21, 11-12.
- Garner, M. F. 1994, 'Middle Saxon evidence at Cook Street, Southampton (SOU 254)', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 49, 77-128.
- Garner, M. F. 2001, 'A middle Saxon cemetery at Cook Street, Southampton (SOU 823)', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 56, 170-91.
- Geake, H. 1997, *The Use of Grave-Goods in Conversion-Period England, c. 600 – c. 850*, Oxford: British Archaeological Reports British Series 261.
- Geake, H. 1999, 'When were hanging-bowls deposited in Anglo-Saxon graves?', *Medieval Archaeology*, 43, 1-18.
- Geake, H. 2003, 'Portable Antiquities Scheme', *Medieval Archaeology*, 47, 202-17.
- Geake, H. 2006, 'Portable Antiquities Scheme', *Medieval Archaeology*, 50, 274-94.
- Gelling, M. 1976, *The Place-Names of Berkshire, Part III*, English Place-Name Society 51.
- Gelling, M. 1978, *Sign-Posts to the Past. Place-names and the history of England*, London: Dent.
- Golding, B. J. 1989, 'An introduction to the Hampshire Domesday', 1-27 in Erskine ed.
- Gover, J. E. B. 1961, 'Hampshire Place Names' unpublished typescript.
- Graham, D. and Graham, A. 2000, 'Archaeological recording at All Saints Church, Crondall, 1997', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 15, 1-9.
- Grant, A. 1976, 'Animal bones', 262-86 in Cunliffe.
- Green, F. J. 1994, 'Cereals and plant foods: a re-assessment of the Saxon economic evidence', 83-8 in Rackham, ed.
- Guest, P. S. W. 2005, *The Late Roman Gold and Silver Coins from the Hoxne Treasure*, London: British Museum.
- Hall, D. N. 1995, *The Open Fields of Northamptonshire*, Northamptonshire Record Society.

Hall-Torrance, M. and Weaver, S. D. G. 2003, 'The excavation of a Saxon settlement at Riverdene, Basingstoke, Hampshire', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 58, 63-105.

Hamerow, H. 2006, "'Special deposits" in Anglo-Saxon settlements', *Medieval Archaeology*, 50, 1-30.

Härke, H. and Entwistle, R., 'An Anglo-Saxon quadruple weapon burial at Tidworth: a battle-site burial on Salisbury Plain?', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 57, 38-52.

Hare, M. 1992, 'Investigations at the Anglo-Saxon church of St Peter, Titchfield, 1982-9', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 47, 117-44.

Harris, A. 2003, *Byzantium, Britain and the West*, Stroud: Tempus.

Hase, P. H. 1988, 'The mother churches of Hampshire' 45-66 in Blair ed.

Hase, P. H. 1994, 'The church in the Wessex heartlands', 47-81 in Aston and Lewis ed.

Hawkes, S. C. 1990, 'The Anglo-Saxon necklace from Lower Brook Street', 621-7 in Biddle.

Hawkes, S. C. with Grainger, G. 2003, *The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Worthy Park, Kingsworthy, near Winchester, Hampshire*, Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology.

Hawkes, S. C. ed. 1989, *Weapons and Warfare in Anglo-Saxon England*, Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.

Heslop, T. A. 1980, 'English seals from the mid ninth century to 1100', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 133, 1-16.

Hey, G. 2004, *Yarnton: Saxon and medieval settlement and landscape: results of excavations 1990-1996*. Oxford: Oxford Archaeological Unit.

Hill, D. 1967, 'The Burghal Hidage, Southampton', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 24, 59-61.

Hill, D. and Rumble, A. R. ed. 1996, *The Defence of Wessex. The Burghal Hidage and Anglo-Saxon fortifications*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Hill, R. 1937, 'Excavations on Stockbridge Down', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 13iii, 246-59.

Hinton, D. A. 1974. *A Catalogue of the Anglo-Saxon Ornamental Metalwork 700-1100 in the Department of Antiquities, Ashmolean Museum*, Oxford: Clarendon press.

- Hinton, D. A. 1981, 'Hampshire's Anglo-Saxon origins', 56-65 in Shennan and Schadla-Hall ed.
- Hinton, D. A. 1983, 'The Anglo-Saxon church at Yateley', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 39, 111-20.
- Hinton, D. A. 1986, 'The place of Basing in mid Saxon history', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 42, 162-3.
- Hinton, D. A. 1990a, 'Buckles and other clothes fittings', 494-590 in Biddle.
- Hinton, D. A. 1990b, 'Excavations at Otterbourne old church, Hampshire', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 46, 73-89.
- Hinton, D. A. 1996a, *The Gold, Silver and Other Non-Ferrous Alloy Objects from Hamwic*, Southampton Finds Volume Two, [Stroud]: Alan Sutton Publishing.
- Hinton, D. A. 1996b 'A "Winchester-style" mount from near Winchester', *Medieval Archaeology*, 40, 214-7.
- Hinton, D. A. 1997, 'Reviews', *Medieval Archaeology*, 41, 332-4.
- Hinton, D. A. 2005a, *Gold and Gilt, Pots and Pins. Possessions and people in medieval Britain*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hinton, D. A. 2005b, 'Debate: south Hampshire, 'East Wessex' and the *Atlas of Rural Settlement in England*', *Landscape History*, , 71-5.
- Hinton, D. A. 2008, 'The Anglo-Saxon chapel at Bradford-on-Avon', forthcoming in *Cross Conference III*.
- Hinton, D. A. and Hughes M. ed. 1996, *Archaeology in Hampshire: a framework for the future*, Winchester; Hampshire County Council.
- Holdsworth, P. 1980, *Excavations at Melbourne Street, Southampton, 1971-76*, Council for British Archaeology Research Report 33, London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Hughes, M. 1976, *The Small Towns of Hampshire. The archaeological and historical implications of development*, Hampshire Archaeological Committee.
- Hughes, M. 1989, 'Hampshire castles and the landscape', *Landscape History*, 11, 27-60.
- Hunter, J. R. and Heyworth, M. P. 1998, *The Hamwic Glass*, York: Council for British Archaeology Research Report 116.
- Hurst, G. and Hurst, J. G. 1967, 'Excavation of two moated sites: Milton, Hampshire, and Ashwell, Hertfordshire', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 30 (1967), 48-86.

- Iles, R. 1998, reports in Johnston.
- Inker, P. 2000, 'Technology as active material culture: the quoit-brooch style', *Medieval Archaeology*, 44, 25-52.
- James, T. B. 1997, *Winchester*, English Heritage/Batsford.
- Jarvis, K. S. 1983, *Excavations in Christchurch 1969-1980*, Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society Monograph 5.
- Johnston, D. E. 1998, 'A Roman and Anglo-Saxon site at Northbrook, Micheldever, Hampshire', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 53, 79-108.
- Kavanagh, H. 1998, 'West Quay Shopping Centre', *Archaeology in Hampshire Annual Report for 1988*, 49-50.
- Keen, L. 1988, 'Coastal salt production in Norman England', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 11, 133-74.
- Keevill, G., Aston, M. and Hall, T. ed. 2001, *Monastic Archaeology*, Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Kendrick, T. D. and Hawkes, C. F. C. 1935, 'Notes', *Antiquaries Journal*, 17, 322-4.
- Klingelhøfer, E. 1991, 'Anglo-Saxon manors of the Upper Itchen valley: their origin and evolution', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 46, 31-40.
- Knocker, G. M. 1956, 'Early burials and an Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Snell's Corner near Horndean, Hampshire', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 19ii, 117-70.
- Lang, J. and Ager, B. 1989, 'Swords of the Anglo-Saxon and Viking periods in the British Museum: a radiographic study' 85-122 in Hawkes, ed.
- Lavelle, R. 2005, 'Grateley', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 60, 154-69.
- Lewis, E. 1985, 'Excavations in Bishops Waltham 1967-78', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 41, 81-16.
- Lewis, E. and Martin, J. 1973, 'Rescue excavations on a Saxon settlement site at Rowner, 1971', *Rescue Archaeology in Hampshire*, 1, 38-51.
- Light, A., Schofield, A. J. and Shennan, S. J. 1995, 'The Middle Avon Survey: a study in settlement history', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 50, 43-102.

- Lodewicjks, M. ed. 2004, Bruc Ealles Well. *Archaeological essays concerning the peoples of North-West Europe in the first millennium A. D.*, Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Lucy, S. 2000, *The Anglo-Saxon Way of Death*, Stroud: Tempus.
- Lyne, M. 2003, 'The pottery supply to Roman Sussex', 141-50 in Rudling ed.
- McOmish, D., Field, D. and Brown, G. 2002, *The Field Archaeology of the Salisbury Plain Training Area*, London: English Heritage.
- Maltby, M. 1993, 'The animal bone', 258-9 in Millett.
- Marzinzik, S. 2005, 'Wire-inlaid buckle and belt fitting', 121-4 in Teague.
- Meaney, A. 1964, *A Gazetteer of Early Anglo-Saxon Burial Sites*, London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Meaney, A. L. and Hawkes, S. C. 1970, *Two Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries at Winnall*, Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 4.
- Metcalf, M. 1988, 'The coins', 17-59 in Andrews ed.
- Metcalf, M. 1998, *An Atlas of Anglo-Saxon and Norman Coin Finds, c. 973-1086*, London: Royal Numismatic Society and Ashmolean Museum Oxford.
- Metcalf, M. 2005, 'Coins', 130-6 in Birbeck.
- Millett, M. with James, S. 1983, 'Excavations at Cowdery's Down, Basingstoke, Hampshire, 1978-81', *Archaeological Journal*, 140, 151-279.
- Moffett, L. 2006, 'The archaeology of medieval plant foods', 41-55 in Woolgar *et al.* ed.
- Morris, R. and Roxan, J. 1980, 'Churches on Roman buildings', 175-210 in Rodwell, ed.
- Morton, A. D. 1992, *Excavations at Hamwic Volume 1: excavations 1946-83, excluding Six Dials and Melbourne Street*, Council for British Archaeology Research Report 84, London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Morton, A. D. 1996, 'Late Saxon boundaries near Southampton', *Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society newsletter*, 25, 2- 3.
- Morton, A. D. 1999, 'Hamwic in its context', 48-62 in Anderton ed.
- Munby, J. ed. 1982, *Domesday Book*, Chichester: Phillimore.
- O'Brien, E. 1999, *Post-Roman Britain to Anglo-Saxon England. Burial practices reviewed*, Oxford: British Archaeological Reports British Series 289.

- Oddy, W. A. and Tylecote, R. F. 1990, 'Objects associated with goldworking', 76-8 in Biddle.
- Oosthuizen, S. 2005, 'New light on the origins of open-field farming?', *Medieval Archaeology*, 49, 165-94.
- Oxley, J. 1988, 'A possible Saxon smithing site and further evidence from SOU 129', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 44, 41-7.
- Oxley, J. ed. 1986, *Excavations at Southampton Castle*, Southampton Archaeology Monographs 3, Southampton: Southampton City Museums.
- Page, W. ed. 1911, *A History of Hampshire and the Isle of Wight, Volume 4*, London: Constable.
- Parsons, D. ed. 1975, *Tenth-Century Studies*, Chichester: Phillimore.
- Pile, J. 1989, 'Aspects of the Forest of Bere from the late Iron Age to the Middle Ages', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 45, 113-20.
- Pine, J. and Preston, S. 2004, 'Early medieval settlement on land adjoining Froman's, Cow Drove Hill, King's Somborne, Hampshire', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 59, 139-62.
- Potter, J. F. 2006, 'A geological review of some Hampshire Anglo-Saxon churches', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 61, 134-52.
- Price, E. 2000, *A Romano-British Settlement, its Antecedents and Successors, Volume 2: the finds*, Gloucester and District Archaeological Research Group.
- Price, J., 'Late Roman glass vessels in Britain from A. D. 350 to 410 and beyond', 1-32 in Price ed.
- Price, J. ed. 2000, *Glass in Britain and Ireland A. D. 350-1100*, London: British Museum Occasional Paper 127.
- Qualmann, K. 1978, 'St Paul's Church', 265-70 in Collis.
- RCHM: Royal Commission on Historical Monuments (England), 'West Park Roman villa, Rockbourne, Hampshire', *Archaeological Journal*, 140, 120-50.
- Rackham, J. ed. 1994, *Environment and Economy in Anglo-Saxon England*, York: Council for British Archaeology Research Report 89.
- Reuter, T. ed. 2003, *Alfred the Great*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Reynolds, A. 1999, *Later Anglo-Saxon England. Life and landscape*, Stroud: Tempus.

- Reynolds, A. 2003, 'Boundaries and settlements in later sixth- to eleventh-century England', *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*, 12, 98-136.
- Roberts, E. 1998, 'The rediscovery of two major monastic buildings at Wherwell', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 53, 137-53.
- Rodwell, W. and Rouse, E. C. 1984, 'The Anglo-Saxon rood and other features in the south porch of St Mary's Church, Breamore, Hampshire', *Antiquaries Journal*, 64, 298-325.
- Rodwell, W. ed. 1980, *Temples, Churches and Religion: recent research in Roman Britain*, Oxford: British Archaeological Reports British Series 77.
- Rudling, D. ed. 2003, *The Archaeology of Sussex to A. D. 2000*, King's Lynn: Heritage Marketing and Publication.
- Rumble, A. 1980, 'HAMTUN *alias* HAMWIC (Saxon Southampton): the place-name traditions and their significance', 7-19 in Holdsworth.
- Rumble, A. 2002, *Property and Piety in Early Medieval Winchester*, Winchester Studies 4iii, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Russel, A. D. 1996, 'Some comments on the Southampton evidence', *Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 1996, 21-2.
- Russel, A. 2002, 'Anglo-Saxon', 20-6 in Stoodley ed.
- Sadler, P. 1990, 'Osteological remains', 462-508 in Fairbrother.
- Sarris, P. 2004, 'The origins of the manorial economy: new insights from Late Antiquity', *English Historical Review*, 119, 279-311.
- Scobie, G. D., Zant, J. M. and Whinney, R. 1991, *The Brooks, Winchester. A preliminary report on the excavations, 1987-88*, Winchester: Winchester Museums Service Archaeology Report 1.
- Scott, I. R. 1996, *Romsey Abbey. Report on the excavations 1973-1991*, Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society Monograph 8.
- Scott, I. R. 2001, 'Romsey Abbey: Benedictine nunnery and parish church', 150-60 in Keevill *et al.* ed.
- Serjeantson, D. 2006, 'Birds: food and a mark of status', 131-49 in Woolgar *et al.* ed.
- Serjeantson, D. and Woolgar, C. M. 2006, 'Fish consumption in medieval England', 102-30 in Woolgar *et al.* ed.
- Shennan, S. 1985, *Experiments in the Collection and Analysis of Archaeological Survey Data: the East Hampshire Survey*, Sheffield: Department of Archaeology and Prehistory, University of Sheffield.

Shennan, S. J. and Schadla-Hall, R. T. ed. 1981, *The Archaeology of Hampshire: from the Palaeolithic to the Industrial Revolution*, Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society Monograph 1.

Sieveking, G. de G., Longworth, I. H. and Wilson, K. E. 1976, *Problems in Social and Economic Archaeology*, London: Duckworth.

Smith, R. A. 1900, 'Anglo-Saxon remains', 373-98 in Doubleday, ed.

Southern Archaeological Services 1998, '75 Bitterne Road, Bitterne Manor', *Archaeology in Hampshire Annual Report for 1998*, 38.

Stamper, P. A. 1983, 'The medieval forest of Pamber', *Landscape History*, 5, 41-52.

Stedman, M. 2003, 'Two early Anglo-Saxon metalwork pieces from Shawford (Compton and Shawford parish), Winchester', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 58, 59-62.

Stedman, M. 2004, 'Two Germanic Migration Period metalwork pieces from St Cross, Winchester, Hampshire', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 59, 111-5.

Stedman, M. and Stoodley, N. 2000, 'Eight early Anglo-Saxon metalwork pieces from the central Meon valley, Hampshire', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 55, 133-41.

Stoodley, N. 2005, 'Discussion: the early cemetery and its place within southern England', 75-81 in Birbeck.

Stoodley, N. 2006, 'Changing burial practice in seventh-century Hampshire; the Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Portway West, Andover', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 61, 63-80.

Stoodley, N. and Stedman, M. 2001, 'Excavations at Shavards Farm, Meonstoke: the Anglo-Saxon cemetery', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 56, 129-69.

Stoodley, N. ed. 2002, *The Millennium Publication. A review of archaeology in Hampshire 1980-2000*, Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society.

Strutt, K. D. 2006, 'Tidgrove Warren Farm Archaeological Project: an integrated approach to the study of an archaeological landscape', forthcoming in Campana and Forte ed.

Taylor, H. M. and J. 1965, *Anglo-Saxon Architecture*, 2 volumes, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Teague, S. 2005, 'Manor Farm, Monk Sherborne, Hampshire: archaeological investigations in 1996', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 60, 64-135.

Timby, J. 1988, 'The middle Saxon pottery', 73-120 in Andrews ed.

Tipper, J. 2004, *The Grubenhuis in Anglo-Saxon England*, Yedingham: The Landscape Research Centre.

Tweddle, D., Biddle, M. and Kjølbye-Biddle, B. 1995, *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Sculpture Volume IV. South-East England*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ulmschneider, K. 1999, 'Archaeology, history and the Isle of Wight in the middle Saxon period', *Medieval Archaeology*, 43, 19-44.

Ulmschneider, K. 2000, *Markets, Minsters and Metal-detectors. The archaeology of middle Saxon Lincolnshire and Hampshire*, Oxford: British Archaeological Reports British Series 307.

Walton Rogers, P. 2005, 'Gold thread' 68-9 in Birbeck.

Watson, P. V. 1982, 'Man's impact on the Chalklands: some new pollen evidence', 75-91 in Bell and Limbrey ed.

Watson, P. V. 1983, 'The pollen evidence', 159-62 in Millett.

Webster, L. and Cherry, J. 1976, 'Medieval Britain in 1975', *Medieval Archaeology*, 26, 1158-201.

Welch, M. G. 1976, reports in Cunliffe.

Welch, M. G. 1996, 'Anglo-Saxon Hampshire', 35-9 in Hinton and Hughes ed.

Whinney, R. 1981, 'Jack O'Toole's Row, Boarhunt – a medieval kiln dump', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 37, 41-8.

Whinney, R. 1985, 'One hundred years of Hampshire archaeology', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 41, 21-36.

Whitelock, D. ed. 1979, *English Historical Documents c. 500-1042*, second edition, London: Eyre Methuen.

Williams, H. 1997, 'Ancient landscape and the dead; the reuse of prehistoric and Roman monuments as early Anglo-Saxon burial sites', *Medieval Archaeology*, 41, 1-32.

Williams-Freeman, J. P. 1915, *An Introduction to Field Archaeology as Illustrated by Hampshire*, London: Macmillan.

- Wilson, D. M. 1964, *A Catalogue of the Anglo-Saxon Ornamental Metalwork 700-1100 in the British Museum*, London: Trustees of the British Museum.
- Winchester Museums Service 1993, *Nunnaminster. A Saxon and medieval community of nuns*, Winchester: Winchester Museums Service.
- Winder, J. 1980, 'The marine molluscs', 121-8 in Holdsworth.
- Wright, J. 2004, 'Excavation of early Saxon settlement and Mesolithic activity at Goch Way, near Charlton, Andover', *Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, 59, 116-38.
- Woolgar, C. M., Serjeantson, D. and Waldron, T. ed. 2006, *Food in Medieval England. Diet and nutrition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yorke, B. 1989, 'The Jutes of Hampshire and Wight and the origins of Wessex', 84-96 in Bassett ed.
- Yorke, B. 1993, 'Fact or Fiction? The written evidence for the fifth and sixth centuries AD', *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History*, 6, 45-50.
- Yorke, B. 1995, *Wessex in the Early Middle Ages*, London: Leicester University Press.
- Youngs, S. M. 1983, 'The gaming-pieces', 853-74 in Bruce-Mitford.
- Youngs, S. M. ed. 1989, *'The Work of Angels': Masterpieces of Celtic Metalwork, 6<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> Centuries A. D.*, London: British Museum Publications.