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Abstract

This thesis examines archaeological and historical evidence for the socio-economic organisation of the kingdom of East Kent as a territorial and social system during the Early to Middle Anglo-Saxon. Explicit archaeological and theoretical frameworks are considered to propose a hierarchical model of the spatial organisation of communities as a way of providing a micro-economic case-study of state formation. It is argued that the specific heuristic device of exchange relations, in combination with locational theory, allows for a more a synthetic perspective on the spatial patterning of past action and inter alia the dynamic forces underpinning the rise of kings and kingdoms. Within the spatial remit of this study, an innovative methodology is advocated. In addition to other classical economic and geographical analyses applied, the distributional approach examines the frequency or quantity of commodities with respect to units of economic consumption, such as individuals, households and communities. By examining the saturation levels of community consumption as represented in burial assemblages, a hierarchical model of value regimes underlying exchange sub-systems is suggested. Taken in combination with an analysis of the geographical organisation of settlement, this approach allows for a thesis on the way regional space was socially and spatially constructed in ways that restricted and monopolised allocative and authoritative resources. Correlations between spatially-distributed phenomena and features of the physical environment are assessed in order to posit a thesis on the social dynamic in land-holding underlying the territorial and spatially-definable conditions of reproduction. An assessment is made of the importance of restrictions on the movement of people in social formation, by analysing the relationships between routes of communication, the mortuary landscape, and the visual experience of movement. Finally, consideration of these phenomena with respect to changing exchange systems provides a model of Early Medieval state formation.
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I – Introduction and Context
Chapter 1: Introduction

“Kent is no mountain home of liberty, no remote fastness in which the remnant of an ancient race has found refuge; it is the garden of England, of all the English counties, that which is most exposed to foreign influence.” F.W. Maitland 1895, i

1.1 Introduction: Archaeology, space and exchange

Models of Anglo-Saxon landscapes usually start with Bede. Despite modern scholarship’s attempted deconstruction of the Historia Ecclesiastica, a map of Early Medieval England inevitably depicts the landscape in terms of the territorial polygons of emergent kingdoms mentioned by the venerable monk. Admittedly there are other corroborating early sources that suggest that Bede was relating a semblance of eighth-century political reality, such as the Tribal Hidage and the origin-myths of the seventh century (Brooks 1989; Yorke 1990), but it is often difficult to reconcile Bede’s human geography of the Early Anglo-Saxon gens with that of archaeology. The reasons for this are varied, and are as much related to inherent views of homogenous Germanic ethnic and cultural identities, as the epistemological pre-eminence of historical interpretations, processualist adaptations of New Geography and the intransigence of the archaeological record. The revelation by modern re-theorisation, that much past interpretation rested on inadequate basic assumptions, has been explored from a number of fronts, incorporating historical (e.g. Sims-Williams 1983; Geary 1983), anthropological (e.g. Wolf 1982; Bazelmans 1999) and geographical (e.g. Haggart 1971; Cosgrove 1989; Werlen 1993) arguments, yet adequate ‘rehumanised’ landscapes have yet to become a central feature of Anglo-Saxon research.

Many of the criticisms forwarded are not unique to Anglo-Saxon archaeology. In keeping with recent paradigmatic shifts in other social sciences, the move away from the positivist standpoint of New Archaeology has been most clearly marked by the changing focus to a more critical humanist perspective. Accordingly, the emphasis in geography away from Cartesian models wherein social interaction is impacted on by space, to an epistemology in which space is structured by action, finds much resonance in contemporary archaeology (e.g. Tilley 1994; Bender 1993). Rather than the static location of objects in space, a better understanding is gained from a concept in which “the spatial arrangement of objects becomes relevant as a necessary condition and consequence of human action rather than cause - the agents themselves are using different frames of reference for their orientation in the physical,
subjective and social worlds” (Werlen 1993, 143; Holt-Jensen 1999, 148). In practical terms, this shift in emphasis sees a move from the mapped versions of absolute space, to one which includes an interrogation of relative space. Thus, concepts of action such as transport costs, travel time and lived space, which stresses the importance of relative positions in space as key to the dynamics and location of geographical features (Holt-Jensen 1999, 75) become the central areas of investigation. As these concepts of distance include views of costs and time as “partial artefacts of socio-economic demands and technological progress”, Forer (1978, 235) defines their dynamics as structuring a constantly changing ‘plastic space’. Moreover, such space emphasises issues of this ‘cognitised environment’, the basis in which “man's perceptions, experience, knowledge and action form” (Granö 1981, 23), as individual interpretations of the ‘real’ environment.

Though many of the trends within geography over the last thirty years demonstrate these developments, few inroads have been made into the ‘meat and potato’ world of Anglo-Saxon landscape studies. The reason for this phenomenon is as much historical as reactionary. Just as the traditional multi-disciplinary approach of historical, place-name and archaeological investigation of Medieval archaeologists was never as receptive to the tenets of a New approach as the more anthropologically-inclined prehistoric disciplines, so too has it always drawn on the strong tradition of critical and humanist critique prevalent in branches of historical research. Consequently, processualist spatial models of the type employed by, for example, Arnold (1988/1997), Davies and Vierck (1974) or Huggett (1988), have not become the yardstick for wider research in the way that have similar models in Prehistoric contexts (e.g. Renfrew 1974; 1975; Hodder & Orton 1976; cf. Scull 1999). Following the geographical critique outlined above, it could be argued that, in part, these spatial approaches have yet to adequately address the landscapes of action underlying recognised spatial patterning. Whilst, for example, comparative regression models of specific artefact types, may well indicate the contrasting mobilisation of specific objects, the interpretation of these patterns in socio-economic terms has yet to be fruitfully explored in most cases (though see Hedeager 1992; 1993; 1998; Høilund-Nielsen 1997b and Myhre 1987 for recent important Scandinavian studies). The aim of the present study is therefore to offer a new perspective on the spatial remit of certain Anglo-Saxon social dynamics. By demonstrating the importance of agency and action in the constitution of exchange relations with respect to the geographical location of resources and landscape structures, it is argued that the spatial patterning of archaeological
evidence can be used to model broader social and economic structures comprising the early hegemons.

In contrast to pure phenomenological or existentialist claims, it is suggested that the modelling of Anglo-Saxon behaviour, inspired by the documentary sources, can take the informed middle-ground of idealist interpretation (Guelke 1981; 1982) as a stronger theoretical point of departure. Such an epistemological approach finds much ontological guidance from the structural agency theories of Bourdieu, Giddens and Foucault. In keeping with this view of enstructured spatial practice, Werlen (1993) impresses the need to see that actions form the social spaces of analysis, ranging from world 1 - the agent’s knowledge stock and biographical elements of space; world 2 - the social world in which the agent forms space as the product of action [habitus]; and world 3 - the physical world of material fact outside the agent’s body. From an archaeological point of view, such spheres of analysis could include the reconstruction of past landscapes and environmental conditions, the form of social relations and interaction, and a discussion of the conceptual universe of past agents.

Given these three interdependent foci of analysis, a number of different sources of information are utilised to offer contingent models of social action. Whilst it is not the aim of this work to offer a total ‘re-humanised’ landscape of Anglo-Saxon Kent, many of the issues raised by such anthropological, economic and geographical research bear importantly on the objective discussion of past exchange. Given the scope of such an undertaking, no claim can be made for comprehensiveness, and the key features used to highlight following interpretations represent in many cases merely a brief sketch of relevant research. Importantly, the multidisciplinary approach advocated stresses that humanised space need not necessarily be at odds with traditional empirical methodologies (cf. Llobera 1996). Whilst the spatial remit of social action is explored at a number of levels, it is argued that many of the geographical contexts of this action can be visualised via conventional media of maps and GIS. The incorporation of Werlen’s world 3 concept within the model of social space can in this respect be paralleled by recent discussions regarding environmental determinism in GIS (e.g. Gaffney & van Leusen 1995; Llobera 1996). A product of this debate argues that the abstraction of space, in the form of maps or GIS, can nevertheless be utilised as a heuristic device for the exploration of human affordances. The concept of affordances was originally demonstrated by Gibson (1986) and is described by Ingold (1992, 46) as the “properties of the real environment as directly perceived
by an agent in the context of practical action”; in other words, they describe the relationship between *habitus* and the real environment, or between Werlen’s three worlds (1, 2 and 3). The shift in emphasis from a view stressing the cultural imposition on an environment, to one showing a reflexive relationship between individuals and an environmental embodiment of past activity is shown schematically by Ingold below (*ibid.*; Fig. 1.1).

The important recognition of this relationship provides the framework for the exploration of economic relations taken as the central theme of this thesis, as it provides a context for spatial patterning.

“In the process of production, people create their environments, not in the sense of inscribing meaning into things (to yield ‘artefacts’), but in the sense that that environment is the embodiment of past activity. Objects in the environment, as Mead would say, are ‘collapsed acts’ (see Noble 1981, 79), they are as they are because of activities undertaken by persons in relation to them. The history of an environment is a history of the activities of all those organisms, human and non-human, contemporary and ancestral, that have contributed to its formation” (Ingold 1992, 30)

Everitt’s (1986) division of Kent into landscapes of colonisation and continuity, derived ultimately from a concept of *pays* or contrasting countrysides, which in many ways forms the basis of this study, recognised the interaction between environmental characteristics and divergent modes of social action. His comparison of the institutional development of settlement structure, taken with respect to the environmental circumstances over the whole period of settlement, through evidence as varied as place-names, documentary sources, topographical survey and archaeological data, forwarded the interpretation of *pays* as abstracted regions of *affordances*. The constant reproduction of similar practice in these regions, recognised economically, and in local legal and institutional structures, provides concrete evidence for continued contrasting social perceptions of the landscape. *Pays*, in this formulation, provide evidence of Giddens’ duality of structure, wherein both behaviour and behaviour’s reproduction of structure, are seen to converge with recognisable environmental zones in world 3 terms. It is argued therefore, that *pays* provide an ideal point of departure for investigating the spatial remit of economic activities during the period under discussion. Moreover, it is suggested that it is in the relationships between *pays* that many of the dynamics of social change and state formation which characterise this period are to be sought.
1.1.1 Thesis aims and objectives

The broad context of this study provides a number of specific and general aims for this thesis. The overarching theme, initially inspired by Hodges’ important work on Early Medieval socio-economic development (1982; 1989; etc.), is to enhance the debate on state formation by providing a case-specific micro-economic example of the structure of a single kingdom. Hodges’ proposed socio-evolutionary narrative of progressive change drew attention to the mutually-reinforcing elements of functional relationships - such as political structures, access to strategic resources and exchange relations - as prime movers to social development. This research aims to readdress the importance ascribed to these vertical hierarchies, firstly, by considering their definition in light of more recent research in archaeology, anthropology, history and economics, and secondly, with respect to additional horizontal hierarchies, such as valuation and gaming.

The need for such reassessment stems from recent concerns with the proposed model of Anglo-Saxon hierarchisation (e.g. Saunders 1990; 1991; 1995; Scull 1999). In the forwarded paradigm Anglo-Saxon state formation has often been interpreted as the result of exogenous factors, where the modes of inter-regional exchange are deemed of primary importance in determining indigenous change, without a clear understanding of what mechanisms governed local social and economic structures. As is discussed below, although gift-tribute systems are of clear importance, as is demonstrated both by contemporary sources and archaeological evidence, it remains to be seen whether the prestige-good system was fundamental, or merely a manifestation of underlying social relations. The latter view would suggest that, rather than an overt over-emphasis on long-distance exchange, local subsistence and raw material modes of production structured the relations of reproduction of both direct producers and the élite. As such, extra-economic modes of production (i.e. politico-military apparatus and luxury goods) are seen as complementary, though discrete economic spheres to primarily agricultural systems. In place of a previous bias towards a specific level of exchange activity therefore, this study focuses on economic systems in the broadest terms. Economic, as the extensive entries under this heading in the Oxford English Dictionary suggest, is a word rich with connotations. It can apply equally to the management and regulation of a household, frugality, maintained for the sake of profit or for the production of wealth, and the operations of nature in the generation, nutrition and preservation of animals and plants. Conceptually, it is tied to both issues of commerce and systemic regulation. As such, a more inclusive theory of raw material
procurement in the Anglo-Saxon Southeast is sought in this thesis, to complement the attention paid by previous scholars to the import distributions emanating from Kent (e.g. Chadwick-Hawkes 1982; Huggett 1988).

This concern with economic systems by necessity stresses not merely the prevalent social institutions but also the environmental circumstances in which they were structured. As such, Landscape, the second key term, also provides an etymological challenge. Related to the medieval German term Landschaft, landscape has been argued by some authors to refer to a restricted or administratively bounded piece of ground (e.g. Olwig 1996), and the association between landscape, defence and national integration has been suggested from a number of studies (e.g. Gold & Revill 2000; Sullivan 1998). In the case of Kent, this association is not to say that the landscape predetermined the territorial units that evolved, merely that, following Everitt (1986, 11), “the regio and the lathe were themselves evolving institutions necessarily moulded, as settlement expanded, by the intractable circumstances of locality and environment”. A theory of socio-economic change therefore requires both a concept of cultural dynamics and, as will be shown in this work, landscape dynamics, in which to accurately model the micro-economic settlement history of Kent.

Given the outlined spatial relationships between activities and resources, the investigation of these social hierarchies has required a number of new methodological approaches. An important by-product of these approaches is the production of a stand-alone database corpus and gazetteer of all Anglo-Saxon material, for the period under investigation, from the Kent case-study area (ASKED). The level and structure of information entered into the database, has allowed for the quantitative exploration of the archaeological material, particularly cross-comparisons of archaeological cemetery data, for statistical and spatial patterning. Whilst the latter component has in most cases involved the use of GIS methods, this research is not to be confused with yet another exercise in GIS modelling; neither is the remit specifically GIS orientated. Whereas the emphasis in these types of work is management – or sometimes simulation – driven, the use of GIS in this case is merely to offer an additional heuristic tool for the investigation of spatially-distributed phenomena and their relation to the physical environment. Nevertheless, despite the explicitly spatial agenda of this research, many of the conclusions drawn regarding higher-level phenomena derive ultimately from a rigid methodological approach at all levels of the archaeological data. As these phenomena are
interpreted as aggregates of lower-level (i.e. individual) behaviour, it was deemed important to re-evaluate the composition of all grave-groups entered in the ASKED, including the reinspection of the original excavated artefacts and documentation. However, although the corpus and gazetteer of all sites and artefacts from the region forms an important tool and necessary outcome, this is not in itself seen as an essential aim of this research (e.g. Richardson 2000; an abridged gazetteer of sites comprises Appendix A merely for illustrative purposes). The object of ASKED is simply to provide a rational management system from which models of spatial interaction can be drawn.

Finally, although the focus of this thesis is necessarily wide-reaching and multi-disciplinary, it is not an aim to explain all the archaeological and cultural phenomena that become apparent. What is offered are broad brushstrokes of interpretation based on several new lines of argument, which, in combination with the established database and GIS, seeks to promote future work in the region and provide a framework for future work in other areas.

1.1.2 Scope

The following section briefly outlines the scope of the research and the sources of information that have been drawn upon. More detailed examination of the data sources and the structure of the dataset is given in Chapter 6 and under the various sub-titles pertaining to specific lines of enquiry throughout the body of the thesis.

1.1.2.1 Region

Barbara Yorke has effectively argued that the foundation of the two bishoprics of Kent shortly after conversion, crystallised both a cultural and political division of the kingdom (1990, 27). The archaeological material from the two provinces (Chadwick-Hawkes 1982, 70-74) and evidence that later administration was initially through dual kings (Yorke 1983) and then ealdormen (Chadwick 1905, 192-3), has hinted at the existence of a primary East Kent kingdom which annexed the province to the west from more ethnically 'Saxon' gens during the sixth century (Yorke 1990, 27). This argument has been sustained with the possible identification of a 'western district' (or ge, related to the German Gau) within East Kent, centred on Wester in the parish of Linton, and corresponding with the 'eastern ge' of Easter-ge or Eastry (Brooks 1989, 69). As it is the East Kent kingdom that forms the basis of this study, a spatial boundary has been drawn roughly along the Medway Valley (a line running NS along 156500 N.G.R.)
demarcating the area of investigation from the modern county of West Kent beyond. Though this line is clearly arbitrary in terms of Anglo-Saxon administrative boundaries, it does have the benefit of both incorporating all of the cemeteries regarded as specifically ‘Jutish’ and the later diocesan boundary between the bishoprics of Canterbury and Rochester, as well as forming an easily referenceable spatial limit to the lists of find-spots and sites in the gazetteer.

1.1.2.2 Date range

Equally arbitrary temporal limits have been placed on this study. Although the initial start date of AD 400 relates to the historically-informed traditional start-date of the Early Anglo-Saxon Period, in fact, the earliest archaeological material entered into the database - that from the Stour Street and Marlowe Car Park excavations in Canterbury - dates from closer to the middle of the fifth century (Bennett 1980; Youngs 1981; Johns 1982, 361). Without drawing too many inferences from the documentary evidence, HE’s ‘Jutish’ settlement of AD 449, taken in conjunction with the lack of early fifth-century material, have suggested AD 450 as a better start-date for the four phases of seventy-five years, used in the statistical analyses of later chapters. The historical and social reasons for choosing AD 900 as the final cut-off point for this study are discussed below (1.2).

1.1.2.3 Data sources

This research draws on the full range of available evidence for the period under discussion. Archaeologically, this evidence primarily takes the form of excavated cemetery material during the earlier part of the period, and find-spots of Anglo-Saxon coins and metalwork during the later part. Included within the analysed catalogue are also a number of finds ascribed to ‘isolated burials’, i.e. where less than 3 individuals have been identified, which could relate to larger burial areas as yet unidentified; finds by metal-detection or excavation of individual artefacts of the period; artefacts and structures relating to the limited number of excavated settlement sites; as well as lists of topographical features, extant buildings and place-names argued to have Anglo-Saxon origin. The sources of information for these various sites are varied, but include: Kent Sites and Monuments Records; the local Thanet and Canterbury SMRs (housed and maintained by the Trust for Thanet and Canterbury Archaeological services respectively); individual site records - published and unpublished; existent gazetteers by Meaney (1967), Welch (pers. comm. 2000), and towards the completion of this thesis, Richardson (2000); anecdotal notes and records of the - now defunct - Broadstairs
Archaeological Society; and personal re-inspection of over 5000 archaeological objects. An outline of the methods of artefact identification is offered in Chapter 6.

Coins included in the corpus include all those listed on the Corpus of Early Medieval Coins (EMC) at http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/Coins/ems.html and in the annual editions of the *British Numismatic Journal* and *Numismatic Chronicle*. Identifications of coins usually follow the standards adhered to by these works. *Thrymsas* are generally given with reference to Sutherland 1948, whilst *sceattas* are usually detailed within the framework of Rigold's (1977) alphabetical series as modified by Stewart (1984) and Metcalf (1993a; 1993b; 1994). The few foreign coins included are classified with reference to Belfort (1892-5) or to the descriptions outlined by Rigold (1975).

Linked to the database, are a number of GIS map projections, either digitised manually from 1:25000 Ordnance Survey maps, or produced at 50m pixel resolution from 10m O.S. digital contours provided by the Digimap Project (http://edina.ac.uk/digimap/). Additional map sources digitised manually for isolated spatial tests include elements of the First and Second edition, six inches to a mile O.S. maps of 1877 and 1898 as well as 1:50,000 geological drift maps produced by the British Geological Survey based on Ordnance Survey National Grid sheets.

1.1.3 Arrangement of the Thesis

The body of this thesis falls into three discrete, though inter-dependent sections, as defined by the central interest in spatial and socio-economic organisation. The first two chapters outline the context of the study in current historical, archaeological and theoretical frameworks. In anticipation of the discussion of Kentish socio-economic structures in the final section (Chapters 6-9), Chapter 2 takes prevalent concepts of exchange in archaeological and anthropological theory as its central theme. The second section, comprising Chapters 3-5, details the physical and environmental characteristics of the landscape of Anglo-Saxon Kent; outlining issues relating to the reconstruction of the ‘real’ environment (Chapter 3), and social use of the environment in the form of movement (Chapter 4) and settlement (Chapter 5). The third section provides an outline of the micro-economic organisation of Anglo-Saxon Kent as seen in patterns of consumption and distribution. Following an outline of the methodological approaches attempted (Chapter 6), issues of value creation (Chapter 7) are placed within the
framework of the physical environment established in Section II (Chapter 8). General conclusions and aims for future research make up Chapter 9. Volume 2 features the appendices, including an abridged gazetteer (Appendix A), summarised from the ASKED dataset, as well as tables and figures referred to in the text.

1.1.4 The Anglo-Saxon Kent Electronic Database (ASKED)

Given the intentions of this investigation, with its emphasis on the exploration of potential inter-regional relationships, it was deemed necessary to develop an extensive electronic database of the Kentish archaeological material, in order to allow for a qualitative and quantitative exploration of the dataset. Given that past, often localised and particular datasets, cannot easily be considered in anything other than the framework within which the data had been constructed, a format was used that could unify all of the archaeological data for the period around a central unit of analysis: that is the individual in the burial. The resultant Anglo-Saxon Kent Electronic Database (ASKED) was developed in collaboration with Sue Harrington, another student at the Institute of Archaeology, UCL, whose investigation of aspects of gender and craft production in Early Anglo-Saxon England similarly required an electronic medium for statistical analyses. The database on which this study was based therefore aimed at a level of data entry which could encompass the broad aims of both researchers whilst also allowing for specialised individual analyses. Both studies required a fully contextualised dataset in which the artefactual data from furnished and unfurnished burials was structured within discrete grave groups at a uniform level of information and codification. Although input from modern published and recorded excavations provided the basis of much of the high-resolution data, some attempt was also made to re-contextualise older excavated material. Given the fragmentary nature of some of this material, in terms of excavation and recording method, as well as subsequent storage and dispersal, this element of data retrieval proved particularly difficult (Harrington 2000; 1.3.1 & Chapter 6 below). Around 300 published articles record in various levels of detail the 47 unambiguous cemeteries discernible within the 175 recorded Early Anglo-Saxon burial sites and over 600 find-spots. In addition to the information gleaned from this published archive, available artefacts, which were individually examined for weight, raw material content, and mineral-replaced textile fragments, were also entered. The database currently holds the individual burial record of over 3,000 interments and approximately 10,000 associated objects. Whenever possible, the exact locations of grave-goods and the details of the tool types that appear in the graves from the
sixth century onwards were recorded. Additionally, it was seen as valuable to inspect visually many of the artefacts from unpublished excavations either for the purposes of dating, or to complement existing discrete typological and artefactual analyses.

1.1.4.1 The ASKED format

Although ASKED exists as a stand-alone database constructed in Microsoft ACCESS, it is linked in various forms to GIS applications in ArcView, ArcInfo, Idrisi and GRASS. Within the database structure itself, relational tables have been constructed at the level of Site, Individual Grave, Artefact, Textile Fragment and so on (Fig. 1.2). To facilitate potential future research, in many ways, the level of detail recorded in respective tables, exceeds the requirements of the individual researchers. The gazetteer of archaeological sites is easily searchable by name, code, date, NGR or site-type, for example cemetery, isolated burial, find-spot or settlement. Although similar in format to the Kent SMR, the records achieve a greater level of chronological, structural and scholarly detail. Additional elements include: expanded bibliographic references; separate fields for locational information, for example ‘facing slope’, ‘distance to nearest Roman road’, ‘distance to nearest waterway’, ‘underlying drift geology’ and ‘dimensions’; as well as contextual information regarding the context of discovery, the current location of archive and finds, and lists of other relevant find-spots. Each site is given a provisional date range and the possible location of associated settlements is noted. Individual graves are given a unique identifier, derived from the cemetery site code and their grave number. The grave table holds details, where known, of the form of the grave, associated mortuary structures such as barrows or coffins, the position of the body, the biological sex and gender ascription of the individual, their stature and estimated age at death. A date range for the burial, derived from current knowledge, is also given. All artefact entries are linked back to the host grave and contain detailed information for each object including type, date range, raw material, weight, provenance and location in relation to the body of the interred. A table of associated textile fragments can be accessed from each object. The database structure allows for simple searches, for example, identifying all artefacts of the same type, provenance or date. It also allows for more complex crosstab queries incorporating arithmetic computations, such as the number of artefacts in a cemetery by type, or the association of certain brooch types with particular textile fragments. As such, the data structure allows for multivariate statistical analyses to be undertaken for full datasets at a variety of levels, for example, artefact position patterning within graves, graves by period/age/sex within cemeteries and phasing of
cemeteries within the region. Comparisons of these data sets within a statistical or GIS framework can identify the trend-surface patterns of artefacts, spatially and temporally, and could potentially be used for the predictive modelling of site locations.

1.1.5 The Kentish Anglo-Saxon Emporia Project (KASEP)

In addition to this research, further questions regarding the nature of Kentish trade and foreign contact during this period were deemed important issues to be explored archaeologically. The Kentish Anglo-Saxon Emporia Project was established in 1998 in an attempt to focus on the lack of archaeological evidence for trade and coastal trading places in Kent. By identifying key sites and researching the landscape in which they are sited (their settlement topography, environment, patterns of land-use and service network) KASEP hopes to provide evidence for a spatio-temporal model of the emporia and their hinterland development.

As part of these broader aims, members of the Institute of Archaeology, London have conducted field-work at the suggested emporia sites of Sarre and Fordwich in Kent under my direction since 1998. Extensive test-pitting, field-walking and geophysical prospection has allowed for early tentative suggestions regarding the size, shape and location of the Middle- to Late-Saxon settlements. These demonstrate, in concordance with previously held hypotheses, that the Anglo-Saxon settlements occupied much the same locations as their modern counterparts, despite some later medieval displacement and nucleation. Field-walking at Sarre for instance, has revealed concentrations of Mid-to-Late Saxon pottery fabrics stretched along the former Wantsum Channel shore to either side of the modern village. Similarly, seventh-century and later post-holes and features adjacent to the medieval town of Fordwich suggest that coastal changes and associated economic decline combined to nucleate both settlements at key nodal positions between waterborne and road modal systems. These findings and greater consideration of their contextual significance will soon be published in Archaeologia Cantiana (Brookes forthcoming b).

1.2 Historical background: setting the scene

1.2.1 A historiography of Anglo-Saxon Kent

Hengest and Horsa's arrival in three boats and the call for 'more' Anglian, Saxon and Jutish mercenaries from their homelands to settle this territory has been retold on numerous occasions. There is no reason to repeat the arguments regarding the validity of this origin myth
from historical and linguistic evidence which have been fruitfully discussed in more specialist
studies (e.g. Levison 1946; Turville-Petre 1953-7; De Vries 1959; Dumville 1977a; 1977b;
Chadwick-Hawkes 1982; Sims-Williams 1983; Brooks 1989; etc.). Despite Kent’s unique
‘historical threshold’ (Brooks 1989, 55) past attempts to outline a narrative of Kentish history
have, however, always been problematic (cf. Eales 1992, 7). The name is reputed to derive
from the Latin *Cantium*, either a latinised British ethnic name, or the preferable ‘cornerland,
land on the edge’ (Wallenberg 1931; Rivet & Smith 1979, 300), an incompletely defined
territory comprising much of the modern south-east counties of Kent, Surrey and Sussex,
which was settled, according to Bede, by the brothers Hengest and Horsa and their ‘Jutish’
followers in AD 449 (*HE*, 56) (Fig.1.3). Subsequently consolidated by Hengest’s son Æris Oisc
(488 - ?512), the ancestral figurehead of the Kentish royal genealogy, the kingdom only passed
dominate to historical reality with the coming to power of Eormenric and his
son Æthelberht (? - 616) who are both mentioned in Gregory of Tours’ narrative history (*HF*).
Until its final incorporation by the West Saxons in AD 825, Kent moved from political pre­
eminence to fitful independence from the Mercians and West Saxons after King Wihtred’s
submission to Ine of Wessex in AD 694.

Despite the uncertainties of secular politics, the growth and consolidation of the church
affords at least a partial index of social stability (Eales 1992, 8). The Viking raids from AD 830,
by contrast, transformed the pattern of tenure. By 900, the devastation of monastic life had led
to an extensive secularisation of Church lands as around a fifth of the taxable lands passed to
the West Saxon kings (*ibid*). It is primarily for this reason that a temporal end-point to this
study is arbitrarily placed at AD 900. Although some of these estates subsequently passed back
into Church hands (e.g. Reculver and Lyminge granted to Christchurch in 949 and 964
respectively, and Minster-in-Thanet to St. Augustine, Canterbury in 964), the changes in land
 tenure during the latter half of the ninth century and the economic changes in the landscape
resulting from this period of turmoil make this date a useful end to a study of landscape and
socio-economic history.

Historical sources for a period of almost 500 years are suitably varied, and synthetic treatments
integrating social and geographical phenomena are correspondingly thin on the ground
(Brooks 1989 and Chadwick-Hawkes 1982 remain two of the few exceptions). Whilst recent
reassessment of the ethnic character of archaeological material from the early kingdoms of
England (e.g. Hines 1984; Sørensen 1999) go some way towards linking migration period ethnicity with documentary mythology, investigations of the underlying dynamics of state formation from explicitly economic view-points are much rarer. This is somewhat surprising given that, even in Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (HE), past ethnicity was the only thing essentially differentiating the people of Kent from those of Northumbria. Although regional studies in Bassett's (1989) *Origins of Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms* relate repeated socio-economic patterns and characteristics, expanded treatment of local micro-economic phenomena, required for the construction of broader pan-regional models, are, in the main still awaited. Accordingly, the following section outlines the available documentary evidence for economic activity in the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Kent, preliminary to a reassessment of the archaeological material discussed in greater depth in following chapters. Documentary evidence for the geographical and topographical structure of the kingdom and the internal context of discussed exchange patterns is elaborated in Chapter 3.

### 1.2.2 Documentary sources

The comparatively large, and certainly the earlier, number of historical records for Anglo-Saxon Kent have emphasised this kingdom's importance in concomitant theoretical models of Anglo-Saxon state formation (cf. Brooks 1989, 55). Bede's emphasis on the Augustinian mission to Kent, and the importance Kentish sources played in providing the information for his narrative history, meant that this kingdom features prominently throughout the HE. The origin myth cited above (1.2) is preserved in the HE as well as the *Historia Brittonum* (HB) and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (ASC), and additional fragments of the royal genealogy and annals are found in the 'Anglian Collection' and other continental manuscripts (*ibid*). Additional sources, in the form of the law codes of Æthelberht, Hlothhere and Eadric, and Wihtred, as well as contemporary diplomas and charters, provide important evidence closer in date to actual events; as indeed does Gregory of Tours' *Historiae Francorum* (HF) and copies of papal letters relating to the progress of the Gregorian mission (Kirby 1991, 23-4; James 2001, 154-60).

### 1.2.3 The historical model for Kentish economic development

In part, interpretations of the archaeological material of the county are the product of retrogressive argumentation from these and other early sources. The importance ascribed to ethnic 'Jutish' origins, for example, has recently been exposed to rely closely on tacit assumptions of past ethnic specificity and regionalism, inferred directly from the extant sources
Of greater importance for this work, has been a thesis linking state formation in Kent with expansionist policies in contemporary Frankia (cf. Hodges 1982; Chapter 2 below). Central to this argument is a belief that Kent developed as a peripheral state to the Frankish hegemon, as a result of the creation of a new northern economic area, tied to the Merovingian Frankish aristocracy (cf. Pirenne 1939). As the focus of commercial and political activity, Frankia is seen as the centre of a diffusionary pattern of social and economic developments throughout the period, and Merovingian connections and developments are fundamental to a consideration of Early Medieval state formation. Archaeological proponents of this thesis have argued that these links are visible in a pattern of exchanged goods and material culture that are at their most characteristic for Britain in Kent, during the so-called 'Frankish Phase' (Chadwick-Hawkes 1982).

The historian Ian Wood has produced a number of important papers on the nature of Kentish-Frankish contact during the late fifth to seventh centuries (Wood 1983; 1990; 1992; 1996). Due to the lack of direct allusions regarding Frankish policy to the north of Frankia by Gregory of Tours, Ventatius Fortunatus, Fredegar and Procopius, much of the documentary evidence for the sixth and seventh centuries provides only fragmentary insights into the political reality of the period. The one-sided nature of the early sources and the fluidity of Migration-Period tribal groupings and confederacies compound problems in disseminating the tribal geography of the period, for they reflect the Frankish world-view rather than any objective formulation of reality.

Of particular interest, however, is the record in Roman sources of a series of Germanic pirate raids from c.12 BC onwards (Haywood 1991, 5). In the fifth century Sidonius Apollinaris regarded both the Franks and Saxons as maritime peoples (Wood 1983, 5). Certainly Saxon piracy was a common feature in the North Sea until well into the sixth century, and the *Litus Saxonicum*, mentioned in the *Notitia Dignitatum*, implies that Saxons were the most prominent group of Germanic seafarers to trouble the coast of late-Roman Britain (Haywood 1991, 52). Frankish naval prowess appears also to have been a fundamental force in North Sea politics however (Wood 1990, 94), though the interpretation that it was a Frankish fleet which repulsed the Danish Hygelac's raid in the sixth century remains somewhat controversial (ibid., 84).

---

1 A view which seems also to have been fostered by the Merovingians themselves as the mythological dynastic founder Merovech can be taken to mean 'sea-bull' or 'sea-born' (Wood 1996, 359).
The environment of maritime warfare evident in documentary sources until the seventh century presents a likely backdrop to confusing accounts regarding Frankish claims of cross-Channel authority. Given Merovingian expansionist policy to the east and south of the realm, it would naturally seem in their interest to protect the Frankish heartland from piracy on its northern coasts. Some garbled testimony for Frankish authority in England has been interpreted from a reading of Procopius, who is assumed to have received some reliable information regarding Frankish Northern policy from the Frankish delegation to Constantinople in c.AD 553 (Wood 1983, 3). He records a curious tale that shipments were regularly ferried from the port of Boulogne to an island of dead souls in Brittia (presumably Britain) (Wars VIII xx 49). Wood believes that Procopius has confused the Greek word thanatos (dead) with the place-name ‘Thanet’ (1996, 341) which would go far to explain the subsequent comment “that this was a service exacted by the Franks from the fishermen living opposite the island in a place of tribute” (Wood 1983, 6) – in this sense, probably mainland Kent (Fig. 1.3). A further tale relates that the embassy of 553 included Angles, in order to demonstrate Frankish overlordship of Brittia, as these Angles had been resettled within the Frankish kingdom from the island (ibid., 12).

Further evidence for Merovingian claims over Kent could be supplied by the Pactus Legis Salicae (39, 2) from the end of Clovis’ reign, which legislates the procedures to be followed in foreign courts for the return of servi who had been carried off trans mare (Wood 1983, 13; Haywood 1991, 86). Certainly Theudebert II (596-612) and Theuderic II (596-613) continued to regard Kent as being within their sphere of influence (Wood 1983, 12) and such Kentish-Frankish contact should explain the similarities between the law-codes and wergild prices of the two kingdoms (ibid., 13), as it does the marriage between Bertha and Æthelbert, prince and subsequently king of Kent in the 580s.

Although these sources may record Frankish political aspirations rather than reality, enough evidence exists to postulate significant cross-Channel connections throughout the sixth century between Kent and Frankia. That these Frankish kings claimed sovereignty over Kent at least indicates the existence of a Frankish fleet with which they could enforce their authority if necessary (Haywood 1991, 86); whilst Procopius’ narrative possibly suggests some regular commercial activity between the kingdoms. Clovis’ legislation adds a third dimension. If trans
mare can be assumed to mean Kent, the appearance of Frankish slaves in that kingdom could imply either that relations between the two kingdoms may not have been entirely amicable, or that it was via Kent that Frankish slaves were returned after abductions by other Anglo-Saxon raiders. Alternatively, a further, less violent explanation finds analogy in current political events: Clovis’ legislation may simply relate to slave stowaways on Kentish or Frankish vessels crossing the Channel (Welch pers. comm. 2001).

Despite the lack of direct allusions to seventh-century trade between Kent and the Continent, the period is marked by a number of known cross-Channel voyages undertaken by bishops and missionaries, implying that finding a boat to cross the Channel was not a particularly daunting prospect (cf. Brooks 1984). Fordwich, the presumed port of Canterbury, is mentioned incidentally in a charter of Hlothaire in 675 (Sawyer 1968, no.7 – further references as ‘S’), whilst Sandwich is recorded as the landing place of St. Wilfrid in 664/5 (Eddius Life of St. Wilfrid, Chapter XIII; Vince 1994, 110). It is only in the middle third of the eighth century that a number of trading privileges, granted to ecclesiastical communities on their ships, attest to commercial activities being targeted at Kent, and via Kent to London (Kelly 1992).

This group of royal charters has recently been discussed by Susan Kelly and deserves some closer attention (1992 for this and the subsequent paragraphs). Five of the charters (S 86, S 87, S 91, S 143 & S 2) are grants for remission of tolls on ships belonging to the abbesses of Minster-in-Thanet dating from c.730 to c.764 at the ports of London, Sarre and Fordwich. In addition, S 1612 (c.762-4) details a grant in favour of the church of Reculver on a ship at the port of Fordwich. Kelly has effectively argued from these toll-charters that the community of Minster had accumulated at least three trading-ships during this period, one of which appears to have been built to order at Minster itself (cf. S 29; ibid.).

The interest shown by the communities of Minster and Reculver (which are both sited on the former Wantsum Channel – Fig. 1.3 and Chapter 3) in commercial activities seems to suggest that they were attempting to access a lucrative shipping-route from northern France through the Wantsum to London and Canterbury. Furthermore, as royal tolls were exercised on ecclesiastical trading vessels, it would appear that the Minster, Reculver and Rochester communities were interested in selling as well as buying merchandise at the emporia of London and Fordwich (ibid., 15). Minster’s estate holdings included tracts on Romney Marsh (where
sheep were already reared in large numbers during the eighth century) and on the Wantsum itself (an area of supposed Anglo-Saxon salt panning) (ibid., 16) and it is certainly also plausible that these ships were acquiring products at the Continental emporia.

These charters present the earliest known clear allusions to Kentish, specifically Wantsum Channel, trade. Unfortunately, the granting of such toll-privileges appears to have been a short-lived and unrepeated addition to the diplomatic repertoire of the mid-eighth century, and as such, no chronological conclusions can be derived regarding commercial activities. That the Minster nunnery was founded merely two generations before the earliest toll-charter was issued would seem to argue against a suggestion that this represents the earliest trading activity in the Wantsum, but any such interpretation is somewhat speculative. Some credence is given to the argument for an earlier origin for taxable trade-routes by seventh-century Kentish law-codes mentioning a king's wię-gerfa at London. Should this term be equitable with the Latin prefectus, such allusions are evidence of the early operation of an office of the ‘reeve’, enforcing toll-collection on trading-ships travelling to London, probably via the Wantsum Channel in the seventh century (cf. Kelly 1992, 19).

1.3 The archaeological sample: previous work
The hypotheses raised by the extant documentary sources have informed many of the interpretations made from the existent archaeological evidence. In order to examine the archaeological framework for these interpretations, the following section outlines a brief history of excavation in Kent, as a prelude to a discussion of local models posited from the archaeological evidence. The broader importance of these local models is discussed in the following chapter.

1.3.1 A brief history of excavation in Kent
1.3.1.1 Archaeological interventions before the twentieth century
Anglo-Saxon funerary archaeology in Kent figures prominently in all discussions of Early Medieval England. A long history of archaeological interventions, the great wealth of material and the large numbers of Anglo-Saxon burials found, especially in the East Kent region under discussion, have provided the source material for many of the studies on artefacts and mortuary behaviour. Excavations of Anglo-Saxon graves in Kent are attested from as early as the seventeenth century (cf. Browne 1884), and surviving records detailing finds at Reculver in
1700 (Battely 1745), Crundale in 1703 (Faussett 1856) and Greenwich in 1714 (Douglas 1793) suggest widespread antiquarian interest in the, then still visible, mortuary structures throughout the early eighteenth century. Amongst the earliest published cemetery sites are a large number identified and excavated by the Rev. Brian Faussett between 1760 and 1773, who, despite antiquarian techniques, nevertheless recorded the individual graves to a standard which was well in advance of his time (cf. Chadwick-Hawkes 1991). Within limits, the observations recorded by Faussett in the *Inventorium Sepulchrale* (posthumously published in 1856) were detailed enough to be integrated within the database structure. Unfortunately, however, the collection itself, which was acquired by Joseph Mayer (1803-86) and transferred to Liverpool in the nineteenth century (Rhodes 1991) has not been as easily assimilated. The carefully detailed contextual information for the artefacts recorded by Faussett, has subsequent been lost due to the disarticulation of most grave-good assemblages. Although some artefacts can be re-identified via the published illustrations, most of the 'mundane' material cannot be placed in a grave, or indeed in most cases, even a cemetery context. Additionally, some subsequent dispersal and the World War II bombing of Liverpool City Museum, which saw the material from the extensive Ozengell cemetery lost, has further denuded the collection.

Other notable antiquarian archaeologists such as Capt. J. Douglas, C. Roach Smith, T.G. Godfrey-Faussett and J. Brent, amongst others, added to the growing corpus of Anglo-Saxon material from Kent, although their publications of excavations were recorded at various levels of competence (Brent 1862/3; 1864/5; Douglas 1793; Godfrey-Faussett 1876; 1880; Smith 1847; 1852; 1853; 1854; 1856; 1857; 1860; etc.). In addition to excavations, records of further finds by Hasted (1797-1801) and the collector Boys (1792) present a reasonably detailed picture of the Anglo-Saxon mortuary landscape as it was known in the eighteenth century. Most of this material has also subsequently undergone various 'collection traumas', perhaps most usefully illustrated by the material excavated by John Brent at Sarre in 1863 (Brent 1862/3; 1864/5). This cemetery was extensively investigated and published in some detail, with unusual care being taken to record individual grave assemblages, their position *in situ* and other depositionary factors. Although a cemetery plan was produced, no individual grave plans exist, however; nor was any mention made of grave structures (Perkins 1991, 140). Custodianship of the material fell to a number of institutions including the British Museum, Maidstone Museum, Cambridge University, the Ashmolean, Rochester and Canterbury Museums (the 1990 material from Sarre is located in the Trust for Thanet Archaeology headquarters outside Broadstairs),
but subsequent handling and archiving has managed to disassociate most of the artefacts from their original grave contexts. In addition, much of the Sarre material housed in Maidstone Museum has also become confused with artefacts excavated by T.G. Godfrey-Faussett at Bifrons in 1867, making the reassignment of material even to the correct cemetery, difficult if not impossible, in most cases. An equally important omission is the loss of the material from King’s Field, Faversham. Combined railway construction and brick-earth digging all but destroyed the clearly exceptional Anglo-Saxon cemetery between 1858 and 1874. Despite significant antiquarian interest in the site, only a few graves were recorded (by John Brent in 1874), and the large body of material remaining from the cemetery today is both uncontexted and diffused across a number of collections.

1.3.1.2 Twentieth- and twenty-first-century archaeology in Kent

In 1999, the deaths of Sonia Chadwick-Hawkes and Kenneth Witney ended an important period in the analysis of Anglo-Saxon Kent that had started with a revival of interest in Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in the post-war era. Increased development throughout the region had sparked a number of excavations during the 1950s and 60s (e.g. Warhurst 1955; Jenkins 1957). Of those excavated by Vera Evison and the late Sonia Chadwick-Hawkes, many have found their way into some form of print, and much of the basic dating chronology and overall patterning outlined here is a direct result of their careful and well-researched work (e.g. Evison 1987; Chadwick 1958; Chadwick-Hawkes & Pollard 1981). The piecemeal publication of some of these cemeteries and almost all of those excavated either fully or partially since 1970, often by contracted field units, has conversely hampered some dissemination. Of the cemeteries excavated to modern standards, the publication of Mill Hill Deal I (Parfitt & Brugmann 1997) provides an important recent addition from which to draw parallels with previous excavations, although it is unfortunate, from the point of view of comparison, that the cemetery seems only to have been in use during the sixth century. Luckily, access has been granted to most of the modern material and its inclusion within the database and statistical analysis is a direct reflection of the generosity and support offered by museums and field-units throughout the country.

1.3.2 A synopsis of current archaeo-historical models

Somewhat in contrast to the historical interpretations of Early Medieval Kentish-Continental contact, archaeological views have tended towards considerations of the social organisation of
the exchange systems visible in a pattern of material movement and the role traded exotica played in local spheres of consumption. Whilst the theoretical remit of Kent’s place in broader social phenomena is discussed below (2.3.2), a number of additional works have done much to clarify evidence regarding the volume and nature of cross-Channel contact, visible in local patterns of archaeological data. Three, quite different, archaeological summaries by Huggett (1988), Welch (1991) and Sørensen (1999) in particular, provide an important basis for identifying the primary socio-economic dynamics underlying local material culture.

Welch believes the distribution of culturally specific metalwork and other artefacts from the grave-assemblages of Kent, north-west France and the Isle of Wight (which, according to Bede, was ethnically and politically tied to the kingdom of Kent during the Early Anglo-Saxon period) can be explained in terms both of the movement of small numbers of immigrants or exogamy, and exchange between the regions. The apparent limited occurrence of such characteristic artefacts outside the Kentish political region (where c.90% are clustered) is explained within the model of a Frankish-Kentish trade monopoly suggested by historical and theoretical sources (cf. 2.3.2 and 2.6.2 below). Further social exclusivity is also argued to be visible in terms of the relative wealth of these Kentish grave assemblages, when compared with those from other Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, and this tendency is also visible in the cemeteries of the Isle of Wight, notably at Chessell Down.

The identification of immigration and exogamy has generally been on the basis of ‘foreign’ elements within grave-assemblages, argued to demonstrate the specific ethnic affiliation of the interred individual. Welch draws his interpretation by defining two distinct forms of such material culture (1991; 1992): ‘foreign’ objects of domestic function and others of inferred luxury value, which he relates to potentially differing modes of transference. Studies of handmade pottery appear to suggest that distributions of specific types, or stamp-groups, were limited to local communities (cf. Myres 1977, 59-64) and therefore best explained by local production and distribution mechanisms, including transference by exogamy and local exchange. Exotic metalwork on the other hand, is argued to reflect both specialist production and restricted social use. As such, their distribution is often implicitly understood within luxury-good exchange mechanisms, or as migratory heirlooms.
Expanding on the trade thesis, Huggett’s important paper on imported objects in Anglo-Saxon grave-assemblages (1988) outlined a number of visible spatial trends which he regarded as indicative of broader economic phenomena (Fig. 1.4 - 1.6). Fall-off curves generated from the distribution of a number of different imported artefacts provided evidence of two distinct regression patterns. Group I artefacts, such as wheel-thrown pottery vessels, glass vessels and amethyst beads, were recognised as clustering in Kent, with find-spots outside this region fitting an exponential regression curve of the form predicted by down-the-line exchange (ibid., 89). Group II artefacts, such as amber beads, ivory rings, or crystal beads, on the other hand were found to be distributed throughout southern England in a pattern more indicative of directional trade (ibid.). Huggett went on to suggest that these differential patterns are likely to be the result of two separate economic processes of foreign interaction. Whilst the near monopoly of Group I artefacts in Kent were interpreted within the model of restricted continental trade to be outlined in Chapter 2, the pattern of Group II artefacts suggested their exchange both through a number of localised centres or people, and possibly via alternate trade routes around and across the North Sea (ibid., 91-2).

Continued continental contact has also been suggested by Sørensen’s (1999) analysis of ‘Jutish’ ethnicity. In her work, contextual analysis of the archaeological, documentary, traditional and linguistic evidence for ethnic ‘Jutes’ in both the three alleged settlement areas and continental homelands, was contrasted with the migration models proposed by Anthony (1990; 1992; 1997). Re-analysis of specific pottery and metalwork, previously attributed a ‘Jutish’ provenance, and a reconsideration of the context of deposition, demonstrated a substantial time-lag between historically-attested migration and phases of exceptional consumption of ‘foreign’ artefacts. Sørensen’s chronological interpretation of this phenomenon is seen with respect to Anthony’s phase of ‘stream migration’, where initial migration involved movement to and from the home and newly settled lands (Anthony 1990, 903; Sørensen 1999, 227). Conspicuous consumption in this model, belongs to a secondary phase of settlement, classed the ‘establishment phase’, where the descendants of migratory apex families sought ideological ethnic symbols to legitimise their social position (Sørensen 1999, 226-7). These symbols could take the form of inherited heirlooms, locally-produced pseudo-ethnic metalwork, and constructed symbolic assemblages and rituals.
1.4 Discussion: traffic or trade, some wider questions

Whilst this previous work provides the important framework for some of the courses of past spatial action, many of the important implications of this research have yet to receive specific treatment in current literature. The abiding omission is a reluctance to entertain a discussion of the interplay between action and structure. Following Giddens (1981; 1984), social change is a result of the forces of people’s subjective experience and the way these experiences shape both their practice and struggles. Social power in this perspective can be seen as the outcome of struggle over the allocative and authoritative resources, such as material wealth or decision-making power, resources which have both a spatial and socially uneven distribution. In this work, a comparison between inter-regional and local trade, as well as an investigation of the local processes of redistribution from a specific micro-economic perspective, is utilised to attempt a more flexible understanding of the spatial and social processes of marginalisation, dominance and reproduction. Although imported goods, such as those discussed by Huggett, are generally identifiable, further understanding of the local responses to trade require an investigation into the precise direction of regional diffusion and the loci of consumption. Such an endeavour, and the wider implications of this research, form the basis of Chapter 2.

A second area of investigation is also evident however. Specific past interest in the social context of inter-regional trade and the concomitant focus on patterns of consumption, has to some extent, avoided the issue of the spatial network of this inferred commerce. Whilst some links have been drawn between the historical references to trade and material culture with respect to the media of exchange (e.g. Arnold 1980, 91; Gaimster 1992) and the identification of specific trading-centres (e.g. Hodges 1982; 1989), little attempt has been made to assess the shape of mercantile activity itself from an archaeological point of view.

In this respect, analogous work into the nature of contemporary trading connections of Celtic Britain and Ireland may offer certain insights. In a number of recent papers Jonathan Wooding has characterised trade along the western seaboard of Britain during the post-Roman period in terms of a ‘tramp steamer’ trade pattern (Wooding 1996). As such, archaeologically recognised Irish links with Western Gaul in this suggestion are seen, not in terms of a specific wine trade, but more along the lines of “non-specific trade, probably with ships carrying a variety of goods to more than one destination” (ibid., 73). Though wine is not necessarily accorded a central role, this characterisation explains the movement of historically-attested honey, hides and salt,
as well as offering an explanation for the appearance of fairly coarse imported E-wares around the Irish Sea, which, as low value/high bulk commodities would not have justified independent commerce. This trade, Wooding argues, formed the western extension of an eastern Mediterranean trade network and was therefore subject to uncertain risk, prohibitively high transaction costs and dangerous shipping patterns, which contributed to its sporadic and discontinuous nature. Such fragmentary links, he goes on to assert, are better characterised as traffic rather than trade, as the latter implies a continuous and reciprocal relationship not visible in the Irish Sea context.

In some respects, Wooding's interpretation offers a number of helpful guidelines for the interpretation of contemporary exchange along the eastern seaboard. Indeed, given this view of traffic, both of Huggett's regression models could be accommodated within the same distribution system. Monopolistic trade between Frankia and Kent may represent only part of a sequence in a global economic system. Given Kent's strategic position at the head of the entire eastern coastal trading network, it is in fact unsurprising that most foreign trade is concentrated in this region. Moreover, from a continental merchant's point of view, the Kent market offers the highest returns for the least risk, and it is possible that this translated both into increased mercantile interaction and a higher volume of trade in high bulk/low value commodities. The inferred link between wheel-thrown pottery, and possibly even glass vessels, with a nascent wine trade (cf. Evison 1979) could hypothetically be interpreted in this light. Once in Kent, the 'tramp steamer' model suggests that traders may have occasionally traded further up the coast, weather and mercantile opportunities permitting, before returning to their home ports. Given that it is uneconomic to continue shipping high bulk goods further than is required, the objects of this trade are more likely to have been of low bulk and high value, as well as being specifically targeted at local patterns of consumption and taste. The widespread distribution of peaks for Group II artefacts, such as amber and crystal beads, could indicate a number of such specific trading places or individuals. Importantly, East Kent remains the highest consumer in both types of regression model, arguing that, even in the case of such directional trade, Kent was always the primary trading partner.

Wooding's characterisation of 'tramp steamers' offers a subtle addition to the model of early medieval trade, which, with the evidence for migration and exogamy, suggests a number of different artefact displacement schemata. Whilst such a model admirably takes into
consideration documentary and archaeological evidence for contemporary levels of social and political violence and their impact on mercantile rationale, this very environment must however also be recognised as an important mode of material transference. Certainly, close political relations between the kingdom of Kent and the 'Jutish' settlement of the Isle of Wight and southern Hampshire, as well as the continental homelands, could only have been realised through maritime connections. As such, the well-documented historical references for Saxon raiding may allow us to postulate an environment of Kentish entrepreneurial maritime opportunism in which Kentish communities profited from fishing, piracy, as well as trade with their Frankish, Frisian and Saxon neighbours (Brookes 1998, 50).

1.5 Conclusions
Historical and archaeological studies of Anglo-Saxon Kent have identified a number of socio-economic processes underlying the structure of the early kingdom. Of particular importance has been the role attributed to Kent in the monopoly of foreign exotica emanating from, or via, neighbouring Frankia, witnessed in documentary sources and the dense patterns of imported goods in the county. The distribution of these luxury-goods, and the evolutionist models proposed by analogy with the later documented emporia sites within the same geographical zone, have pre-eminenced the early Kentish material as central to macro-economic interpretations. In the diffusionist pattern of settlement, trading connections, state formation, and Christianisation, Kent therefore features as the focal node of impact, presumably due to the inevitable shipping patterns around the East Kent headland. Whilst several potential modes of artefact transference have been posited comprising the East Kent/continental connection; including the physical movement of people, autonomous mercantile activity, raiding and plunder, it remains to be seen how such movement fits within wider theorisation on the nature of socio-economic development over the course of the period. As part of such an endeavour, several key lines of enquiry present themselves:

1. In what ways can we link exchange systems with social complexity?
2. In what ways can we differentiate between sub-systems of exchange, including differential value regimes?
3. What is the social and spatial relationship between production, exchange and consumption?
4. Was regional space socially and spatially constructed in ways that restricted and monopolised allocative and authoritative resources?
2.1 Introduction: expanding the horizons of exchange

Some assessment of the main theoretical trends in the interpretation of past economic activity is an important preliminary task for any study of socio-economic development during the Early Medieval Period. This chapter identifies and explores four essential approaches, deriving ultimately from archaeological, anthropological, economic and geographical theory. These approaches can be labelled as:

a) Configurational
b) Contextual
c) Spatial
d) Distributional

and in many ways form the subtext of this thesis, as they underpin both the methodological and theoretical basis of further interpretations.

The configurational approach attempts the modelling of exchange patterns from identified archaeological data. Excavated production centres, market-places, craft-working debris or artefact typologies focus attention on the patterning of the archaeological record and interpretations drawn from this material. Contextual approaches alternatively, draw on social theory to model inferred exchange systems on the basis of other recognised social systems. Implicit within these models is the belief that exchange systems are a reflection of wider institutional processes, as exemplified in Systems, Structuralist and Marxist theory. Spatial approaches attempt the modelling of economic exchange from the spatial patterning of commodities or hierarchies of settlement. Finally, the distributional approach attempts to model the “differential distribution of commodities among the society’s primary units of economic consumption” i.e. households or individuals (Hirth 1998, 454).

Although these sub-headings will be returned to on a number of occasions throughout this work, it is important to note that none of these approaches forms an exclusive body of study, and indeed they can often be seen as complementary methodologies. Central to most of the cited works is a concern with trade and exchange, not only as an investigation into the

---

1 As similar approaches have been recently discussed in an article concerned with the identification of market economics in the Mesoamerican archaeological record (Hirth 1998), the nomenclature adopted in that work has been appropriated here.
archaeologically recoverable spatial effects of 'movement' (i.e. certain configurational models) but also with its powerfully perceived explanatory role in modelling interaction between 'societies' (contextual approaches). The reasons for this use of trade as a theoretical bridging argument are outlined by Shortman and Urban (1987, 49):

"The choice of trade as the means towards this end is understandable considering the following points: it is a process that produces archaeologically recoverable results, thereby avoiding the vagueness of diffusion, and it can be tied into the economic subsystem of a culture, thereby appealing to the materialist tendencies of evolutionary archaeology."

Thus, deriving from ethnographic parallels that have observed economic relations as a catalyst for cultural change, trade has been interpreted as a societal subsystem that, superficially at least, is archaeologically identifiable. Further theorisation has founded an orthodoxy united in the perception of trade as a dynamic to social hierarchisation and cultural complexity as well as offering a point of entry into investigations of mechanisms of interaction within and between past societies. Such interpretations have not proceeded without debate however. It could be argued that our ethnocentric, capitalistic investigations of economic behaviour have tendenced towards social evolutionary generalisation, whilst oversimplifying the role of exchange within social and political institutions. Furthermore, the problematisation of archaeological interpretation itself has critically highlighted the ambiguity of the material record with regards to trade and exchange.

Part of the methodological problem in the investigation of trade and exchange has been the abstraction of spatio-temporal movement in terms of large spatial and macro-social units when it is the "relationship between individual agency from which all artefact structure and patterning must ultimately arise" (Tilley 1986, 1). Thus, although the study of exchange from the point of view of regional artefact studies is fairly well developed, many overarching models derive ultimately from anthropologically- or historically-determined hypotheses or archaeological type-sites. Against this backdrop, the socio-evolutionist tenor of many interpretations of the period under discussion are dependant on two great cultural developments; the reorganisation of Roman Britain under an immigrant Anglo-Saxon elite during the fifth century, and the emergence of a new centralised and urbanised political system over the course of subsequent centuries. Archaeologically, both these developments can be characterised by two predominant sources of data, the Early Anglo-Saxon mortuary landscape
and the emergence from the seventh century of special commercial or trading settlements (*wics* or *emporium*). The evidence from written sources to help clarify these developments is sketchy. Certainly, it seems safe to say that kingdoms had come into existence by the late sixth and the early seventh century, ruled by kings claiming continental Germanic ancestry (Kirby 1991; Yorke 1990) but the mechanisms of their evolution or indeed structure, are less easily inferred. In part a reflection of this documentary vacuum, both developments remain amongst the most contentious in Anglo-Saxon archaeology and history, with little consensus either on the nature and scale of Germanic colonisation, or whether Anglo-Saxon kingdoms can be effectively modelled within Renfrew’s Early State Module (1974; 1975; Renfrew & Level 1979; cf. Scull 1995; 1999).

These two specific Early Medieval areas of debate ultimately bias any interpretative framework extrapolated from archaeology. Interpretative propositions, regardless of the approach adopted, essentially make broader (contextual) assumptions about the structure of past economy and kinship systems; an issue implicit in Lévi-Strauss’ view of economics:

> “The rules of kinship and marriage serve to ensure the circulation of women between groups, just as the economic rules serve to ensure the circulation of goods and services, and linguistic rules the circulation of messages. These three forms of communication are also forms of exchange which are obviously interrelated (because marriage relations are associated with economic prestations, and language comes into play at all levels)” (Lévi-Strauss 1963, 83).

The implications of this view are far-reaching, but can be summarised in the following way. Archaeologically-recoverable material representations of past action, events or processes, reflect a “range of contextual mechanisms by which different forms of agency have gained their various historical realities” (Barrett 2000, 61). Material culture, in other words, represents both the situational context in which past agency was constructed, and the intentional and unintentional results of past actions (*ibid.;* Hodder 1982c; 1986; Shanks & Tilley 1987). This view of agency stresses that actions are embedded within broader social, cultural and ecological conditions. Thus, the transformative capacity of individuals must be seen in terms of the material and informational resources needed in order to act (Miller & Tilley 1984; Shanks & Tilley 1987). Whilst studies of these conditions equally run the danger of ignoring individual agents in favour of macro-processual explanation (cf. Hodder 2000), this exploration of structuring conditions is regarded as a necessary precursor to understanding past action. To
clarify this point: we cannot talk about the interests of individual actors, their strategies for change, or their success at affecting system and structure without exploring the prevalent conditions of structure, including the distribution of material resources, the systems of symbolic order, the underlying social consensus's of value, available technologies, or the modes of production and exchange.

Full treatment of all of these conditions is clearly far beyond what can usefully be discussed in the present study. Nevertheless, the aims set out for this thesis in Chapter 1 require a survey of both explicit explorations of Anglo-Saxon structural conditions (i.e. contextual approaches) and the larger volume of work containing implicit discussions of relevance (i.e. most configurational approaches). From the outset, it is important to recognise the inferential assumptions made from the archaeological dataset. Beyond broader issues of socio-economic organisation and interaction, for example, there remain important concepts of raw material/artefact production and movement. As such, current interpretations of exchange from the basis of artefact studies provide a useful methodological background to further economic modelling.

2.2 Modelling exchange

2.2.1 Configurational models of Anglo-Saxon exchange

2.2.1.1 The archaeological context

As socially-constructed activities, trade and exchange systems have been effectively argued by a number of authors to present far more complicated spatial and temporal distributions than was formerly accepted (cf. Stjernquist 1967, Olausson 1988, Needham 1993). Indeed the embedded nature of transactions within society has called for a more stringent interpretation of material displacement (Needham 1993, 162) rather than the blanket interpretative terminology of 'trade' and 'exchange'. Distribution maps clearly do not equal trade routes per se (Olausson 1988, 15) due to the intervening taphonomic processes (Needham 1993, 161 - Fig. 2.3), though some functional aspects of behaviour can be inferred from both production and transit (e.g. shipwreck) sites. Perhaps due to the archaeological difficulties in recognising small-scale localised exchange, archaeology has welcomed centre-periphery modelling in the form of Wallersteins's world-system, where the standard archaeological practices of recognition and sourcing can be used to infer long-distance relations. Nevertheless, even in these situations, the remit and social context of spatial distributions pose serious problems for archaeological interpretation. This point has been made succinctly by Needham (1993, 167):
"on a general level we can extrapolate backwards from ethnographically observed circumstance. Polanyi's definitions for 'exchange', 'reciprocity' and 'redistribution' for example (1957, 250-6), can be easily understood to embrace most circumstances possible for goods passing between hands (although one might add 'theft', and again 'lineal descent' to allow cases with greater time depth). The problem, however, lies in their application to archaeological evidence, firstly how to differentiate adequately between these broad modes and, thereafter, how to refine them, as we should inevitably wish to do."

This differentiation of modes of transmission, both theoretically and in the material record, has been approached from a variety of perspectives, often governed by underlying assumptions on socially-derived phenomena. Thus, 'luxury goods' have been understood to provide evidence for specific structures of social dominance, whilst subsistence goods exist within contexts of agricultural production. This artificial division of material culture into assumed 'primitive valuables' on the one hand and 'mundane' or 'domestic' artefacts on the other, effectively undermines the very interpretation of the 'prestige good system'. The theory stresses the controlled circulation of wealth objects as status and power markers in exchange for subsistence goods from the direct producers. Not only is the 'value' of exchanged objects determined by the possessor's status (Sahlin 1972, 179), but the 'role' of different commodities was determined within different exchange activities (Loveluck 1994, 296). This example of the gift-giving/traded commodity debate (emblematic of wider issues of Marxist capitalist vs. pre-capitalist social systems or the endogenous vs. exogenous debate in Processual archaeology) deftly illustrates some of the problems encountered within archaeological theory and interpretation. It will be discussed further below (2.3). It is important to recognise from the outset, however, "that all human societies are primarily producing societies, and the distribution and exchange of goods are to be explained in terms of the concrete conditions of the particular social production (including ecology, 'diffusion' of new elements, social barriers, historical events, etc.)" (Brentjes 1992, 152). Within these conditions of social production, three distinct forms of artefact transference can be identified within archaeological literature: voluntary exchange, coercive exchange and incidental movement.

Although academic discussions on the wider social implications of these various processes will be considered below (2.3), the success in recognising these processes in archaeological terms is crucially linked to wider theorisation. Given that the recognition and sourcing of artefacts within the material record remains a central archaeological device for inferring models of
exchange activities, it is, therefore, within contextual studies which place exchange within broader identifiable social phenomena, that the most persuasive interpretations of material culture have been forthcoming (cf. Needham 1993, 168; Hodder 1982b). It is on the basis of such studies that, for example, historically-attested barbarian troops serving in the Roman army have been recognised archaeologically within late Romano-British cemeteries (Böhme 1986; Clarke 1979; Hills & Hurst 1989). Similarly, models of incidental movement in the form of migration, are arguably better established methodologically within Early Medieval studies than for any other period (compared for example with the ‘colonisation’ of La Tène Ireland – Herity & Eogan 1977) due to the broad application of multi-disciplinary sources. Other studies have placed artefactual criteria, rather than ethnic assumptions, at the centre of regional exchange processes. Hand-made pottery or metalwork analyses have demonstrated a wide spectrum of displacement regimes, although in most cases, discussions of the behavioural processes underlying the material patterning has been avoided in favour of interpretations of artefact production and use. Thus, although the sources of particular artefacts, such as certain Early Medieval metalwork, can now be identified with some precision, current concerns are directed more at their mode of manufacture and function as social identifiers (e.g. male/female, high/low status, utilitarian/ceremonial, etc.) than the actual mechanisms underlying their distribution. The latter view, would attempt to incorporate, not only the inferred exchange value of goods within a model of social behaviour, but to seek to establish the linkage between regional, inter-regional, ceremonial and local resource exchange.

Such attempted modelling of transference naturally relies on the inferences derived in the former arena of study, an example of which can be offered by Anglo-Saxon pottery studies. Here, the recognition that the previously held division between so-called ‘domestic’ and ‘funerary’ vessels may well be artificial, stresses the potential role these objects played in the demonstration of past social and cultural identity (Blinkhorn 1997; Richards 1987). In mortuary contexts, the shape and decoration of pottery vessels has been argued to carry symbolic information about the age, gender, and social status of the interred, whilst differences between Anglian and Saxon pottery groups suggests further cultural differentiation (ibid.; Richards 1992). That both ‘Illington-Lackford’ stamped vessels and rusticated wide-mouth pots are now being identified in settlement sites such as West Stow, as well as in the cemeteries discussed by Myres, demonstrates that all pottery potentially played a role in signifying social identity and was a product of these self-same socially-mediated traditions.
(West 1985, 130-5; Blinkhorn 1997, 116; Myres 1977, 69). Similarly, the analysis of ‘Sancton-Baston’ stamp-linked vessels from a wide geographic zone appears to show the totemic significance of decoration irrespective of fabric provenance (Arnold 1983, 63). As such, the seeming importance attributed to the ‘desired end-points’ of hand-made pottery, emphasise the importance cultural reception played in determining artefact manufacture. In this case, the inherently flexible medium of manufacture, in terms of the raw materials, techniques, or implements used, has suggested that concepts of this industry are perhaps better understood within models of the ethnic and cultural affiliations of the potter and the consumer than in interpretations of standardised workshops of craft specialists. Accordingly, the transferance of hand-made pottery is generally interpreted in these current studies, as a cultural, rather than economic phenomenon.

2.2.1.2 Inferring voluntary exchanges: technology and workshops

This practical example provides evidence of the real and conceptual links between technical and social action. As technology is the product of learned knowledge and gestures - what the artefact should look like, what raw materials to use, how to use the tools to make it, etc. - technical action, and therefore the products of this action, is enstructured within habit and social practice (Dobres & Hoffman 1994; Ingold 1990; Pfaffenberger 1988; Sinclair 2000; Spector 1991; etc.). Technology accordingly, by embodying the social nexus of art, thought, wealth, gender, age, practice, knowledge and so on, is one of the social processes by which identity is signified and negotiated. The link between learned knowledge and artefact manufacture forms the basic premise of numerous artefact studies, as is demonstrated in Fig. 2.1, and it is from the basis of such studies that issues of ‘craft specialisation’, ‘workshop groups’ or the identification of individual craftspersons from the material record have taken place. Even amongst the, on the whole, essentially practical approaches, the underlying development of techniques and structures of knowledge are implicitly understood as social acts. Beyond the material aspects of physical evidence itself therefore, technology has traditionally provided an epistemological link between artefacts on the one hand and social dynamics on the other (as is evidenced for example in Service’s 1971 classification of societies).

As these studies form the basic data from which to identify potential methods of object manufacture, transference and distribution, it is important here to quickly look at the model of
Anglo-Saxon artefact production and exchange as derived from artefactual evidence. In what follows, I do not wish to restate arguments relating these objects to typological or chronological classifications. Neither is there any need to contextualise these objects within social or technological practice, as their relationship with broader themes, such as the ideologies of order and social hierarchy, wealth, socio-political and economic organisation, are discussed in greater detail below (2.3).

Explanations of voluntary exchange underlying material distributions in the Early Medieval period have generally assumed a number of possible models of specialised craft production, ranging from free itinerant craftspersons to bonded sedentary craftspersons or centralised workshops of free craftspersons selling in an open market (Shepherd 1998). Using metalsmiths as the case-in-point, a recent summary of the extant literature on artefact production and consumption has revealed a consensus on the limited variety of scenarios able to account for the movement of Anglo-Saxon ornamental metalwork. Production and movement of metalwork brooches can be accorded to (cf. Hines 1997, 212):-

a) *Itinerant craftpersons*, trained in certain production techniques, but carrying out repairs or making items either to order or on spec using a familiar stock of cultural symbols, or using local heirlooms, imported brooches or brooch templates as casting models;

b) *Movement of models or templates*. Local workshops, of either bonded or free craftpersons, using imported brooches or brooch templates as casting models;

c) *Movement through trade/exchange*. Centralised workshops dispersing considerable quantities of finished brooches through trade or gift-exchange;

d) *Movement of owners*. In addition to processes a), b) or c), the further movement of items as heirlooms, tribute or booty, possibly copied locally in processes a) and b). These equate with modes of incidental movement or coercive exchange.

Whilst these transference processes theoretically explain a variety of ways that objects might be distributed, in practice, the identification of particular metalsmiths or workshops in the material record has been more problematic. The methods employed by archaeologists in Fig. 2.1 are clearly dependent on available characteristic variables. The wide variety in alloy-composition of 'bronze' artefacts for example (see section 6.3.3 below) has forced most definitions of 'workshop groups' or 'craftpersons' to be tied to stylistic and typological
analyses. Some argued cases are stronger than others. Coincidence in the distribution pattern of a number of different artefact groups and sub-groups may in some cases be indicative of a particular workshop, as could be argued from the three series of sixth-century Kentish square-headed brooches, and some of the garnet inlaid disc brooches and buckles analysed by Leigh (1980). Such interpretations do not provide much evidence, however, for or against the existence of sedentary or itinerant craftspersons, nor concerning the organisation of the distribution of ornamental metalwork.

Whilst the constellation of knowledge detailed in Fig. 2.1 succinctly outlines areas of potential investigation into processes of manufacture, the enstructured conditions of production place equal weight on processes of reception, as was demonstrated by the interpretation of Anglo-Saxon pottery production. An equally useful case highlighting this dialectic is seen in metalwork analyses. Peter Inker's study of Quoit-Brooch Style metalwork offers a link between culturally-conditioned art-style and metalworking traditions. As with ceramic stamp groups, punchmark techniques are recognised to be both stylistic signifiers and stylistic determinants. Although Quoit-Brooch Style grows out of Roman production methods and draws on pseudo-antique motifs, differential typological forms are argued to represent both cultural requirements and metalworking techniques on the basis of little consistency in form, technique or punchmark types (Inker 2000). The same broad variation is also seen as evidence of a number of workshops, rather than itinerant metalsmiths, drawing on a similar stock repertoire of motifs and technology (ibid). Similar Late Roman production continuity has also been recognised in the development of Saxon chip-carved equal-arm brooches in the Weser-Elbe region and the Nydam Style in Southern Scandinavia, where finds represent an “adoption of exactly the same Roman motifs [geometric and palmettes] and techniques of decoration [chip-carving and niello inlay]” (Haseloff 1974, 5-6). On the basis of such stylistic interpretations, related brooches such as those from Finglesham D3, Canterbury St. Mary's Field, Agerskov, Skonager, Engers and Basel-Kleinhüningen are no longer attributed to a single Kentish workshop (Äberg 1926, Hawkes 1956) or a ‘Kentish Master’ (Bakka 1958), but either to workshops in Denmark/Southern Scandinavia or to “a craftsman [in Kent] from the Danish peninsula who had perhaps been trained in the workshop that produced the Gummersmark brooch, but who, at any rate, had firsthand acquaintance with contemporary Danish work”

---

2 Examples of groups defined on the basis of metallurgical composition such as the paired great square-headed brooches discussed by Hines (Brownsword & Hines 1993; Hines 1997, 215-7) are on the whole still quite unusual.
(Chadwick-Hawkes 1958, 55). Subsequent excavation of contemporary production sites at Helgö, Gene and Västerös in Sweden shows the variety that metalwork can take from a single workshop, but also that workshops existed as centralised places (Holmqvist 1972; Ramqvist 1983; Arrhenius 1982, 12). The archaeological identification of specialised sites such as these offers tactile evidence for analogous workshops often suggested to have existed in this country from the basis of metalwork distributions. Faversham has commonly been considered amongst such potential workshops due to the important cluster and general quality of the jewellery found in the cemetery at ‘Kings Field’, tentative evidence for continuing late-Roman settlement structures at nearby Stone-by-Faversham, and the place-name Faversham itself (Wallenberg 1934, 577; Gelling 1978, 80; Tatton-Brown 1984, 28-30; Myres 1986, 125-6; etc.). Identified as Febresbam in a charter of AD 815 (S178), the place-name probably derives from the Latin ‘faber’ or smith, which in combination with other unique local Latin loan words, has been interpreted as possible evidence of a continuing local British craft industry (ibid).

The recognition that stylistic artefact groups are therefore defined both on the basis of their cultural reception and their mode of production creates natural problems for the determination of exchange patterns. For example, as stamp-linked and punchmark groups are argued to exist within stylistic traditions as executed by individual craftspersons, and are generally identified from cemetery assemblages, cultural or social patterns in burial may be stronger determinants of patterning than exchange mechanisms (cf. Arnold 1981, 246). Beyond this, although technological processes can be seen to account for variation within stylistic groups, whether this variability can be tied to particular workshops or is simply the result of inconsistencies in manufacturing processes, may be impossible to ascertain in most cases (Arnold 1988, 350; Riddler 1986, 17-20; etc.) Given the assumption that many brooch types were produced using some form of ‘one-piece investment mould’, such as the square-headed brooch clay mould fragment found at Mucking or the hundreds at Helgö, variation in design is even to be expected (Holmqvist 1972; Webster 1982). In this view, ‘secondary’ local copies, demonstrating “less expertly renderings of an original design idea” (Dickinson 1993, 14) such as the Aston Remenham, Lechlade, Long Wittenham saucer brooch sequence could be the result of less skilled local derivatives of heirlooms or traded brooches as the result of a changing manufacturing environment for such items.
Even against this backdrop of, both deliberate and accidental, diversity, the strong impression gained from the study of motifs on various metalwork forms appears to show a number of more unified patterns. Whilst pieces were likely to have been manufactured to reflect unique combinations of totemic symbols of either the producer or consumer - as was found also with ceramic stamp groups - the production of ornamental metalwork is likely to have been by skilled craftspersons, drawing on a repertoire of cultural symbols and techniques known and familiar to local populations. This observation would seem to suggest that a trade in brooch moulds or model templates is a less likely mode of transmission, but also perhaps over-emphasises the importance of rigid symbols of social identity. Although some ethnically-coherent complexes could be argued to relate to cross-Channel exogamy or migration for example (Welch 1991), the common occurrence of ‘foreign’ objects in an otherwise ‘coherent’ Kentish grave-assemblage, suggests that social identity was signified by a complete costume suite, with a range of different individual artefacts used to express wealth and prestige diversity as intra-class distinctions.

The implication of a model of artefact movement, in part determined by itinerant craftpeople, has long been recognised within Early Medieval studies (cf. Hinton 2000). The existence of travelling smiths, potters and other artisans, raise the critique that artefact provenance on the basis of stylistic criteria is a difficult and contentious task. These self-same mechanisms of transfer may also underlie however both the inception of characteristically ‘international’ decorative styles, and the common ‘use’ of objects throughout the North Sea region. On this basis, it is probably safe to say that when the use of imported objects deviates considerably from the use of those objects in their region of origin, that this reflects a deliberate choice on the part of local consumers, rather than ignorant replication. In keeping with this view, recent analysis of Style I metalwork (Shepherd 1998) suggests that, whilst the proliferation of these pan-Germanic symbols throughout the North Sea could be related to common ideological messages, their reception and use could fluctuate depending on local socio-political conditions. Shepherd’s conclusions in many ways parallel those drawn by Sørensen (1999). During the period of fifth- to sixth-century state formation, (Sørensen’s ‘establishment phase’), ideological and pseudo-ethnic symbols took on powerful meaning in buttressing the legitimising claims of local magnates. As such, the localism of differential artefact distributions is argued to reflect the different legitimising strategies of local élites comprising the nascent kingdoms. In support of this, Shepherd’s derived motif group relations describe
geographically-coherent units equitable with either historically-determined hegemons, or linked by logical routes of communication (Fig. 2.5).

The implications these interpretations have on metalworking are manifold. Firstly, the localism of motif groups appears to indicate more prescribed modes of transference than would be arguably visible if primary production was by free itinerant craftspersons. Secondly, as partially-defined, locally-negotiated symbols of legitimising authority, the geographical distribution of motif groups is by nature closely tied to the élite using these symbols to buttress their own politico-cosmological status. Thirdly, the first two points suggest that some restriction was placed on production by local élites, either by the control of craftspersons, or the control of places of manufacture (cf. Shepherd 1998, 53).

Somewhat in contrast to these conclusions, the excavated smith at Tattershall Thorpe, Li, dated to the later seventh century, revealed evidence inconsistent with this view of bonded craftspersons. The excavated suite of tools, scrap-metal and gems was argued by the excavator to represent an incomplete set of smithing equipment. Whilst on the one hand, this observation is consistent with a view of a craftsperson dependent on lord for the supply of equipment and materials, the inclusion of a number of artefacts, such as garnets, Continental studs and an openwork disc, suggests that the interred individual had also managed to collect materials of his own (Hinton 2000, 113). The conclusion drawn by the excavator, was that the individual was likely to have been an itinerant smith either travelling in search of, or under local, noble patronage (ibid., 114), could provide a more flexible view of Early Medieval specialised production. The ‘smith’ in this formulation, is dependant on élite patronage, but has greater freedoms than other low-ranked bond-men. A similar conclusion is drawn by Shepherd in his analysis of the position of smiths in Germanic society (1998, 86-7). His interpretation of the word *Leagyl* in the law codes of Æthelberht, suggested that smiths, whilst equitable with slaves in social freedoms, nevertheless retained the social ‘worth’ of other social leaders (ibid). This proposition goes far to explain both the range of artefacts identified with the Tattershall Thorpe smith and the restricted distributions of Shepherd’s motif groups, as it ties both to contemporary levels of élite control.
2.2.1.3 Coercive exchange and incidental movement: taking and keeping

In addition to these forms of voluntary exchange, the transfer of objects as heirlooms, tribute or booty, can provide further evidence both of prevalent social conditions and artefacts removed from normal voluntary exchange mechanisms. Both coercive exchanges in the form of, for example, plunder or tribute, and the incidental movements of heirlooms, are dynamics by which the movement of inalienable possessions may take place. The importance of heirlooms as objects inscribed with personal biographies and used to reinforce the history of individuals and groups, makes keeping the ultimate role of these objects (Weiner 1992; Bazelmans 1999). In contrast to exchangeable alienable goods, the value of these possessions lies in their power to amalgamate past action and present identity. In some cases, the importance of these objects is the direct result of coercive exchanges; by providing either the material link with group biographies or by embodying the means of access to exclusive social or cosmological relationships. In the case of plunder, taken goods might become carefully controlled status markers in the constitution of new group identity. Other material possessions alternatively, such as regalia or totemic items, may be regarded as emblematic of social powers guaranteeing the exclusive rights to tribute or offerings. The importance of keeping all these objects for further social action, implies that their alienation is the result of special circumstances, such as loss as plunder, or changes in their socio-cosmological importance over time.

2.2.1.4 Discussion: hierarchies of value

This discussion of various forms of artefact movement has identified a number of significant features regarding the constitution of material ‘worth’. As such, archaeological approaches to modelling exchange on the basis of artefact analyses, suffer from two main unresolved issues. One is that artefacts have not been clearly modelled within their roles of consumption. Although ‘luxury’ imports are assumed to represent high-value rarity objects, the relative value and rates of exchange of these commodities to other objects has not been explored. Given that social identity is constructed from a range of physical manifestations of success, status, power, gender and ethnicity, the role of artefacts within various value regimes needs to be identified. Partially, the lack of such modelling is a reflection of archaeology’s preoccupation with hyper-crafted élite objects. As articulations of special politico-ideological value, accessible and comparable only with respect to a fractional population group, these objects are in many ways divorced from other social value regimes. In this respect, issues of their production and
exchange, though important for wider theorisation, are restricted to their use in élite consumption. Leading on from this, the second unresolved issue is to consider how wider exchange systems supported luxury-good manufacture. By what means were agricultural surpluses converted into prestige goods, and what methods of exchange underlined both these commodities and their use in general society?

2.2.2 Contextual models
2.2.2.1 Introduction
Concepts of trade and exchange have taken on increased importance within these interpretations of the archaeological material; partially as a reflection of theoretical trends in anthropology, archaeology and history during the 1960s and 70s (the so-called New wave). Building on the pioneering work of the historian Henri Pirenne, interpretations of the archaeology of the eastern seaboard of England and particularly Kent have continually stressed the importance that foreign exotica, rather than commercial commodities, played in changing social and economic conditions during the period. In Pirenne’s opinion, the economic basis of western Europe remained that of Late Roman long-distance trade between scattered urban markets, until Arab incursions effectively severed the commercial link to the Mediterranean (Pirenne 1939). This view has been further developed in more recent years by the inclusion of archaeological evidence on the one hand, and the increasing willingness to test theories of state formation by using early medieval societies on the other. In the following section the importance of Richard Hodges’ contribution to the debate will be examined in the light of more recent anthropological, economic and archaeological theorisation. As an important proponent of contextual approaches in medieval studies, and one of the few scholars who has addressed issues of socio-economic development in Kent, Hodges’ work provides a useful point of entry for wider discussion. Whilst a re-reading of Hodges’ work provides the student with a number of core assumptions and conclusions, this synthesis restricts itself to two main themes: exchange and evolution.

2.2.2.2 Richard Hodges
Although anthropological models of gift-exchange had been applied to early medieval societies from the basis of written sources before the 1970s (e.g. Mauss 1925/1990, 60-63), it was not until more recent decades that these models were used to explain archaeological data. The work of Richard Hodges (1978; 1982; 1988; 1989) has been particularly influential in recent
debates on the nature of medieval development. Deriving his views from anthropological theory, and a specific illustration of Carol Smith's (1976) model of economic growth, Hodges has attempted to show that early medieval state formation was the result of peer-polity interaction between the rival, competitive, fledgling kingdoms of the Middle Saxon period. Central to this argument is the identification of changing social, and as a consequence, exchange relations, as the stimulus to urbanisation and market-based economics. At the heart of this view stands the notion that traumatic social upheavals can be pinpointed to the ninth and tenth centuries when a change from socially embedded exchange to disembedded market economics represents 'England's First Industrial Revolution' (Hodges 1989).

The driving dynamic leading to this level of 'economic take-off' is argued to be the exchange and distribution of prestige goods. Within the myriad of newly established competitive polities, foreign high-status goods are seen as critical in the reproduction of gift-mediated Anglo-Saxon social relations. This view is fostered in the absence of further social and material evidence by the documented importance of gift-giving in literature and law-codes of the period. Drawing particularly on the substantivist views of Polyani, Dalton and Sahlins, Hodges disseminates Wolf's (1982) economic framework in characterising the development in terms of a change from 'kin-based' to 'tributary' modes of production (Hodges 1988a, 4).

Summarised briefly, kin-based modes of production, as exemplified by the prestige-good system, rely on individual kinship bonds to a big-man in structuring political power.

"Kinship ties restrict the amount of social labour which can be mobilised for collective purposes, and necessarily delimit the concentration of resources in the hands of one individual or family....These are often described as chiefdoms, forming around a charismatic leader but seldom outlasting his lifetime...To break the limitations of kinship a chief must lay hold of mechanisms that guarantee independent power over resources. To effect such power requires new political instruments of domination" (Hodges 1988a, 4).

As such, the economic structure in effect, is bounded within relations formed through socially mediated ideological and political structures of dominance in which the processes of social formation centre on the monopoly of production and exchange (cf. Friedman & Rowlands 1978; Miller, Rowlands & Tilley 1989). In contrast, tributary modes of production derive from an exploitative relationship between dependant social classes. Specific forms of domination
and resistance enable the appropriation of surpluses in the form of tribute from the producers for the sectional interests of the élite (Tilley 1984, 112).

Hodges presents the first phase of Anglo-Saxon development in terms of a centre-periphery model related to the widening commercial interests of Merovingian Frankia during the late fifth and sixth centuries (cf. Wallerstein 1974). As such, he sees the influx of prestige goods into the relatively egalitarian tribal groupings of England as a dynamic to increasing social instability, by promoting competition between the rival kingdoms in order to secure the means for ever increasing forms of elaborate consumption. He argues, that, as the controlled circulation of these long-distance traded wealth objects was necessary in gelling the aggregated groupings of the early kingdoms around powerful leaders through conspicuous gift-giving, peer-polity competition forced increasingly exploitative strategies in order to access and monopolise their exchange and distribution. In other words, the manipulation of long-distance trade was essential for the individual polities to secure political hegemony on a regional and inter-regional scale. The physical articulation of this competition is argued to be characterised by the appearance of extensive emporia sites, notably Hamwic (Saxon Southampton), Londinium, Ipswich and Eoforwic (York), interpreted as royally-planned settlements intended to secure long-distance trade for the essentially redistributive seventh to ninth century economy.

Hodges’ skill lies in his persuasive application of anthropological modelling in terms of historical situations, thereby appealing both to the tenets of socio-evolutionism and historical studies. By explaining the growth of the early kingdoms in terms of competitive emulation between individuals, he has managed to draw the historical narrative into a systemic framework (Saunders 1991, 142). The control of the increasing trade connections around the North Sea periphery compound the widening gap between the élite and the direct producers, whilst simultaneously widening the ‘kinship distance’ (Sahlins 1972, 185-276; Hodges 1988a, 4) between transactors. As the prestige system widens, the creation of hierarchical institutions and an increasing exploitative relationship between the dependant social sub-groups stimulates rural specialisation and competitive markets. “Market development”, to quote Tom Saunders (1991, 142) “hence depended on the élites, the one group with an economic interest in breaking the political hold on a socially embedded economy”. A politically powerful figure like Alfred therefore, determined the qualitative moment in the evolution of market-based
economics through his creation of an hierarchical system of competitive burh markets, deriving from the earlier emporia prototype.

Indeed, the development of emporia stands as the crucial link in Hodges' evolutionist framework. By interpreting Anglo-Saxon social hierarchisation in terms of exogenous factors, the mode of inter-regional exchange is of primary importance in determining indigenous change. The emporia are seen, not merely as the articulation of increasing élite authority, but also as “images of Continental connections, reinforced by the arrival of the Church, which already embodied a modified classical tradition of commodity production and distribution” (Hodges 1988a, 5). By introducing concepts of tribute into the kinship social system, the Church legitimised widening forms of élite exploitation, hastened the development of fixed trading-sites, and fostered the growth of a permanent aristocracy by advocating new ideals of property ownership and inalienable wealth (Hodges 1989, 70). As such “we cannot disentangle the inception of tribute, the coming of the Church and the beginnings of fixed trading-places” (Hodges 1988a, 5). Crystallised within a new ideological strategy, the emporia are conceived as the product of a new hierarchy and the means by which this hierarchy was perpetuated.

As long-distance commerce provided the means by which the élite empowered themselves, the emporia are interpreted by Hodges within a specific framework. Firstly, the emporia were founded by particularly charismatic leaders for the promulgation of their royal dynasties. They reflect royal management and enriched the leadership though strict control and exaction of dues. Therefore these sites are to be expected on boundaries of kingdoms where the élite can maintain controls on transactions between the foreign merchants and lower-ranked native groups (1989, 70). As these sites reflect royal authority, they, like the royal palaces, constitute one single unit where internal property divisions are not to be expected (Hodges 1988a, 5). Similarly, not only the control of trade, but also reciprocal production should be focused on the settlements. Additionally, each of the major kingdoms of the seventh to ninth century are assumed to have been served by one or more of these sites (Hodges 1982, 93-4).

With reference to these sites Hodges has attempted to define a typological sequence from seasonal coastal fairs to large, permanent trading sites operating as solar central places. These 'gateway communities' (cf. Brughardt 1971; Hirth 1978) in Britain’s case, are implicitly coastal settlements, straddling passage points between external trade routes and distinct cultural or
natural regions (Hodges 1989, 43). Type A *emporia* are defined in this sequence as merely settlements that have grown up around neutral landing places. They may or may not be permanently inhabited and engage in trade only periodically (Fig. 2.4). In Hodges' formulation, these sites are the crystallisation of elite exchange networks and as such are divorced from retail distribution to the immediate hinterland, except when this represents secondary gift-exchange mechanisms. As these sites are intrinsically linked to the elite, each *emporium* is assumed to have been associated with and probably have been adjacent to a high-status settlement. Viewed with respect to the peer-polity environment of the Mid-Saxon Period, a number of such sites in competition represent the Type A1 development: rival elite groups accessing international prestige exchange through their own transitional gateway communities.

Type B *emporia* represent fundamental changes in administration and economic structure from the first two site types. The settlements are planned and permanently inhabited, implying secular or ecclesiastical control. They are targeted at the optimisation of long-distance trade, and they have evidence of reciprocally tradable production. As such, in contrast to Type A/A1 *emporia* that functioned only in inelastic redistributive commerce, Type B *emporia*, though still bounded by elite exchange and redistribution, have some claim to be fulfilling wider economic and political functions. These sites are argued to be the articulation of increasingly complex forms of socio-political authority, and in their restricted interaction with the hinterland, have some claim to be regarded as urban or proto-urban.

Utilising this framework, Hodges has drawn together a coherent narrative of Anglo-Saxon socio-economic development. The distribution pattern of 'luxury goods', which cluster in a coastal zone including Kent, the Thames Valley and the East Anglian headland during the Early Saxon Period, were compared with the geographical distribution of later *emporia* sites to suggest an evolutionary model of increasing specialised trade. In Hodges' model, Kentish sixth-century pre-eminence, visible in the luxury good density, is seen in terms of a close monopolistic relationship with Frankia; a political link which allowed Kent to adopt exclusive control over long-distance trade. Documentary sources attesting to the East Kent/Frankish connection in the form of Frankish claims of authority over Kent, royal alliances and tribute extraction, as well as a group of eighth-century charters relating toll remissions at the ports of Sætre and Fordwich, had been utilised to explain the dense patterns of imported goods in the county prior to Hodges' interpretation (see 1.3). Similarly, previous commentators drew the
connection between the inevitable shipping patterns around the East Kent headland and Kent's apparent role as the focal node of impact for the diffusionist pattern of settlement, trading connections, state formation, and Christianisation. But it was only in the explicitly systemic Hodgean framework, that these geographical conditions, historical sources and archaeologically-recognisable developments could be drawn into a model of hierarchical linkages.

In keeping with the Kentish model, Mercian control of London and the documented liaison between Offa and Charlemagne is seen as the basis of the kingdom's powerful position in the late eighth century. Ine's creation of Hamwic, thereby spurning the leap to Type B emporia, is seen as reflecting competitive measures by the West Saxon kingdom to channel North Sea trade to Wessex. Drawing on the ideas introduced by the Church and from contact with Frankia, eighth- and ninth-century optimisation in England is interpreted within a diffusionist paradigm. Only under visionary leadership such as Alfred's, is the qualitative unrestricted move made to urbanism. His creation of a hierarchical network of centres, drawing together administrative, marketing and commodity-production functions, coupled with coinage and tax regulation, mark a socially-disembedded economic system percolating through all levels of society. Processes of individual competition and emulation produced the first English kingdoms and the wics as their economic funnel, and this same process, once separated from traditional, socially-bounded relationships, accounts for the Smithian economic growth (1776) that leads from the ninth and tenth centuries to the modern world.

2.2.2.3 The anthropological critique: gift and commodity

Despite an essentially economic approach, Hodges' thesis represents a compelling synthesis of multiple strands of archaeological, anthropological and historical data. His contribution has not gone uncriticised, however, whether from a theoretical (e.g. Saunders 1990, 1991, 1995), historical (e.g. Dyer 1988), or economic (e.g. Jones 1993) perspective. Additionally, archaeological research in the decade following Hodges' interpretations, particularly in Ipswich and London, has contributed considerable data to add to the discussion of wic sites. Though the underlying tenets of his argument, that the period is characterised by a change in societal relationships, is widely established, there are serious reservations to accepting his dynamics to social gradation.
Hodges’ discussion rests heavily on an inflexible interpretation of exchange mechanisms on the one hand, and an overemphasis of the importance of gift-giving as a social dynamic on the other. I shall deal with both problems in turn. The importance of gift-giving as a social structuring concept or as a mode of artefact displacement during the Early Medieval period cannot be denied. However, medievalist interpretations often stand in some contrast to the tenets of the substantivist school from which they take their ultimate point of departure. As exchange is embedded within social relations: it is the relationship between transactors and the consumption of the exchanged goods that form the primary unit of investigation rather than the objects themselves. Thus gift-giving cannot be seen either as an exclusive exchange system, nor representative of a phase of economic development between non-capitalist ‘primitive’ economics and capitalist commodity exchange.

Analysis in economic anthropology has suggested a number of subtle reinterpretations of the diametrically-opposed concepts of economy typified by Hodges’ model. Hodges is certainly not alone in stating this dichotomy between commodity and gift, and an analysis of the multidimensional aspects of these relationships requires a summary of the contrasts. Figure 2.2 provides a synthetic schema of the contrast between gift exchange and commodity exchange as presented in the works of Marx, Lévi-Strauss, Sahlin and others, as a way of summarising this framework of theoretical notions.

Whilst in many respects the distinctions drawn between these two dichotomous forms of exchange relationships remain important characterisations, recent anthropological thinking has moved towards fuzzying the distinctions. Thus, for Appadurai the recognition of alienable exchange in non-capitalist economies prompts the need to look for “the commodity potential of all things rather than searching fruitlessly for the magic distinction between commodities and other sorts of things” (1986, 13). To Gregory alternatively, the dichotomy is a necessary part of a whole economic system of valuation, through which people “create multiple value systems for themselves and are constantly switching between them according to the dictates of the moment” (1987, 8). A key element of both interpretations, is the recognition that both the exchanged object and the individual participating in exchange are linked within a conceptual world view in which the proper roles of all individuals are specified. In these societies, economy is not divorced from other social phenomena such as politics or religion, but is the nexus of social relationships between both the living, the dead, monsters and gods (Bazelmans
1999, 19). Thus, “the participant in exchange is not independently given, but rather defined by exchange - persons and objects of exchange are, in other words, commensurable - and the value of the object of exchange is dependent upon the exchange in which it is involved” (ibid).

The forms which exchanges can take are varied. Documentary sources offer many examples of the importance of gift-giving within the negotiation of social relationships both by relieving and creating social tensions. They also demonstrate how the objects of exchange in turn personify and structure the image of the possessor. Thus we find in Beowulf, for example (Hill 1982), that gift and counter-gift are employed in Hrothgar’s attempted adoption of the hero, the queen’s struggle to terminate Beowulf’s relationship to the royal couple, and by Beowulf himself seeking to maintain his neutral position (Samson 1991, 90). Similarly, by way of establishing the character of Hrothgar, he is referred to as “our noble king, our dear lord, friend of the Danes, the giver of rings” (353-4) whilst in the song of the battle at Finn’s Hall, the Frisian battle survivors are granted amnesty as “their own ring-giver after all was dead and gone, they were leaderless”.

Viking sagas also, represent gift-giving within a continuum of social relations: reciprocal gifting must be after an established elapsed time and as it ‘demands’ return, forms a social bond between the individuals. As such, not only is it seen as the only socially acceptable mode of exchange between equals of good standing (ibid., 91) it is as socially loaded as the blood feud, theft or raiding. This point is effectively illustrated by Miller’s (1986) discussion of Njál’s saga in which Gunnar’s attempt to buy hay from Otkel Skarfsson moves from alienable purchase to inalienable gifting under the unspoken threat of violence. Exchange with potentially dangerous foreigners or long-distance expeditions aimed at the acquisition of goods (whether through trade, theft or plunder) help in turn to structure the traveller’s local social position on which the inalienable status is based, through the fame and danger coefficients such exchanges embody. Thus, the personification of the possessor’s goods also aid in the creation of the individual (Miller 1995, 24), so we hear of Shield-Sheafson in Beowulf and people being lucky (or unlucky — Fig. 2.6) when in receipt of luck-gifts embodied with the qualities of the giver (Vestergaard 1991, 98).

Modern ethnographic examples suggest that different forms of exchange co-exist along-side restricted gifting, as defined by specific products, situations or social relationships. Rather than
a diametric opposite to gift exchange, commodity exchange in this view is context dependent. In Parry's (1986) analysis of exchange in northern India, commodity exchange is a moral obligation for certain castes. Commodity exchange, in other words, still has a social group function, and is still commensurable with the individual as part of society. To Dumont, these ethnographically-attested phenomena are evidence of a *system of ideas-and-values*, through which relationships and hierarchies of value are brought into a coherent social whole (1986). Jos Bazelmans (1999) has gone on to apply Dumont's thesis to Early Medieval society as represented in the *Germania* and *Beowulf*, and constructed a ritual-cosmological model of the relationship between lord and warrior-followers comprising the Anglo-Saxon system of ideas-and-values (Fig. 2.7). In this model, contrasting forms of ceremonial gift exchange, represent part of a hierarchical relations between man and nature, the constitution of personal 'worth', to relations between men, to time, action, and God.

Bazelmans’ thesis offers an important point of departure for an analysis of socio-economic development in Early Anglo-Saxon Kent, as it provides the framework for many of the social relationships underlying action and value. Given the primary source of information for his model, there remain a number of unresolved issues however. It could be argued that *Beowulf* presents an idealised formulation of social interaction struggling to conceptualise the top-down relationships within society following Christianisation. Although God is evident within the ritual-cosmological system of ideas-and-values, “Christianity - with its notion that all men are fashioned equally in the image of God - has developed a *universalistic* conception of purely disinterested giving” (Parry 1986, 468. Original emphasis). Beyond the true, unreciprocated gift, Christianity’s conception of individuals separate from things, forms the precondition of isolated value-setting capacity, i.e. market exchange (*ibid.*, Dumont 1986, 260). In addition, *Beowulf’s* emphasis on the relationships between lord and warrior-follower, by focusing on the prestations of the élite, reveals little of the political motivations of the valuers, nor the dynamics of individual agency in a world-system environment.

**2.2.2.4 Traded exotica or the division of land?**

Whilst Bazelman’s thesis provides an important indirect critique of Hodges’ model of state formation, Hodges’ emphasis on dynamic social change over the period needs highlighting. In light of the presented system of ideas-and-values, long-distance traded artefacts can be seen as of fundamental importance within the spheres of gift-mediated social relations. For the same
reasons however, it is likely that previous analyses have over-emphasised the role played by gift-tribute as a catalyst to social hierarchisation. Additionally, this distortion of a prestige-good system has placed undue emphasis on *emporia* and their suggested role as elements of an expanding prestige-goods apparatus. Though gift-giving played an active role in the maintenance of social relations by concealing unequal relations or by widening spheres of influence, archaeologists have tended to stress the emphasis on moveable wealth. However, it is the 'masked blackmail' (Hauken 1991) of a gift-exchange system and the economically exploitative relationship with social dependants which ensured wealth and status. Royal estate maintenance for example, revolved around the constant collection of livestock and agricultural produce in exchange for feasts on the one level, and the payment of taxes for a *eorl* or *eorlcund man's* ability to be able to mobilise protection or administer justice on the other.

This view of the structure of land-holding forms the central tenet of Tom Saunders’ explicitly Marxist framework of the Anglo-Saxon transformation. In his view, social change within this period is to be sought, not in the rise of a tributary mode of production, but in the growth of “land-based social relations, culminating in the establishment of feudal-based states” (Saunders 1995,32). Tributary-based kinship structures of class differentiation developed into landed social relations of seigneurial control over a disenfranchised peasantry (*ibid*). This is a process recognised archaeologically in England through the rise of the manor and rural nucleation during the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries. Where previously in Christian Europe economic subsistence had been characterised by a belief in Providence (Le Goff 1980, 90), it is only c.AD 800 that the remodelling of calendars, for example, shows a crystallisation of labour as an acceptable mode of production and ideology (*ibid.*, 84-86). Saunders has suggested that, although long-distance traded artefacts were of fundamental importance in gift-mediated social relations, gift-tribute and the *emporia* founded for the expanding prestige-goods apparatus can never be seen as the catalysts for social hierarchisation (Saunders 1995, 37). In contrast, the prestige-goods system is merely a manifestation of underlying social relations, which, rather than influencing later social developments and urbanisation, are in effect, the final articulation of tribute-based social relations. Such interpretations have stressed (cf. Polanyi 1957; 1963) the role of prestige goods, administered through royal incentive at the *emporia*, as:

"an essential means of mediation in the potentially antagonistic relationship between tributary king and feudal lord. As a symbol of reciprocity the gift played an active role in concealing the unequal relationship between king and lord, the latter having to bear the
double burden of economic and military obligations. Consequently, with services and tribute being mediated through gift giving, early medieval kings became dependant on being able to control the flow of prestige goods...The inherent momentum behind gift exchanges and the development of emporia in Anglo-Saxon England was therefore not self-propulsive, but rather determined by the dynamics of tributary social relations...The introduction of bookland, however, led to the renegotiation of the relationship between king and lord. The development of feudal social relationships meant that the role of prestige goods within Anglo-Saxon England was transformed. Royal alliances and support were not something which needed to be purchased continually by means of the exchange of gifts. The shift in emphasis away from moveable wealth meant that the all-persuasive role of prestige goods in society diminished” (Saunders 1995,37-38).

Saunders has drawn particularly on the work of Marxist economic historians in formulating this interpretation. Following Brenner (1986), as the pre-capitalist system by nature aims at the maintenance of property relations (in this sense, the relations of reproduction) of both direct producers and the élite, the change to commercial and specialised production is an historically peculiar phenomenon. Provided the direct producer remains in partial possession of the land, it is in the rational self-interest of the ‘peasant’ to retain the primarily subsistence mode of production (ibid.). Rather than Smithian economic growth, the producers will only “specialise because they must exchange” (ibid., 35). This greatly diminishes the chance of market development and forces the exploiting lords to look at means, other than specialised production, to raise their income (ibid., 30). As such, the élite direct their resources towards forms of consumption and building up extra-economic means of coercion for the maintenance of their reproduction (i.e. politico-military apparatus and luxury goods) and inter-élite status (ibid., 31). Thus, non-subsistence forms of production (i.e. military and luxury goods) can be seen as an articulation of inter-social relations, but only as a separate economic sphere rather than as a direct catalyst to agricultural specialisation and social change. Indeed, political accumulation could be seen to cause long-term economic stagnation and class struggle rather than development. Hence, the current reanalysis of the explanatory role played by long-distance exchange in social hierarchisation for both the Late Iron Age (Wolf 1993) and Early Medieval Europe (Saunders 1995) for example, have stressed the need to locate changes within the sphere of agricultural production rather than overt concentrations on trade. This is not to say that analyses of exchange are unfruitful avenues of research, merely that prestige goods must be seen “not as an autonomous instance with its own internal dynamic, but at a level other than that of exchange itself i.e. explaining its role in the reproduction of the conditions of production” (Saunders 1990,75). Therefore, rather than a simplistic evolutionary model from tributary to feudal relations, gift-giving encompasses an economic system far greater than
the narrow interpretations characterised by many archaeologists, covering social dependency, and the total relationships between power, production exchange and consumption (cf. Samson 1991, 96).

Saunier's emphasis on the development of land-holding as the fundamental dynamic to social change over the period, suggests a number of important tensions underlying the relationships described in Beowulf. At the beginning of the period, inalienable grants of land are a form of gift from king to follower, through which recipients become guardians of the landscape for their lifetimes (cf. Stenton 1971, 306). With the introduction of bookland over the course of the eighth century, grants of inalienable land - with the liberty of exchanging, giving, selling or bequeathing it to any heir of choice - recipients become the mediators of land between the dead and the unborn (ibid., 307; Gregory 1997, 82). The increased emphasis on birthright and inheritance in the latter scenario has an inverse effect on land value however, as outlined by Gregory (1997, 84-9). As part of a wider system aiming at the maintenance of property relations, the earlier form of guardianship tends towards the parcelisation of land into smallholdings covering diverse economic landscapes, supplemented by periodic rural markets. With grants of one type of land to individuals, the lack of diversity means smallholders need to invest more labour to remain productive. Increased capital investment and labour in turn, leads the family that expended the labour to assert further property rights and restrict access (ibid., 88). As an outcome: "this ancestral labour principle not only gives the household permanent use-rights and the power to bequeath land (the path of goods) it also gives it disposal rights to sell (the path of commodities)" (ibid.), ergo the widening of market exchange.

2.2.2.5 Trade and merchants in the Early Medieval Period

If the work of Saunders and Gregory provides the theoretical basis for socio-economic development over the period in question, what evidence is there from archaeological and historical sources to support this model? The Hodgean paradigm takes as a given that neutral forms of exchange are central to the witnessed development of the Anglo-Saxon economy over the Mid-Saxon period. Recent investigations throughout the North Sea littoral appear to substantiate his view that the period is marked by certain and ever increasing commercial connections around the North Sea periphery. In contrast to Hodges, however, this commercial awakening does not appear to be restricted to the eighth and ninth centuries. Emporia type-sites are now being identified over an increasing time span and in a variety of forms. Of particular
interest appear to be the high-status burial/beach market sites of, for example Gudme (Fyn, Denmark) and Helgö (Mälar, Sweden), between the fourth and seventh centuries. As Hodges’ thesis rests on the belief in a teleological expansion of big-man economic structures, his interpretation has assumed a linear development from simple to complex exchange apparatus (like the progression from Type A to Type B emporia), rather than the existence of multiple forms of trade, whilst his inherent search for the birth of capitalism has over- emphasised the importance of emporia type-sites.

Thus, alienable mercantile activities in both luxury goods and subsistence products can be inferred from a much earlier period in Merovingian France and the Rhineland. The distribution of Mediterranean objects, and particularly silver coins, north of the Alps, suggests that not only was this trade commercial, but, for a period in the sixth century, that the balance of payments ran from south to north (Spufford 1988, 12). Spufford goes on to assert that, as political subventions during this phase of monetary history appear to have continued in the Late Roman tradition of being paid in gold, this distribution of silver coin implies that commercial payments independent from secular control, were already operating outside tributary systems (ibid.). Contemporary Visigothic and Frankish law-codes that laid down deliberate legislation dealing with foreign merchants (negotiatores), bolster this interpretation (Nehlsen 1985), whilst Anglo-Saxon merchants (neguciantes aut Saxonis) are noted in written sources from at least AD 710 at the periodic market at St. Denis, and at Marseille in the mid-eighth century (Claude 1985, 52 & 72). Similarly, the occurrence of a Frisian merchant at Lundonwic in 679, and a Frisian colony at York from the early eighth century (ibid., 71) bear witness to the early development of a North Sea ‘trade diaspora’ (Curtain 1984) that may, or may not, have been operating through limiting kinship affiliations. The historical allusions here attest to a rise of autonomous trading and bourgeois values independent, and to a certain extent prolific, in the decentralised infrastructure of the first millennium AD (Hall 1989, 102) as is witnessed in the proliferation of pre-ninth-century taboos on money and merchants (Le Goff 1980, 60).

Such written sources have been drawn on by a number of studies, all presupposing the existence of mercantile trade. Thus, it has been often suggested that Frisian middlemen (cf. Scull 1997, 285) negotiated cross-Channel commerce and transactions, thereby accounting for some of the discrepancies between coins and pottery provenanced from the excavated sites. This suggestion has further implications however. Merchants suggest the existence, even if
restrictive, of price-making markets, where not only resource extraction, but also reciprocal trading is taking place. Though it is possible that all Anglo-Saxon production and tradable commodities were organised and disposed through élite estate systems (cf. Scull 1997, 299) and non-market exchange, this view ignores the evidence for restricted élite authority within the relatively egalitarian Early- to Mid-Saxon social structure and the introduction of coin use. Whether or not coinage was an introduction merely to facilitate taxation, by the early ninth century 24% of the revenue from free mansi was received in coin in Frankia (Spufford 1988, 47). Therefore, by c800 country persons of the Paris basin at least were freely utilising the market place to raise money for the payment of rent (ibid). Though monetary circulation in the previous century may well have been more restricted, the evidence that port tolls were paid in silver as well as other dues, suggests a class of people (i.e. merchants) were dealing in both a money economy and long-distance trade. Thus, it seems clear that active independent mercantile activity co-existed with non-market exchange. Such market activity was restricted not merely due to élite control, but because of the prohibitively high transaction costs involved. Following Jones:

"The level of monetization and the nature of trading settlements tend to indicate, however, that only a small proportion of output was sold in price-making markets. This is not surprising as primitive transportation meant that, for most types of goods, the cost of trade over distance must have been prohibitively expensive. Occasionally low value/high bulk commodities might be transported over considerable distances, but economic logic would suggest that such goods were probably shipped by institutions rather than individual merchants accustomed to calculating the opportunity cost of their actions. Even when the merchants were prepared to trade, a highly fragmented market prevented price signals and other information from being readily transmitted. Levels of risk and uncertainty, as well as transaction costs, were correspondingly high. The limited use made of price-making markets has serious implications for economic growth since it meant that most people were unaware of the choices open to them. Consumption patterns therefore remained largely fixed, with few acquiring the taste for a wider range of goods or the desire to consume more. Faced with restricted demand and seeing few opportunities for profitable exchange, the incentive to generate additional surpluses for sale was inevitably dulled. There were other implications too. Often unable to refer to the market for a price, producers had few yardsticks by which to calculate the opportunity costs of their production decisions. Resources were therefore both under-utilised and poorly allocated." (1993, 662-3)

Given the issues of violence inherent in non-capitalist trade and the social inclinations towards alienable exchange outlined by the documentary sources, the appearance of so-called ‘gateway communities’ in the form of emporia should come as no surprise. Though it seems clear that active independent mercantile activity co-existed with non-market exchange, such market
activity was restricted due to élite control and the prohibitively high transaction costs involved in long-distance trade. Restricted market trade was patterned, in contrast to Hodges’ formulation, not by overarching élite monopolising control of commerce, but restricted by the merchants themselves in an environment with little state provisioning of public goods and uncertain and dangerous shipping patterns. Anglo-Saxon kings in this view are the prime-movers of increasing trade only in as far as law-codes, safe-havens and inter-regional peace agreements created an environment in which trade could flourish. And in this respect, I include the maintenance of peaceful exchange by ecclesiastical houses at seasonal fairs or by the local élite at hundredal meeting places. Nonetheless, market-based trade in long-distance traded goods was also subject to the economic constraints of transport costs and profitability and therefore tended to consist primarily of goods of inelastic demand. Low value/high bulk commodities might be transported over considerable distances by institutions, rather than by merchants subject to high levels of risk and uncertainty (Jones 1993, 662), but were therefore more likely to consist of goal-driven trading enterprises rather than mercantile activity (Samson 1991, 124). Thus, economic historians, such as Brenner (1986), North (1977; 1981) and Jones (1993), have all stressed institutional change and the reduction in transaction costs as primary indices of market-based economies. Such processes apparently occurred as a consequence of emergency conversion — such as continuous Viking raiding — forcing a reliance on the market rather than any internal drive for specialisation. This model stresses that Middle Saxon emporia and the contemporary sceatta currency were never intended to mark, nor represent, any significant change from earlier restricted market trade. A change occurred only when price-making markets supplemented other forms of exchange in supplying conspicuous exotica for élite consumption. Mercantile activity, before the mid-ninth century thus catered for an inelastic demand at specialised sites, where the search and information costs were minimised and the weight of merchant numbers and royal protection offered a measure of security.

This emphasis away from the importance of prestige goods within local spheres of social dynamics presents a far sounder basis for interpreting the archaeological and historical evidence. The group of eighth-century trading privileges discussed by Kelly (1992) for example, attests not only to commercial activities being targeted at Kent, and via Kent to London, but also that it was the tolls on the lucrative shipping-routes that were the area of élite interest rather than the inbound goods.
The similarity noted by Kelly (1992, 19) between the Kentish [wic-gerefa] in London, mentioned in seventh-century Kentish law-codes, and contemporary prefecti reinforces this interpretation. Not only does this make it likely that Kentish toll-collection was being enforced in the seventh century on trading-ships travelling to London, probably via the Wantsum Channel, but it also suggests that the institution of toll-collection and the office of reeve were similar to Frankish and Visigothic counterparts, possibly in imitation of the latter. Such familiar pan-European institutions would certainly have eased mercantile interaction and suggest one further hypothesis: the existence of known and well-established taxable trade-routes operating by the seventh century.

2.2.2.6 Discussion: Multiple levels of exchange

I have laboured over this issue of exchange deliberately, as it bears some weight on the discussion of Early Medieval traffic. Nowhere in the documentary sources is it evident that trade transactions, in the strict economic sense, are an exclusive mechanism of artefact displacement. Rather, from the existant early medieval documentation, trade and equally barter, is construed as a social taboo between kinspersons or people of equal status. Though this does not mean that alienable mechanisms did not exist, it does restrict such forms of exchange socially and geographically to manageable areas where peaceful transaction can be guaranteed by some overarching power. Following on from this, one could additionally suggest that North Sea economic growth was dependent, not on changing modes of production, but on increasing controls over the levels of societal violence. Equally, such a view of multiple exchange mechanisms suggests a possible model for coin use in the Mid-Saxon period. The phenomenal sudden inception and widespread use of the sceatta currency in the late seventh century effectively demonstrated by Metcalf (1984; 1988) suggests a number of points. There is increasing evidence that the early eighth century (and the second quarter of the eighth century in particular) marked a period of intense economic growth, represented by coin finds, expansion phases at the emporia and inland sites such as Wicken Bonhunt, the increased distribution of Ipswich ware outside East Anglia, and some corresponding rural specialisation at sites such as Pennyland in Buckinghamshire and Riby Crossroads in Lincolnshire (Blinkhorn 1991, 14). This major economic development, in contrast to Hodges' observation, predates Carolingian hegemony and the introduction of the penny by at least half a century. Archaeologically, the interpretation of emporia as regulated trade centres is somewhat ambiguous. For example, though Hamwic and Ipswich appear to have had planned orthogonal
street patterns established during a short time period in the mid-eighth and early-ninth centuries respectively, which could imply some form of centralised and organised authority, the imported goods, though proportionately biased to certain continental production centres, are by no means indicative of monopolistic trading; particularly as some goods appear to have moved on from Hammic to Mercia as well as elsewhere within Wessex (Dyer 1988, 75; Holdsworth 1976, 60). This seems to suggest, in concordance with the charters discussed by Kelly, that the élite were not interested in the monopolisation of trade other than to regulate it for fiscal purposes. The supportive hinterland economies, production and the movement of tradable commodities as such, are just as easily explained within a model of élite estate organisation and disposal systems (cf. Scull 1997, 299) and therefore non-market and non-monetary exchange. The sceatta series in this view were therefore probably made both by foreign traders and locally to ease special-case alienable exchange as part of the same safety issue as the emporia sites themselves. Similarly, it is expected that coinage passed in and out of alienability in local spheres of consumption. Thus, coinage use could represent alienable exchange between traders at market sites, though still move on through the Anglo-Saxon economy in inalienable gift-exchange mechanisms including tithes and taxes.

Whilst this view of hierarchies of exchange fits well with many of the issues discussed by Dumont, Bazelmans and Gregory, the existence of merchants on the one hand, and the ritual-cosmological systems of ideas-and-values joining lords with warrior-followers on the other, presupposes not only a common system of value, but also a concept of bounded ethnic space comprising the social whole. Whilst the issue of value was also identified by archaeological approaches (2.2.1.4), the implications of Gregory’s analysis is that land and territoriality lies at the heart not only of the dynamics to social change, but also defines the relations between people themselves. Territoriality, as a form of consciousness binding people together, forms the basis from which society produces value by forming the bounds of social relations represented, for example, in Bazelmans’ ritual model. Equally, territoriality is recognised as underlying the principles governing the transmission of mercantile credit (1987, 166). Before these issues can be elaborated further, it is important to look briefly at the spatial approaches to modelling exchange.
2.2.3 Spatial approaches

2.2.3.1 Regression models for Early Anglo-Saxon Kent

The traditional archaeological study of the spatial organisation of past activities has natural points of overlap with all of the aforementioned approaches. Of important interest to New archaeology has been the application of modern variants of geographical spatial analysis such as Von Thünen’s model of agricultural land use, Weber’s model of industrial location, Christaller’s central-place model, Hägerstrand’s model of innovation and its diffusion and gravity models of varying types (Hodder & Orton 1976). Important from this point of view, however, are those approaches that attempt the reconstruction of comparative exchange mechanisms from the spatial distribution of commodities or the arrangement of hierarchies of settlement with respect to the tenets of central-place theory.

Artefact regression models are routinely applied in archaeological practice to interpret both different types of exchange and the social organisation of exchange mechanisms. Following Renfrew (1975; 1977) different forms of exchange can be modelled as spatial distributions on the basis of the expected fall-off rates from their point of origin. On this basis, the distribution patterns identified by Huggett allow for wider inferences on the nature of Early Anglo-Saxon trade (1.3.2). The regression pattern recognised for Group I artefacts was argued to be representative of balanced reciprocal down-the-line exchange flowing through Kent into the rest of England (Huggett 1988). Regression curves for Group II artefact frequencies alternatively, are argued to fit more closely with models of redistributive or directional exchange, where the fall-off curve is disrupted by secondary peaks representing central places or persons (ibid., 89). The interpretation of these Group II artefacts however, demonstrates some of the problems with fall-off models, as the covariant of distance is dependant on known points of origin, or in this case, entry (Renfrew & Dixon 1976; Huggett 1988, 91). On this basis, the two artefact-group patterns have been argued to reflect contemporary exclusive trading regimes; one centred on Kentish/Neustrian trade and the other on East Anglian/Austrasian contact (Huggett 1988, 91; Hodges 1982, 36). Given the context of deposition of these grave goods, an important caveat must, however, be borne in mind. Although it could be argued that Group I artefacts in particular, nominally fit the pattern of reciprocal movement, the correlation of these objects with specific well-equipped burials outside Kent, could equally represent the movement of people rather than exchange systems. Furthermore, ethnographic evidence suggests that different commodities are likely to succumb
differently to multiple levels of exchange mechanisms when they are traded. Particularly given the social remit of deposition, it is likely that certain commodities functioned within local community contact, whilst others operated in between-group exchange (Hodder 1978, 239).

2.2.3.2 Discussion: GIS applications in Anglo-Saxon archaeology

Whilst there is no need to further arguments undermining the interpretation of regression models in archaeology (as usefully outlined by Hodder & Orton 1976 and Hodder 1978), advances in geographical information system (GIS) analysis have propagated a sub-genre of anthropological-archaeological thinking problematising the spatial context of social action. In part such approaches have developed from the ecological anthropology and archaeology of the 1960s, and the concern with correlating spatially-distributed phenomena with features of the physical environment (Aldenderfer 1996, 12). As Kvamme (1989, 16) notes, however, most pre-GIS results remained, on the whole, unconvincing due to the small scale and unsystematic manner in which they were undertaken. Similarly, it has only been with the advent of GIS that advances have been made in the sophistication of locational modelling, incorporating both economically-related variables, such as land cover, soil type, or distance from water, and theories of human behaviour. Whilst the success of these models is variable, and clearly dependent on the questions asked, the value of GIS as a form of exploratory data analysis is undeniable. Despite the possible applications of GIS to spatial problems in archaeology, few current case-studies exist for Early Medieval contexts, although many of the issues addressed by New geography have penetrated the discipline (e.g. Hooke 1986; Aston 1986; Hodges 1982; 1988b; etc.). The importance attributed to ecological and environmental conditions in aiding the construction of cultural and social systems in these and other works (e.g. Everitt 1986; etc.) places additional emphasis on the need to recognise some of the ways in which socio-economic behaviour might be recognised in space. Methodologically, the approach adopted in this work depends on the tenets of the distributional model.

2.2.4 The distributional model

In an attempt to limit the reliance on tacit assumptions of ‘prestige-good’ and competitive emulation in models of Early Anglo-Saxon exchange, Loveluck has outlined a methodology aimed at discerning the mechanisms of transfer between subsistence and commodity goods (Loveluck 1994; 1996). His analysis of the distribution of indigenous and imported commodities in cemeteries from parts of East Yorkshire, the Upper Thames region and the
Peak district revealed evidence of restricted economic access underlying other social phenomena. Thus in East Yorkshire, agrarian reorganisation during the seventh century in the coastal *pays* is reflected in changes to final-phase deposition, whilst, by contrast, increasing control of iron production is suggested as the cause of hardening hierarchical social structures in the On Driffield region (Loveluck 1996, 45-6). Similar mechanisms of control underlined his interpretation of the basis of wealth in the Upper Thames region during the Early Anglo-Saxon period. This inland basin is suggested to owe its economic importance to its location as a gateway between the tin and Byzantine gold sources of the south-west and the Scandinavian and Frankish trade routes which entered England via Kent and the Thames estuary (Loveluck 1994, 232).

The importance of this thesis lies not so much in Loveluck’s interpretation of the available data, however, as in the methodological attempt to model alternate levels of exchange activity below that of luxury exchange. His attempted spatial quantification of resources by communities can in many ways be compared with that of Hirth’s *distributional* model (1998). Although the primary goal of the latter work was the attempted definition of Mesoamerican market-places, the conceptual underpinnings adopted therein, like Loveluck’s work, allow for broader social theorising from the basis of community consumption. By examining the frequency or quantity of commodities with respect to units of economic consumption, such as individuals, households or communities, comparisons of community “artefact inventories provide a measure of differential involvement in a common distribution network” (*ibid.*, 456). The control offered by adopting a constant variable, such as ‘the individual’, as the basic unit of analysis, thus allows for the extrapolation of broader social and economic themes as aggregates of social organisation. The spatial and economic context of investigation is provided by the individuals themselves, allowing for the comparison of the ways in which regional space may have been socially and spatially constructed to restrict and monopolise allocative and authoritative resources with respect to geographical and topographical data.

With a constant variable established, the comparative quantification of additional variables can take a number of different forms. Loveluck’s research on Anglo-Saxon England adopted a simple numerical count of interred raw materials, with some success. By contrast, Myhre’s (1987) work on Late Roman and Migration Period southern Norway, suggested an important correlation between the weight of gold in finds and regional topography. In this example, the
distribution of gold from hoard and grave finds was compared with that of wealthy graves (defined by the inclusion of combinations of gold, imported glasses and bronzes) to posit a model of hierarchical central-places, circumscribed by topographical features, such as watersheds. Whilst the models proposed by both Myhre and Loveluck are in no respects novel to archaeology (e.g. Hodder & Orton 1976, Chapter 4; Renfrew 1984) the importance of the adopted distributional approach adds explanatory force to the conclusions they draw between spatially-distributed phenomena and features of the physical environment. Accordingly, the implications of such an approach with reference to Anglo-Saxon Kent forms the basis of Part III of this Thesis.

2.3 Conclusions: the problems of exchange

In summary, four alternate, though mutually-sustaining, methods of investigation have been developed in archaeology to explore systems of past exchange. As a product of these applications to the archaeology of Early to Middle-Saxon England, the pattern of luxury goods in particular has been cited as evidence of incipient state formation in the form of Renfrew’s Early State Module. Implicit in this view, the visible complex economic dynamics of the period are portrayed as a reflection of increasing spirals of competitive exchange, thereby pre-eminencing specialised trading settlements (uics or emporia) within general models of state formation. This explicit separation of systems of exchange from systems of production has, however, reduced social development during the period to a prime-mover model of debatable applicability. Firstly, the exploration of exchange systems and associated value regimes underlying luxury-good production have only recently begun to be explored. This work requires an understanding of Early Medieval wealth measurement, not restricted to élite goods, on the one hand, and a model of agricultural surplus production on the other. Secondly, the recognition of multiple levels of exchange operating within respective value regimes suggests a number of important issues which need to be further explored archaeologically:-

1. The social context of specific exchanges (and the objects of exchange) within a ritual-cosmological project imply the spatial polarisation of gifts and commodities.

2. In keeping with Point 1, alienable exchange is not restricted to phases of market-based economics, but is to be expected at specialised places (e.g. fairs, minsters, towns, emporia). This observation stresses the potential existence of locales of restricted market exchange in operation from the earliest period of settlement.
3. Most trade is primarily goal-orientated (cf. Samson 1991, 125) and therefore exists within specific higher value regimes. This can be compared with middle and low value regimes in local or mundane artefacts.

4. The identification of a social dynamic in land-holding (cf. Gregory 1997) suggests that conditions of reproduction have a territorial and spatially-definable context.

5. With the introduction of Christianity and the concomitant separation of individual and object, some values, rather than emanating from society, are determined by individuals on the basis of their intrinsic properties (cf. Dumont 1986; Parry 1986).

6. Points 1-3 stress the importance of the movement of people within social formation.

Central to these points are two important avenues of analysis to be explored via all four of the outlined methods of investigation. The first involves an analysis of the spatial organisation of production, exchange and consumption; the second, an exploration of value regimes from the basis of mortuary evidence. The applicability of the kingdom of Kent for detailed micro-economic investigation has been suggested on the basis of archaeological, theoretical and historical grounds (1.2-1.5). The postulated importance of the kingdom in trading networks and luxury good exchange, in addition to the quantity of excavated material from the county, thus place it in an ideal position for analysis.
II - The physical landscape: *pays*, territories and landscapes of communication
3.1 Introduction: a question of landscapes

The division of the landscape by historians, archaeologists and geographers has, as Tilley pointed out in 1994, imposed abstractions of space onto the lived human space of the past (1994, 8). In archaeological depictions of the past landscape, site distributions, nearest neighbour analysis or site catchment areas, are presented as static points or polygons within the Cartesian plane of environmental, or more commonly, geographical geometry. It follows that past human activities are therefore constructed from the perspective of mapped and measured space; in other words, one which regards "space as a medium rather than a container for action" (Tilley 1994, 10). Instead, conceptual structures of space in Tilley's view must consider human-environmental relationships in which the landscape linked cultural meaning, divisions of power, cosmological and economic prerogatives from the experiential perspective of lived social relations at the landscape level.

Although this view presents an important addition to how we perceive past landscapes, a vital key to understanding has, even in such phenomenological approaches, been the recognition that past and present landscapes were structured by uneven distributions of resources. Historians have long recognised the regional diversity in forms of medieval settlement and their relationship with the economic landscape. Homans' (1944) comparison of 'woodland' and 'champion' settlement, for example, was defined not merely by geographical attributes, but also by social structures of inheritance and the economic pattern of field-systems, whilst more recent approaches have stressed these pays as central to understanding regional forms of social and economic structure (e.g. Everitt 1977; 1979; 1986; Fox 1989; Bowman 1996). In keeping with many of the (often prehistoric) archaeological approaches to landscapes, this research clearly attempts to relate the economic landscape with the space of past action; an environmentally-deterministic view of which Tilley is very critical. In research of the historical period, however, the emphasis of such studies has often also been to relate the environmental attributes of a system with those of known political units, or to plot the boundaries of territorial units as they relate to the administrative structures known from documentary evidence. For example, Jolliffe's (1933) assertion that the antiquity of the lathe, and the importance this local administrative institution played in the structure of settlement and economic geography, was based on a view that saw the interdependence of socio-political systems and the landscape. By stressing the link between the structure of local communities
and the pattern of settlement, rather than strict environmental determinism, he in many ways influenced the direction that studies of English medieval rural settlement would take in successive generations. In keeping with Jolliffe, later landscape historians, for example, have been receptive to the influence of the Annales school, and approaches such as the one adopted by Everitt (1986) are clearly marked by their underpinning belief in the relationship between social structure, human settlement geography and the physical characteristics of geology and topography. Indeed, this assumption appears also to be espoused by Tilley, who rather than criticise the belief in a physical relationship of individuals and the landscape, seems instead to argue for alternate methods of perceiving the landscape, removed from contemporary mapped forms. Despite attempts at cognitive landscape modelling in GIS, however, it is becoming apparent that the abstract geographical principles on which this system rests has in the past propagated many studies suffering from the same prioritising of environmentally-deterministic explanations, criticised by Tilley (cf. Van Leusen 1999).

Though this study does not purport to offer any new methodological solutions, nevertheless it does hope to draw many of the past approaches to the Anglo-Saxon landscape together. Just as the ‘themes’ of GIS afford an opportunity to conceptualise the various layers of geographical structures, and to examine their significance of physical location in terms of visibility and accessibility, so too can the various conceptual landscapes be visualised as layers. A level of spatial data, comprising archaeological, place-name and historical evidence, is intrinsic, however, to the detail of landscape-layer construction. Due to the scarcity of any archaeological data pertaining to Kentish Anglo-Saxon settlements for example, any investigation of the internal organisation of settlement is unfortunately mostly speculative, whilst a discussion of the external topography of settlement by necessity is restricted primarily to the ceremonial and mortuary landscape and the associated hypothesised landscape of settlement.

Part II of this Thesis sets out to establish the spatial context of past action. The physical geography of East Kent is examined to provide the longue durée framework for an investigation of social and economic dynamics (i.e. Braudel’s conjonctures). In this endeavour, Alan Everitt’s illuminating work on the chronological development of settlement in Kent can in many ways be seen as the baseline for further spatial or topographical analysis of the county. By placing settlements firmly within the context of environmental zones, or pays, Everitt has been able to
infer specific landscapes of settlement, both in terms of temporal developments, as well as in the socio-political and economic relationships between them (Fig. 3.1). In this work, the examination of the interplay between ecological and social conditions, has shown the importance of physical geography as a guiding force; channelling, obstructing and moulding the evolving territorial institutions (1986, 11). Everitt’s primary interest however, lies in explaining the colonisation of the marginal *pays* from the ninth century onwards and the dynamics of dependency that tied these colonised zones to the quarter or so of Kent recognised as the Original Lands (i.e. the Foothill and Holmesdale *pays*). This later chronological emphasis in many ways blurs the motivating forces of the Kentish settlement history however, for it could be argued that it is the evolution of the estates, *regiones*, *villa regales* and *capita* of the Original Lands during the Early and Middle Saxon Periods that provided the context for later systemic relationships. By AD 800, fifty-five of the eighty-one settlement names recorded in pre-Conquest charters are sited within the Original Lands (Everitt 1979, 102) and the colonisation of the highland *pays* was just beginning. In the sense that later settlement colonisation of the Downland and central Chartland followed from earlier systems of transhumance from the lowland estates, the expansion of the settlement system beyond the Original Lands assumes that a complex hierarchy of settlements was well established by the early ninth century.

It is with the aim of focusing on this primary settlement dynamic that this study starts. In order to simplify both the comparison and elaboration of Everitt’s approach, much of his terminology has been adopted, whilst the case-study area chosen, East Kent, which comprises the Domesday *lathes* of Eastry, Borough, Limen, Wye and Milton (Fig. 3.2), can be seen both as the archaeologically-identifiable core area of the early kingdom and the focus of economic structures prevalent in the later medieval period. The Wantsum Channel is referred to interchangeably as part of the Coastal Plain (in this paper, the Foothill zone closest to the sea) or the East Kent Fens, depending on the context used.

### 3.2 The geomorphological background

In the following section an outline of the geomorphological characteristics of the Wantsum Channel area of north-east Kent is provided as a case-study for an analysis of environmental structuring conditions. As is suggested by comparable work on Romney Marsh in the south-east of Kent, this case-study seeks to demonstrate the evident importance of past ecological
dynamics. It is argued that understanding of the archaeological complexes can only be advanced by defining the complex, and much altered, spatial context of past action.

### 3.2.1 Introduction

Considerations of past geomorphological changes in East Kent are central to any interpretation of societal and economic systems prevalent during the Anglo-Saxon period in this region (Fig. 3.3). Drastic alteration to the landscape is shown not merely by Holocene sea-level changes, but also by local coastal responses (cf. Long 1992) and vegetational change associated with the closing of the Wantsum Channel, or the drainage of Romney Marsh. In contrast to present conditions, a model of Anglo-Saxon settlement history, particularly in the north-eastern corner of Kent, must therefore be seen with respect to a predominantly coastal and riverine environment. Given the location of many of the identified Anglo-Saxon archaeological complexes, this view consequently pre-eminences the charting of Wantsum Channel eco-dynamics and, by association, the rapid coastal advance which has accompanied its inning, as the primary step for any reconstruction of the Anglo-Saxon landscape and economy. Such an interpretation is not novel. Early works by Jessup (1930), Worsfold (1926; 1943; 1953), Hardman and Stebbing (1940; 1941), Walker (1927) and Chadwick-Hawkes (1968), amongst others, have attempted to place archaeological finds within a context of the temporal physical geography of the Wantsum. More recently, this appreciation of the Wantsum (OE *Wadsum*: winding) Channel as a safe navigable short-cut and haven, and the island geography of Thanet, has been cited as an important characteristic, not only of Roman (cf. Johnston 1977) and Early Medieval (cf. Brookes 1998) shipping patterns and settlement, but also as an explanatory feature of prehistoric occupation on Thanet (Perkins 1992).

Equal environmental concerns have underlined much of the work carried out by the Romney Marsh Research Group (now Trust) since 1983, on the 100 square miles (27,000ha) of coastal marshland making up the southern region of the East Kent study area. The overtly multi-disciplinary perspective advocated by this work has consistently attempted the presentation of archaeological material in the context of marshland evolution (e.g. Eddison 1995; 2000; Eddison & Green 1988; Eddison, Gardiner & Long 1998). As many of the results of this work have formed the basis of a number of conferences and a series of substantial monographs, the following will not attempt to revisit this data in anything but the most introductory fashion. Instead, a detailed geomorphological study of the north-east corner of Kent provides a
supplementary case-study of coastline evolution from which to posit a thesis on the ecological conditions of past action.

3.2.2 Romney Marsh

Whilst the investigations of geomorphological changes in Romney Marsh have to some extent outlined the problems of coastal and environmental reconstruction, these same studies have demonstrated the importance of integrating studies of settlement history with those of palaeogeographical evolution. According to these studies, the physical evolution of Romney Marsh formed in response to the combined environmental processes of sea-level change and the development of shingle barriers at Dungeness, as well as human reclamation activities during the historic period. A central concern of geomorphological studies has been to establish the timing and shape of the gravel beach barriers of the Dungeness Foreland and the sequence of sedimentary infilling comprising the Marsh proper. As part of these studies, offshore seismic surveys have demonstrated the progressive seaward migration of barrier sediments (Dix, Long & Cooke 1998), whilst numerous sedimentary analyses of the back-barrier marshes are slowly revealing a complex picture of paleochannels and tidal creek systems underpinning the marshland development (e.g. Waller, Burrin & Marlow 1988; Burrin 1988; Spencer, Plater & Long 1998; etc.) (Fig. 3.5). By comparison, the topographical reconstruction of Medieval estates (e.g. Brooks 1988), archaeological fieldwalking evidence (e.g. Reeves 1995) and retrogressive map-analysis (e.g. Eddison 1988; Smith 1998) are beginning to establish the sequence of Roman, Medieval and later land-use. In combination, these studies have provided a model of marshland formation demonstrating the importance of recognising changes in the course of major waterways (i.e. the River Rother) and other tidal channels, the rate of sedimentation and shoreline development as well as the pattern of human occupation and agri-pastoral exploitation (Fig. 3.5).

3.2.3 Previous work on the geomorphology of the Wantsum Channel

The interest shown by archaeologists in charting past coastal morphology in the area of the former Wantsum Channel has not been matched by that of geologists until recent years. Though some general works on geophysical aspects of the area exist (e.g. Edmunds 1960; Wooldridge & Linton 1955; Coleman 1952; Lacey 1929; Plackett 1961; etc.) it is only with more recent studies by, for example, Long (1991; 1992), So (1963), Bates (1994) and Tooley (in prep.) that the lack of interest in the geomorphology of north-east Kent has begun to be
improved. Some allusions to coastal features do appear in the historical works of Leyland (1535-43), Boys (1792), Hasted (1797-1801) and Lambarde (1570) etc., and these have been cited as mapping evidence for coastal changes (cf. Maxwell 1921; 1929; Lewis 1911; Mothersole 1924) along the north-east coast. Although this corpus of work offers a useful point of departure for the present study, which is intended both as a critical analysis and synthesis of many of the conflicting interpretations, it is suggested that some local spatio-temporal features are deducible from the combination of geological, cartographic and historiographical data.

3.2.4 Geology

The north-east Kent solid geology represents the eastern extension of the North Downs Chalk outcrop as it stretches from Chatham to Dover (Fig. 3.6). To the north, a gradual syncline underlies the plains of the Lower Stour and Wantsum Channel beyond which a final anticline of minor upfolds constitutes the geology of Thanet. This bedrock of the Upper Division is exposed in a layer between 91m and 116m in depth (Holmes 1981) and comprises a number of local variant beds and faults, offset with tabular flint bands.

Capping the Chalk are various Tertiary spreads of Thanet, Woolwich and Oldhaven Beds, London Clay, Claygate and Bagshot Beds as well as Pleistocene deposits of River Gravels and Head Brickearth (Fig. 3.4). The former drift cap is concentrated mainly in the Stour terraces and may be the product of post-glacial flooding (Worsfold 1926) or the remains of an ancient Wealden river system, whilst the latter is thought to be wind-borne at least in part (Weir et al 1971). Alluvial deposits, overlying a shallow chalk syncline, mark the Stour and Lydden Valleys and Wantsum Channel. These intertidal mudflat and tidal channel sands, silts and clays consist of dullish brown and bluish-grey silty clay and fine loam, and have been recorded up to 9m in depth, though the identification of marine shells within the upper 12m of the underlying Thanet Beds have led to the suggestion that the Channel may have been up to about 21m in depth at one time (Hardman & Stebbing 1940, 75).

The rate of inundation of the Wantsum due to changing sea-levels has been estimated by Devoy (1979), who based its greatest limits on the extent of the alluvial plain believed to be in existence in the Roman and/or Anglo-Saxon period (Fig. 3.4). This zone corresponds roughly with that of the 2m contour around the river-valley and is about 0.5m below sea level during
the spring tides (Hearne et al. 1995, 258). At this time, the Channel could be seen to range in width from 4,000m at its seaward ends to just 1,000m between Wall End and Sarre (the traditional Medieval ferry crossing). Though the exact mechanism and rate of Wantsum inning remains somewhat speculative, a consideration of the geomorphological processes involved in the deposition of the alluvial beds remains central to this thesis.

The silting up of the Channel is believed to have occurred as a consequence of the gradual establishment of the offshore Stonar Bank as a bay-bar through a process of onshore shingle migration (Robinson & Cloet 1953, 70). Forming from late prehistory to the present, the offshore bank was slowly driven inland by tidal currents or wave action, eventually blocking off the southern terminus (ibid) leading to increased alluviation of the river valley.

Such a thesis has been criticised, however, by So (1963) for not adequately explaining either the geological make-up of the Stonar Bank, nor the shape of the spit. This model argues that the Stonar Bank predates the infilling of the Wantsum and that the spit would have migrated against the Channel currents. Instead, So’s float tests in Sandwich Bay (ibid. 183) suggest that both the Stonar Bank and the Shellness Spit grew northwards as a result of re-deposited shingle, sand and pebble material carried by the predominant north-easterly longshore swell. This suggestion is lent some credence by historical data which records a double mouth to the southern entrance of the Wantsum Channel in AD 1267 (Brookes 1998) and also that Stonar itself was initially a shingle bank island which gradually built up northwards (presumably in tandem with the growth of the Shellness Spit) until joining the Ebbsfleet peninsular, and sealing the Wantsum, at sometime during the later Medieval period.

The Stonar and Peperness (Shellness) shingle-storm beaches had certainly begun to develop in prehistory, as several sets of Roman settlement remains have been identified overlying the shingle spits (Jolliffe 1963). The founding of the town and port of Stonar in the late eleventh century on the southern terminus of the Stonar Bank heralded a new period of intense occupation that was to continue until the town’s destruction in 1385. Although Saxton’s 1575 map (Fig. 3.7) of the Four Southern Counties (Ravenhill 1992, 32) shows that by that date
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1 Boys (1792) records an official perambulation by the Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports from this year, in which his itinerary took him: “through Sarr and Boxley in Thanet, to the shore at the passage directly against the cross of Hennebergh, and from that cross straight to the opposite side to the sea; and thence along the sea shore to Stonore...and on the other side of the river, crossing over to Peperness”.

84
Shellness had extended to the middle of Stonar, a position recorded also by Symonson in 1596\(^2\) and Seller in 1690 (Robinson, Pl.16), conflicting evidence is implied by both Redman (1854) and William Borough's 1596 maps of south-east England (Robinson 1962, Pl. 11) (Fig. 3.8), which place the distal end of the spit at Sandown Castle in the late sixteenth century. These discrepancies are only explicable following a consideration of the more recent coastal changes. O.S. one-inch maps from 1819 onwards and the six-inch versions from 1876 demonstrate that although the spit has extended nearly 610m northwards during that period, there have also been temporary shifts back (Fig. 3.9). These fluctuations in the development of Shellness would have been even more marked when the distal end of the spit lay to the south. In these circumstances the spit was under greater influence from north-easterly wave action (So 1963, 195), as was demonstrated by the extensive deposition of storm beach sediments following a major storm in 1287 that greatly extended the spit, almost blocking off the Wantsum (Hearne, Perkins & Andrews 1995, 243). In general terms, the extrapolated rate of net growth northwards suggested by Robinson and Cloet (1953) which places the end of Shellness close to Bloody Point in the mid-ninth century, could be accepted as plausible, provided one takes into account temporal setbacks in the growth of the Shellness spit.

During the thirteenth century, both natural processes and increased innning and draining operations had made the Channel virtually unnavigable (Davis 1934), though a ferry continued in operation at Sarre until a bridge was built in 1485 (Land 1992, 67). Though the exact nature of the geomorphological conditions prevalent during the Early to Middle Saxon Period cannot be postulated, an approximate picture of the watercourse can be suggested. The steeply shelving marine shoreline excavated below the alluvium in 1994 at Weatherlees Hill and the associated Medieval (eleventh- to early fourteenth-century) drainage ditches suggest that the Ebbsfleet peninsular continued to constitute the seashore until the fourteenth century (Hearne, Perkins & Andrews 1995, 258). By extrapolating this evidence, the Anglo-Saxon shoreline is expected to be close by (i.e. within \(\approx 7\)m), though submerged by the extent of the alluvial deposits.

Though natural processes led in part to the infilling of the Wantsum waterway, anthropogenic agency can be seen to have assisted the reclamation of the river valley. A number of monastic tidal defence walls and associated innning operations can be noted especially in the Chislet
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\(^2\) P. Symonson's 'New Description of Kent' 1596 5\(\frac{3}{4}\) inches to 1 mile
Valley, running parallel to the former coastline (Bowler 1983, 36), until the final closure of the northern terminus and subsequent drainage and management of the Wantsum Channel in the late sixteenth century (Fig. 3.10). Though no secure dates are known for the earliest sea defences, the fact that they are not mentioned in the mid-tenth-century Reculver charter boundary (S546), which records its eastern perimeter along the *mylen fleot* (Hogwell sewer) to *hade mœringe* (probably the Hemmings field) (Gough 1992, 94-5), suggests that inning operations post-date this period at least. Sea defence earthworks, such as The Monk’s Wall and Boarded Groin near Sandwich, were probably begun in the twelfth or the thirteenth century by the monks of St. Augustine (Hearne, Perkins & Andrews 1992, 243), and a similar date could be suggested for the onset of large-scale reclamation throughout the river valley. That the documented Anglo-Saxon features correspond with the boundary between marsh and dry land and are closer to the latter than the earliest defences further corroborates the view that the extent of the alluvial deposits marks the late Saxon/Norman Wantsum coast. As such, the late twelfth- to early thirteenth-century feature identified cutting the alluvium at the Weatherlees Hill excavation (Hearne et al. 1995, 258) provides a *terminus post quem* for the greatest extent of the alluvial spread. Of interest, Bede relates that the Wantsum Channel was three furlongs (i.e. 660 yards, or 603m) wide in his day, a figure broadly reconcilable with the c.700m of alluvium between Gore End and Sarre. This implies that the top of the alluvium, shoreward of the high medieval defences, can be correlated with the highest water-mark during the mid-twelfth century, which despite probable truncation by modern agriculture, still exceeds 1.5m O.D. (Hearne et al. 1995, 159).

**3.2.5 Coastal Recession**

Holocene sea-level changes (Long 1991, 92) and the considerable tidal range recognisable around the south-east coast (Bergsager 1985, 18) have had a great effect on local coastal morphology, as is most recently demonstrated by the loss of Beachy Head. The rate of coastal erosion however, can be seen to have a wide range of localised deviations due to diverse coastal landforms and features in the region. Landslips on the London Clay coast between Whitstable and Reculver appear to have had a greater mean effect on coastal recession than around the Upper Chalk coast of Thanet.

This phenomenon is most clearly demonstrated by the course of the six-fathom (36ft or c.11m) submarine contour as it arcs around the Thanet headland before broadening to enclose the
shallower waters of the Kentish Flats. Its course, and the identification of terrestrial material
within the bounded area from hydrographic samples, suggests the possible limit of coastal
waste (So 1963, 37).

Though little evidence exists to demonstrate the rate of coastal change in the prehistoric
period, some observations can be cited to postulate the rate of more recent erosion. The mean
rate of attrition over the last two centuries has often been calculated by a comparison between
terrestrial reference points and their distance from the sea, particularly the Roman fort and
Twin Sister church of Reculver.

Around the north coast of Kent, an extension of present-day inland topographical profiles
which are not rising seaward, would place the former coastline approximately 2-3 miles
(c.3200-4800m) further north (So 1963, 62). This argument is supported by a line of cement
boulders, marked on early Admiralty Charts, and considered by Smith (1907) to have been
navigation marks lying originally on the south bank of the river. Interestingly, Collard (1902)
recalls that during the exceptional low tide of 1896, these cement-stones were exposed along
with large tree stumps and trunks, as well as ancient fishing weirs and were visible up to 1¼
miles (c.2,000m) beyond the Black Rock.

Leland (1535-43) relates that c.1535 Reculver was within a ¼ of a mile (i.e. c.402m) or so of the
sea, an estimate considered by Smith (1850) to mean double the amount due to Leland’s usual
measure of distance. Smith’s contention would suggest that almost 900 yards (823m) of
coastline had been eroded between 1535 and 1850, a mean rate of attrition close to present-day
figures. Similarly, Page (1932, 19) details a plan of c.1600 which places the fort within 180 yards
(155m) of the coast to the north and somewhat closer to the north-west (Jessup 1936, Dowker
1881). Various periods of particularly bad weather appear to have accelerated the rate of
recession, as is illustrated by a petition of 14th January 1657 by the inhabitants of Reculver
stating that ‘the sea has since Michaelmas last enroached on land near six rods’ (i.e. c.100 foot,
or c.90m, in 15 weeks) (R.C.H.M. 1881, I, paragraph 248a). The north wall appears to have
fallen into the sea around 1690 (Batteley 1711), by 1735 the coast had moved to within 60
yards (55m) of the church (Urban 1735), and in June 1809 the cliff was five yards (4.6m) from
the north corner of the tower (Jessup 1936) forcing the building of the protective works by
Trinity House to save the church towers. A plot of the known measures, in combination with
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recent coastal charts of the undefended coast further west, suggests that the mean loss rate through cliff erosion can be gauged at \( \pm 170 \) to 200m a century at Reculver, with far less appreciable change around Seasalter and Whitstable, an area of Lower London Tertiaries.

The Upper Chalk geology of the Thanet coast, though less yielding to wave action, has also undergone heavy recession due to its more prominent, exposed location. Generalisations on the annual rate of attrition have ranged for this coastline from as much as 30 feet per annum (i.e. 9.144m) (Lyell 1867) in the nineteenth century, to more recent estimates of 8 inches to a foot (0.203m-0.305m) (Hole 1957). Though the process is clearly slower than along the Whitstable/Reculver coast, the Thanet Upper Chalk does degrade irregularly forming cliff-platforms, caves, inlets, arches and stacks depending on the varying structure and hardness of the bedrock. Similarly, exposure of the north-east coast to more extreme weather conditions appears to have caused a greater net erosional effect than on the northern cliffs. This suggestion is in part borne out by the extension seawards of chalk coombe profiles, which on the northern coast continue for around 800m as opposed to around 1,000m in the east (So 1963, 125). Finally a comparison between the estate plans of Holland House, Kingsgate, Broadstairs of 1761 and modern O.S. maps reveal a loss of land nearly 70m wide (Perkins pers. comm.) over the last 250 years. In light of the insufficient data a conservative estimate would suggest an annual rate of attrition at around 25-30cm, with recession of the north coast since AD 800 of around 300m and to 360m or so on the eastern side. In contrast, the mid- to late-Saxon coast at Reculver is believed to have lain almost 2,000m further seaward, with a narrowing of the coastline westwards more in line with the modern topography.

In addition to the geological data, certain topographical features have been deduced from the Reculver charter boundary by Gough (1992). As such the mid-tenth century saw not only the continuation of West Brook (the *norðmufan* of the text) and Plenty Brook (*maian brœc*) to the north coast, but also the existence of a small island around Black Rock (*ibid.*, 94), separated from Reculver by the two mouths of the Bishopstone Brook as it flowed into the Thames estuary and Wantsum Channel. A combination of these features and an interpolation seaward of modern coastal contours has enabled the extrapolation of an approximate view of the coastal topography of this area during the mid-to late Saxon period (Fig. 3.11). Unfortunately, equivalent documentary evidence is lacking for the Thanet coast.
3.2.6 Environmental Characteristics

This outline of the physical geography of north-east Kent presents a picture of the East Kent Fens during the Anglo-Saxon period with extensive areas of water, shingle beaches, estuaries, salt marshes and islands. Although the reclaimed alluvial marshy levels now support mixed agriculture and pasture, freak flooding, such as occurred in 1953, has, on occasion, caused a resumption of the coastal characteristics of the area. Unfortunately, the estuarine mineralogy sequences that constitute such marine/brackish sediments restrict the terrestrial pollen record and hinder any reconstruction of past vegetation (Smyth & Jennings 1988, 1). In light of recent work (Kerney, Preece & Turner 1980; Burrins & Scaife 1984; Smyth 1986; Smyth & Jennings 1988; Long 1992; etc.) which has begun to address the causal mechanisms of Holocene alluviation and floodplain formation in south-east England, some general trends in the regional vegetation history can be commented on. Woodland clearance in the Wealden district during the late Bronze to early Iron Age appears to have started a complex process of episodic valley-side erosion, colluvial inwash and floodplain development in the coastal and lower valley zones, which, in combination with climatic change and rising sea-levels, form the sequence of freshwater, estuarine and marine depositionary environments visible from palynological and sedimentological analysis. Concurrent with this dramatic deforestation, recent pollen frequencies record a greater diversity of meadow herbs and an increase in Gramineae and Cerealia. Palaeoenvironmental investigations at East End, Ash (Bates 1994) provide a local example of the general visible trends. At c.2000 b.p. a major environmental change is evidenced by a decrease in lime pollen (Tilia) and the formation of salt-marsh throughout the area investigated. A small back marsh channel identified by sampling, formed from brackish tidal waters and slope runoff, contributed to a mixed terrestrial/salt-marsh flora and fauna whilst the adjacent higher ground retained some woodland and open areas of grassland/bracken shrub (ibid.). Similarly, investigations in the Lydden Valley (Long 1992) record a complex sequence from salt-marsh to supratidal or intertidal mudflat conditions related to rising sea-levels and inundation. Given these prevalent environmental conditions all along the Wantsum Channel, Old English place-names mentioned in pre-AD 731 charters such as Stodmarsh ('the marshland where the horses graze': S7) and Sudanie ('an ðeg marsh island': S1648) on Thanet, or residual British names such as Reptacaestir (Richborough: 'the muddy estuary waters') and Canterbury ('walled town by the marsh') (Cox 1976) make greater sense as contemporary descriptive nomenclature.
Although the full effects of past tidal waters on local aquatic plant communities cannot be charted exactly, the correlation between the swamp and tall-herb fern species which dominate the East Kent Fens today and the existent pollen sequences for north-east Kent suggest that much the same coastal vegetation existed during the Anglo-Saxon period. Given however, that present species such as *Typha angustifolia* and *Sparganium erectum* require a slow-moving, eutrophic water habitat (Rodwell 1995, 185-193) the distribution of these communities may have been restricted in the past to the flat, sheltered areas removed from the Wantsum tidal flux. In addition to these present taxa, which also include tall-herbs such as *Praegmites australis* and *Phalaris arundinacea*, the identification of *Aster*-type and *Chenopodiaceae* in the Lydden Valley pollen record (Long 1992, 193) suggests estuarine reed-swamp conditions forming a vegetation zone between the open-water and swamp aquatic species and the woodland and meadow species on drier ground. Given that, in general, drift soils in north-east Kent, with the exception of alluvial and Nailbourne deposits, are moderately to well draining (Fordham & Green 1973, map) these transitional fen communities are expected to have been limited to coastal and river terrace geologies.

Dryland species represented in the Lydden Valley (Long 1992) and Ebbsfleet (Scaife 1995) sequences, although dominated by *Gramineae*, attest also to high frequencies of *Quercus* and *Corylus* pollen, much the same species as in the present (Rodwell 1991, 156). Around 75% of Kent's woodland today takes the form of this coppiced ash-maple-hazel underwood interspersed by oak wood (Garrad 1954, 199), depending on the base status of the soils (Rodwell 1991, 185). The *Quercus-Pteridium-Rubus* woodland appears to cluster on less calcareous bedrock with a marked transition to the *Fraxinus-Acer-Mercurialis* wood on base-rich soils and clays (ibid.). The Ebbsfleet sequence (Fig. 3.12) records a reduction of *Quercus* during the Roman/Anglo-Saxon period with an associated expansion of *Corylus, Fraxinus, Fagus* and *Carpinus* secondary woodland, possibly related to either a new phase of community expansion, or, as these species represent the most common coppicing *taxa*, increased woodland management (Scaife 1995, 303-313). This period is also characterised by some remaining oak/hazel and lime woodland and a substantial increase in *Plantago lanceolata*, which also signifies a phase of post-Roman woodland expansion (ibid.).

In terms of charting a diversified and evolving Kentish landscape over the last two millennia, palaeoenvironmental evidence is found wanting, however, for the lack of source material
(Scaife 1987, 125), and a dependency on samples from Sugarloaf Hill, Folkestone or Brook in the Weald, offer little direct or local evidence for the subtlety and patch-work character of the rural scene. In contrast, as Kent experienced little parliamentary enclosure in the eighteenth century, the landscape historical approach espoused by, for example, Everitt (1986), has provided a methodological basis for the reconstruction of past settlement, land-use and ecology which is able to illuminate both the diversity and evolution of the landscape through the period. An example is offered by the historical distribution of woodland throughout the study area. Though some woodland remnants still prevail along the steeper-sided Downland valleys to the south, the deforested Foothill zone of rich agricultural land is only interrupted by the last vestiges of the Blean Forest to the north of Canterbury. As is attested by the large number of woodland names around the Blean (Norwood, Grovehurst, Woodstock and Wildmarsh etc.) (Fig. 3.13), it is likely that this wood once extended from the Medway to the Wantsum (ibid., 30). This pattern matches that of the heavy London Clay geology, which is avoided both by Early Anglo-Saxon place-names and finds (Fig. 3.14), suggesting the Blean, like the Weald, formed a region of later ‘colonisation’ which was utilised primarily as managed woodland and for transhumance throughout most of the first millennium AD. Similarly, though Thanet is now almost entirely deforested, the number of place-names featuring woodland nomenclature such as Westwood, Nuthwood, Colyswood, Villa Wood etc. remind us of the prevalence of woodland until more recent periods of land clearance.

Whether one can assert that the Blean was primarily royal property, which was only parcelled out amongst private owners in the eighth to tenth centuries, as is the case in, the Weald (cf. Witney 1976) is difficult to say. In favour of such an interpretation Hasted asserts that the Thornden Wood, mentioned as a neighbour to the Reculver property in Eadred’s charter (S546, Gough 1992, 97) was “the king’s antient forest of Blean”. Given Everitt’s contention that minsterlands were generally royal or monastic foundations associated with early Jutish estate-centres (1986, 261), the St. Augustine grant by King Æthelberht in AD 605 may well equate with the later parishes of Westbere and Chislet, including the detached Chislet-Blean portions mentioned as adjacent to the Reculver estate. The St. Augustine lands based on Chislet thus formed, as neighbouring properties belonging to Reculver Abbey and Minster Abbey (i.e. the Sturry portion), discrete ‘multiple estates’ combining marshland pasture, demesne lands and woodland pasture by at least the tenth century, and probably from as early as their foundation in the seventh century (Tatton-Brown 1992, 85).
3.2.7 Conclusions

The results of this case-study and comparable work in both Romney Marsh and the Swale Estuary suggest that the coastal and marginal environments of East Kent have been subject to radical, and sometimes very rapid change throughout the Holocene period. With evidence for such dramatic change in the form of Medieval inning in the East Kent fens or coastal erosion and sea-level change throughout the south-east of England, it is clear that any attempted investigation of past human occupation and activities, cannot proceed without an assessment of contemporary material and environmental conditions. As a corollary, given the documented importance of the Wantsum Channel for inter-regional connections, any investigation of the spatial organisation of socio-economic behaviour, especially of issues such as location utility and circulation, is dependent on the successful geographical identification of this major maritime routeway.

Whilst the outlined coastal changes can therefore be seen to underline substantial ecological alteration over the past two millennia in these marginal areas, changes to the inland environment of Kent are better understood as the result of human interaction. Colonisation and use of the coastal margins could in many ways be described as a losing battle against a constantly changing environment. Alternatively, the evidence from palaeoenvironmental and place-name research suggests relative environmental stability away from the coast. Most of the modern taxa have been established since the Bronze Age, and Kent remains to this day one of the most heavily wooded areas of the country. Whilst economic colonisation of the coastal margins is crucially linked to environmental dynamics therefore, colonisation of the inland margins of the Weald is tied to changing patterns of human activity. The socio-economic dynamic underlying this form of colonisation has long been recognised by historians, and it is the aim of the next section to elaborate on the results of this research.

3.3 Reconstructing the structure of the kingdom of Kent

3.3.1 Sources

That the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Kent features so prominently in Bede's narrative history of the English People is as much due to the importance of the Canterbury archives in providing the source documentation, as the role the kingdom played in the conversion of England. Despite devoting twenty-two chapters to a description of the British Isles and the pre-Conversion history of England however, Bede reveals precisely little of the secular or
administrative structures prevalent during this period, beyond naming some of the sub-territories of the early English kingdoms. This fact notwithstanding, some semblance of the political map of Anglo-Saxon tribes south of the Humber, can be gleaned from a comparison of HE and the ‘Tribal Hidage’. If a seventh-century date for this Mercian (or Northumbrian) fiscal record is accepted, the picture presented is a snap-shot of temporal development, with the smallest units indicating the sort of local hegemons with which the process of peer-polity competition is argued to have started, and the largest, those where regional chiefs are beginning to claim authority over wide areas and people (Davies & Vierck 1974; Bassett 1989; Higham 1995; Scull 1999). In this light, Kent's assessment of 15,000 hides represents a kingdom of considerable size and cohesion by this date, belying its historical composition of two separate regna amalgamated under the Oiscingas of East Kent in the sixth century. As described in HE, the people of Kent, the Cantware, are bounded by the peoples of the East Saxons to the north of the Thames and the South Saxons to the west and south. Although of middling size in terms of hidation, the strong sense of unifying regional identity, manifested throughout the seventh and eighth centuries by sporadic autonomous leadership and action runs in some contrast to the concepts of hyper-regional leadership suggested by Bede's imperium or the Bretwalda of the ASC. Even as a dependent regnum in the later Anglo-Saxon period, Kent appears to retain a certain amount of independent jurisdiction and territorial cohesion. Despite the undeniable importance of charismatic leadership and personal relationships between men in unifying the tribal groupings of the Early Medieval period therefore, it has been argued on such evidence by a number of authors that many of the early Anglo-Saxon kingdoms owed much to existing territorial groupings (e.g. Higham 1995; Hooke 1998). Given that some of the identified groups, including the Cantware (Brooks 1989), the Hwicce (1985) and the East Saxons (Bassett 1989), appear to take on geographical footings not dissimilar to the civitates of Late Roman Britain, this evidence could and has been used to posit a case for continuity in Roman territorial divisions.

Although Bede affords the earliest source of information on the kingdom of Kent therefore, it is primarily from later texts that the evidence of settlement topography and administration is inferred. Some idea of the state operation can be gleaned from the law codes of Æthelbehrt, Hlothhere and Eadric, and Wihtred, but it is primarily from the charter and diploma evidence and most importantly from the Domesday Book (DB) and the Domesday Monachorum (DM) of Christ Church, that the structure of this Anglo-Saxon kingdom has been debated. In addition
to these texts, two further important satellite Domesday surveys provide notable primary source material (Eales 1992, 6): the thirteenth-century cartulary of the Abbey of St. Augustine (White Book) which contains entries for a number of lands held by the Abbey of St. Augustine and Christ Church; and the Textus Roffensis (TR), with a list of Rochester episcopal estates. Secondary documentary evidence becomes more important in the form of antiquarian scholarship after William Somner’s Antiquities of Canterbury in 1640 and use has been made particularly of Hasted’s History and Topography of the County of Kent published in a series of volumes between 1797 and 1801. The interest in local history and antiquities shown by authors from the eighteenth century onwards forms the backbone of the archaeological evidence discussed, whilst it has predominately been the mission of twentieth-century historians and archaeologists to elucidate the framework of the Anglo-Saxon Kentish kingdom. These will be discussed more fully below.

Although the western border Kent shares with Sussex and Surrey is unclear in places in 1086, the boundary of Kent, as it existed prior to 1889, is most likely similar to that of the combined Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Kent. Though probably largely undefined, particularly in the Weald, this pattern of geographical boundaries is a useful, if speculative assumption which certainly holds true after the Domesday Survey. To the south, some of the wetlands of Walland Marsh may have belonged to the kingdom of the South Saxons as they did in the tenth century, whilst the natural boundary afforded by the River Rother across the featureless marshland is likely to have delimited the edge of the kingdom (Gardiner 1995, 35). That this border passed, in concordance with the pre-1889 county boundary, in the vicinity of Broomhill is also suggested by a mid-eighth century charter, whilst the general pattern of a boundary with Sussex along watercourses (Kent Water, Teise, Bewl, Kent Ditch and Rother) has been argued, on the basis of denn place-names to relate to an early demarcation (ibid., 36). The association between land-use and fixed boundaries in this respect may be important. Whilst the whole hierarchy of boundaries may have been employed to demarcate areas in regions of primarily arable and/or permanent pasture, these may have been much more loosely defined in relatively empty regions such as the Weald, where sporadic, or periodic, use necessitated the frequent redrawing of boundaries, at least initially (Welch, pers. comm. 2000). Finally, the Medway border with west Kent has been stressed as an important ethnic divide both in folklore and archaeology (e.g. Myres 1969, 48; 1970, 28) and it seems clear that it too formed a geographical and territorial boundary for some time during the Early Anglo-Saxon period.
3.3.2 Jolliffe and the social geography of settlement

Unfortunately, Jolliffe’s argument for a “very early origin” (1933b, 38) underlying the tenurial structure of Domesday and Medieval Kent is very difficult either to substantiate or refute. His attempts to chart the local patterns of administrative boundaries through the retrogressive analysis of evidence from Anglo-Saxon documents, the Domesday Survey and later sources, though very influential, suffers from a methodological selectivity of evidence all too apparent even to very early reviewers (e.g. Ward 1933). Nevertheless, his thesis presents a compelling account of a precociously centralised early kingdom which has influenced both a number of later analysts and underlined many of the arguments for Romano-British/Anglo-Saxon continuity in the county. It therefore deserves more expanded treatment here.

In a number of articles on Anglo-Saxon administrative structure Jolliffe (1929, 1933b *passim*) contended that the *lathe* (meaning ‘land’ or ‘landed possessions’) as it was recorded in DB and a few pre-Conquest documents, was an artefact of Anglo-Saxon, and possibly prehistoric, territorial organisation (Fig. 3.2). He argued that such *lathes*, though not recorded before the tenth century (Brooks 1989, 69-70) were equivalent to the *regio* sub-divisions mentioned by Bede, and he translated their function as the ‘jurisdiction’ or ‘court’ of a district. By drawing a link with documented eighth-century grants detailing Wealden denua lying on *limenwara wealde*, *weowara wealde* and in *burh waro maalde* (ibid., 70), as possible allusion to the Wealden pasture of the Domesday *lathes* of Limen, Weo and Burh, Jolliffe went on to assert that Kent had originally been divided into eleven (or possibly twelve) territories compared with the five and two-half-*lathes* recorded in the DB.

Underlying this ancient system of territorial administration lay an economic framework founded on further uniquely Kentish social mechanisms. In contrast to the general pattern of Southern England, the settlement form of Anglo-Saxon Kent was assumed to have been composed of scattered hamlets, underlying the patchwork character of the later manor and parish units. Rather than nucleated villages, the fully-formed thirteenth-century estates in Kent constituted an ‘archipelago’ of dependent units in the landscape accreted from these earlier hamlet settlements.

Spatially, these manorial estates were formed out of demesne lands, ‘inland’ dependent peasant fields and ‘outland’ *gavelkinders*, or free peasants. The latter term merits brief further
explanation. Codified in 1293, a body of Kentish customs, known collectively as “the Customal of Kent” describes a unique Kentish form of partible inheritance known as *gavelkind*, argued by the people of Kent in the thirteenth century and modern historians alike, to represent a remnant of Pre-Conquest social organisation (Jolliffe 1933b, 19; Sinclair Williams 1979, 78; Hull 1958; 1980; etc.). By the thirteenth century, a number of clauses set *gavelkind* apart from contemporary forms of primogeniture inheritance: land was divided equally between all sons (or daughters in the absence of sons); *gavelkind* land was not forfeited if the tenant was hanged as a felon; the widow of a deceased tenant retained half of the estate during her lifetime, whilst the other half was apportioned between heirs; the youngest heir inherited the hearth; and so on (ibid.). In addition, thirteenth-century *gavelkinders* claimed they were free (i.e. equivalent to the Anglo-Saxon *ceorl*), as is also suggested by their ability to dispose of land under the provisions of the ‘Customal’. In this respect, the rights of *gavelkinders* contrasts markedly with those of the dependent tenants of the ‘inland’ (the *laets* of Æthelberht’s laws) or the unfree villeins and slaves (*theow*) of the demesne, who were inseparable from the estate itself (Jolliffe 1933b, 17-18; Witney 1982, 17-20). In this interpretation, forms of landholding and social status were therefore inexorably linked. *Gavelkinders*, occupying the ‘outland’ were essentially rent-payers, holding land in exchange for food rent and military service. The various forms of *laet*, occupying the ‘inland’ by contrast, had no independent claim to their land, although they were still required to pay food rent, and were additionally required to undertake numerous duties for their lord, ranging from picking and storing the lord’s apples, to stocking the hall and herding and droving (ibid., 66).

To complete the self-sustaining economic requirements of the estate many also maintained a fourth unit; detached pasture and woodland, often physically removed from the primary manor though bound to it through jurisdictional ties (Eales 1992, 11-12). From the charter evidence one could therefore clearly see more important manors in the arable Foothill zone laying claim to a denn or shared denn in the Weald for swine-pasture or woodland, meadow pasture, and marsh for fishing rights and, presumably, also salt-rights (S 9; S 233; S 1611; S 140; S 35-6; S 123; S 125; etc.) to complement their more local agricultural assets. These specialised marginal areas also provisioned the *gavelkinders* of the ‘outland’ in the form of common land, particularly in the Weald.
This scattered pattern of multiple holdings was only explicable if these units originally formed much larger estates containing a similar mixture of lands. These, Jolliffe contended, were administered by the East Kentish kings through the lathe, which itself originated as an economic unit encompassing part of all of the natural agricultural zones. The two westernmost lathe, Sutton and Aylesford, represented the clearest example of the economic logic behind the territorial structure, forming extended corridors of land, up to 25 miles long by 10 miles wide (i.e. 40x16km), from the marsh and sea resources of the coast, across arable and downland pasture to the woodland resources of the Weald. The eastern coastal lathe of The Borough and Eastry by contrast, retained their share of Wealden appurtenances despite their physical separation, leading to the suggestion that the East once formed a single larger agglomeration, including the lathe of Wye and Lyminge (Thorne 1992, 64). In this way Kent was seen to have been sub-divided into symmetrical economic units from an early period, centred on the royal estate centre (villa regalis), and containing a mixture of arable and pasture, woodland resources, royal demesne, dependent and freer holdings. The administrative and judicial role of the lathe, in contrast, was argued to have been a later superimposition, which developed in tandem with the dispersal of the royal estate amongst ecclesiastical and lay magnates (Whitney 1982, 55).

The argument that the lathe as it appeared in Domesday Book retained an artefact of far older institutions was simple:

"If the sulungs arose purely out of the natural growth of the manorial estates, as a means of admeasuring the tenements and their liabilities, their total for the county, or for any area above the grade of the manor, will be irregular. Symmetrical planning will appear within the sphere of the private estate only and will be determined by it. If, on the other hand, the hidation was part of an older royal administration, we shall find a scheme based on larger and more regular units than the manors.” (Jolliffe 1933b, 43)

As he then went on to prove that the sulung assessments of the primitive lathe in contrast to the manorial assessments or the actual physical acreage, were internally consistent within Domesday at either 80 or 160, Jolliffe argued for the lathe's, and not the manor's, antiquity. Additionally, the royal relationship with the lathe was demonstrated with the recognition that Domesday sulung and yoke assessments fell only on 'outland'. Milton lathe, for example, retained the greatest proportion of demesne and 'inland' into the medieval period, and was

---

3 The sulung was a uniquely Kentish form of assessment equitable with the hides elsewhere, and made up of four yokes (i.e. virgates).
consequently assessed at only 80 sulungs, despite answering to 170 ploughs (Eales 1992, 12). This, Jolliffe contended, indicated a high degree of centralisation, crucially tied to the Kentish kings, who not only imposed the lathes as internal provinces, but assessed them with respect to their own income. The villa regalis was regarded as the caput of the whole lathe, whilst hamlet settlement was the basis of social organisation at the local level. The alodial property of the demesne and ‘inland’ contrasted with that of the freer ‘outland’ which was tied together by the ‘common law’ or ‘folk-right’ of the gavelkind (Jolliffe 1933b, 68).

Given this view of the lathe as an early royally-instituted administrative framework, Jolliffe saw the (in his view) later imposition of the hundred in terms of a form of seignurial enceillement (Fig. 3.15). The high number of demesne manor and hundred name associations stressed, he argued, the centrifugal forces of disintegration on the royal estates as enfeoffed lands passed into the alodial lordship of ecclesiastical and secular estates. In contrast to the well-ordered and uniform lathe, the unusually large number of hundreds in Kent come in a variety of sizes, representing in some cases only single estates (e.g. Fordwich, Sandwich, Sturry, Chislet) and stretching in their Domesday Book assessment from one yoke (Wechylstone) to 61 sulungs (Hoo) (Thorne 1992, 52). This pattern was seen in terms of the new modes of tenure, probably introduced during the period of West Saxon rule sometime in the tenth or eleventh centuries. Particularly the smaller hundreds could be seen to have been dominated by a single manor, and these were seen as evidence of ‘blanch’ estates, where the hundred formed a jurisdictional appurtenance to the granted vill (cf. Cam 1963, 69). Only when the estates were maintained as tenurial units, such as was the case of the royal lathe of Milton, or the ecclesiastical lordship of the 22½ hundreds of Wye, could the pre-hundredal districts be recognised (Jolliffe 1933a, 160). As such, the hundreds that remained under royal control, could be seen to demonstrate a number of features in contrast to those areas that formed part of the great franchises into secular and ecclesiastical lordship. These royal hundreds (e.g. Milton, Faversham, Eastry) were generally larger, as they encompassed the demesne, inland and outfield of the royal estate; they had at their centre a villa regalis; and as a consequence of the patterns of royal privilege, also contained a larger number of estates belonging to king’s thegns and other royal servants (ibid.). These “complexes of royal privilege” were therefore “so intermixed as to resist division for the function of the hundreds” (ibid.), whilst the history of the enfeoffed territories “owe[d] their variety and completely disparate proportions to the natural inequalities of the map of lordship” (Jolliffe 1933b, appendix).
3.3.3 Jolliffe's critics: analysis and synthesis

Jolliffe's interpretations have been attacked for their methodological shortcomings (e.g. Ward 1933; Witney 1976; 1982) and conclusions (e.g. Brooks 1989; Everitt 1986; Gardiner 1995) on a number of occasions, so there is little to be added on the subject other than a brief consideration of their critiques.

Retrogressive analysis of territorial estates from the geld assessments in DB presents a number of serious problems, not least among them the assumption that the hidages recorded in 1086 represented an antique, unmodified relic of estate organisation. However, even despite Witney's (1976, 35-6) demonstration that many of the round figure lathe assessments presented by Jolliffe should be questioned, some more recent re-evaluations have come to the similar identification of recuring patterns in the Domesday valuations. Thorne, for example, has argued that "there is strong evidence in DB for the imposition of round units of assessment from above, but whether on large manors, later grouped into lathes, or on the lathes themselves is far from clear" (1992, 65: note 177). It is this uncertainty that suggests a possible revaluation of Jolliffe's underlying assumptions themselves. If the Domesday assessment took as its head the lathe rather than single vills for its valuation, it seems possible that the estates comprising a lathe could have shared the burden of payment. This interpretation makes amends both for the lack of continuity between assessments of named estates in pre-Conquest charters and their valuation in DB, and the seemingly round assessment of the lathes. Rather than an antique system, these rounded figures could really mean that the liability to taxation could have been comprehensively revised, using the fiscal lathe as the unit of assessment, shortly before 1066 (cf. Gardiner 1995, 29). Similar revisions have been recognised for example in Cambridgeshire and Northamptonshire, where it is argued that the basis of Domesday hide assessments was probably laid out in AD 942 (Hart 1970; 1974).

There is some further evidence that the lathe may indeed have been introduced to simplify the administration of older and more chaotic hundreds (Fig. 3.15). Brooks (1989, 70) uses the example of the Rochester bridge-work charter of c.975 in which a reference to "Hollingbourne and all the lathe that belongs to it" was one to an area corresponding with the Eyhorne hundred in DB, whilst Thorne (1992, 64) points out that the Bircholt hundred in DB was divided between the two lathes of Wye and Eastry. This seems to indicate that the lathe boundaries were either a late imposition, or had been readjusted during their history. Certainly
hundreds are known to have changed their composition for administrative convenience on a number of occasions during their development (e.g. amalgamation under a single bailiff, shipsoke or as constituents of larger manorial estates etc.) and it seems possible that the lathes represent some form of early attempt at simplification. On the other hand, Brooks stresses that too much importance has been placed on the territorial definition of the lathes rather than the other, jurisdictional role (1989, 70). If the courts of the lathes are correctly understood as the structure through which the gravelkinders could seek justice, then we should be neither surprised that they make no appearance in pre-Conquest charters and settlement disputes, the domain of the nobility and the shire courts, nor that they form overarching and clearly defined territorial regions. The hundreds in Kent, alternatively, are clearly tied to the manorial estate. Some are, as Jolliffe rightly pointed out, based on eleventh-century estates with no clear precedence, whilst many others, were constituted from a single manor. However, rather than an example of the fragmentation of royal power under the proprietary rights of enfeoffed lords, Loyn (1974, 13) impresses the need to see the hundred as an extension of royal power, for it was, as he sees it, the mechanism through which the king controlled his secular lords. By tying the jurisdictional administration of the kingdom to the royal manor and dependant satellite manors, kings attempted to control secular lords through servants directly tied to them, i.e. the reeves. Certainly multiple estates that fragmented to form manors are not peculiar to Kent (cf. Sawyer 1979) and it therefore seems possible that the hundred and lathes developed contemporaneously, though with different functions. That in Kent, the hundredal meeting places are so commonly located at the manorial centres, suggests the possible imposition of an explicit administrative framework, aimed at the security of royal assets at the local level, rather than their disintegration, whilst the lathes maintained the administration of the gavelkind. It is for this reason, rather than economic rationale, that the lathes form corridors of land to the Original Lands. As the gravelkinders cluster in the more marginal lands of the Weald and Downland, their administration is tied to the Wealden and Downland appurtenances of Foothill manors. Though the economics of the multiple estate system is therefore still seen as primary to the geographical form of the lathes, their function may well be a secondary addition pasted onto the existent tenurial settlement pattern.

3.3.4 Other approaches (Everitt and Witney)
Rather than assume the antiquity of rigid territories, more modern approaches to Kentish settlement, have stressed the importance of identifying the pattern of settlement in relation to
the types of countryside, or pays. It was these contrasting topographical zones of agrarian resources, rather than an overarching administrative framework, which have been recognised as underlining much of the settlement pattern in Kent. By looking at the ancient patterns of land usage in terms of their detached lands and ancient common rights, Everitt (1979; 1986) and Witney (1979; 1982) in particular, have drawn attention to the lack of territorial structure during the earliest phases of colonisation. Everitt sees the colonisation of the more marginal pays of the Downland and Weald by the settlements of the more intensively cultivated Foothills as fundamental to the structure of later Kent. In this view, the diffusion of appurtenances from the primary estate-centres pre-empted the development of administrative structures such as regiones, lathes or hundreds, which were put together piecemeal to manage the patterns of colonisation. For example, eighth- and ninth-century charters suggest that the Wealden commons were initially undivided and for the use of all of the settlements in the arable Foothills. Only with later sub-division, was access restricted to specific manors in the lowland areas, which even then, with the lathe as a form of Wealden frontage, established boundaries as colonisation pushed further south into Andred. The lack of settlement names south of the Wealden Clay line in DB demonstrates that this southerly colonisation of the Weald was still ongoing in 1086, and, as is shown by the changes in Wealden lathes and disputes of territories (e.g. Penenden Heath), into the thirteenth century and beyond. Rather than a primitive administrative framework into which settlement slotted, this model therefore stresses the importance of tenure in defining the later political and jurisdictional boundaries. Both Everitt (1986, 8) and Brooks (1989, 73) accept that a governing structure like the lathe may have had quite ancient origins, particularly in the East of the county. Whether the boundaries of such structures can be disentangled however from their subsequent evolution is doubtful. Certainly the population units such as the Weowara, the Limenwara, the Burhvara already mentioned, as well as districts such as Sturigao in AD 605 (S 4) and regio Eastrgena (‘the Eastry District’) in AD 788 (S128) hint that the regiones formed some kind of territorial groupings that may well have been crystallised into the lathe.

In addition, Everitt has argued that the form of hamlet settlement Jolliffe saw as characteristically Kentish, is a remnant of the colonisation away from the Foothills into the Downland and Wealden areas. As such, the pattern of settlement in the Downland and central Chart was formed by the same processes of colonisation, as was the Weald during subsequent periods. It was the relative freedom provided by the isolation of such marginal hamlet
settlements, he argues, which might have aided the development of *gavelkind* tenure. Rather than the Stenton-inspired portrait painted by Jolliffe of a proto-communist community of egalitarian peasants inhabiting the Wealden ‘folkland’, Anglo-Saxon society, particularly in the Original Lands, is therefore seen as a highly ordered class-society (cf. John 1996, 8). Only when such intersocial structures could not be physically reinforced, such as in the ‘Forest Counties’ of Kent, Sussex and Surrey, could more free forms of custom develop.

3.5 Conclusions: further questions

The outlined geographical and historical background to the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Kent, presents many more questions for the archaeologist than answers. Both lines of enquiry have revealed some common ground, however. Despite critiques levelled against environmentally-deterministic explanations in archaeology, both geographical and historical approaches have demonstrated the importance of ecological and topographical factors in structuring the socio-economic patterns of Anglo-Saxon settlement and action. On this basis, not only can an exploration of archaeological complexes not proceed without an understanding of the environmental dynamics underlying past material conditions, but the spatial characteristics of settlement themselves are resolutely related to the nature of social relations. Although the validity of modern concepts of territoriality, land and ethnicity implied by ‘kingdom’ could be debated (cf. Ausenda 1995), if Everitt is to be believed, one can not divide the administrative function from the agrarian units of territoriality. The custom of *gavelkind*, the ‘estate’ system and the *regio* are all testimony to the interrelation of custom and law with spatial units of the landscape. This is not to say that the landscape predetermined the territorial units that evolved, merely that, following Everitt (1986, 11), “the *regio* and the *lathe* were themselves evolving institutions necessarily moulded, as settlement expanded, by the intractable circumstances of locality and environment”.

Whilst this interrelationship between society and environment could therefore be taken as a point of departure for further research, many of the aspects of these relationships are not easily modelled in Cartesian space. Geomorphological evidence from East Kent demonstrates graphically that the environment was far from static. Equally, although we can draw many settlement areas and activities together to constitute an economic hinterland, in few documented cases do these units form continuous discrete wholes. In contrast to the idea of bounded space as presented by Aston’s interpretation of the tenth-century hundred as the
primary unit of administrative, judicial, economic and religious functions (Aston 1986), the
evidence for regions of colonisation and the disarticulated nature of early manorial holdings
questions the expectation of fixed past boundaries and patterns of tenure. If, as is suspected by
a number of authors (e.g. Hooke 1998; Saunders 1995), modern concepts of land ownership
only developed as a consequence of Church involvement during the Middle Saxon Period,
social reference to the landscape during the earlier period is expected to have been of a more
subjective manner. Such a view has numerous implications, not least regarding economic
parcelisation as already mentioned (2.2.2.4). Without concepts of commodified land,
landscapes are more likely to act as stores for cultural meaning; particularly in stressing
ownership and rights (Munn 1970). Furthermore, given the socio-cosmological relationships
underlying forms of land holding (2.2.2.3), the value-laden nature of the landscape itself is tied
to ritualised social action.

One possible way of investigating these issues is through a consideration of the routinised
reproduction of past daily life (cf. Giddens 1984). As human social activities define the
reproduction of cultural, political and social institutions, the temporality and spatial remit of
these activities aids the constitution of both individual biographies and institutions. By defining
spatially-dispersed manorial estates or indeed Kentish Wealden common lands, historians have
drawn attention to an example of such spatially-definable life-cycles. Interaction and
experience of the landscape, as well as concomitant ‘sense of place’ were crucially linked to
social roles defined by individual freedoms and relationships. The recognition that many of
these social roles manifested themselves in economic obligations provides us with important
evidence linking locales, in the shape of environmental affordances, and past life paths. These
issues form the focus of the next two chapters. In Chapter 4, the importance of past
movement in linking and perceiving locales of action, will be investigated. The demonstrated
separation of economic units comprising manorial estates, stresses the importance of both the
spaces between locales and the link between social mobility and the life rhythms of
transhumance and migration. In Chapter 5, the functional characteristics of the spatial
distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon settlements are discussed in order to emphasise the
integration of the regional system, as well as the assumed agricultural framework supporting
the relations of reproduction.
In summary, a survey of the geographical and historical background of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Kent, has demonstrated that:

- the spatial organisation of Anglo-Saxon social institutions was linked to ecological conditions and dynamics;
- neither Anglo-Saxon institutions, nor the environmental conditions were static over the period under investigation;
- economic parcelisation was an important characteristic of the evolving Anglo-Saxon institutions;
- Anglo-Saxon social relations both describe spatio-temporal life paths and reproduce economic locales.
4.1 Introduction

Processualist landscape interpretations have often been criticised for their perceived epistemological shortcomings. Rather than active, perspectival and structured, landscapes are seen as dehumanised characterisations, often interpreted in terms of half-cocked adaptations of spatial models borrowed from New Geography. Such critiques are not as relevant to Medieval landscape studies, which draw their methods more from the schools of French Regional Geography and Länderkunde than from that of Spatial science. However, the development of a re-humanised concept of the social and experiential landscape by phenomenological and cultural geographical approaches does provide new models for understanding. One example of this humanistic approach is the development of movement as a unit of study within the cultural landscape. Movement is implicitly seen as the basis of many experiential perspectives, and construed as one of the most obvious ways in which past agents engaged with the landscape. Verstehen, in the phenomenological sense, therefore requires a model of the landscape incorporating spatio-temporal social construction from the perspective of patterns of movement.

Although the phenomenological critique has undermined much earlier positivist epistemology, methodologically it has replaced it with few middle-range examples. The voluntarism of many humanistic approaches has, as Llobera points out, created “descriptions [that] are usually based on the researcher’s appreciation, which often remains at the theoretical level. They are incorporated within a narrative and lack any form of validation or means by which they can be faithfully explored” (2000, 65). Some resolution from the point of view of theoretical (e.g. agency theory) and analytical (e.g. GIS studies) modelling is taking place, but the gap between theory and practice still needs some bridging. With this in mind, an attempt will be made to explore Anglo-Saxon practices (Bourdieu 1977; 1992) in Kent. By focusing on the spatial manifestation of Early Medieval activities and the distribution and meaning of localities, the nature of the Saxon habitus can begin to be modelled. Such an endeavour is necessarily restricted, but does hope to set a framework for future investigation.

Whilst recent work attempting to model a sociology of movement within GIS space (Llobera 2000) has highlighted the dialectic relationship between agents and landscape, the evidence in Anglo-Saxon Kent of a fossilised network of movements, in the form of roads, droves and ironways, offers a spatial model from which the socialisation of the landscape...
can be investigated. Although some other archaeological studies exist in which ancient roads were seen as the specific focus of analyses (e.g. Trombold 1991), these have tended to emphasise Processualist concerns with their transport/economic functionality and as possible indicators of neo-evolutionary social and settlement hierarchies. In contrast, this focus on the routes of communication in Anglo-Saxon Kent hopes to consider the relationship between movement and the topography of the landscape, the social implications of movement, and the consequences movement has on the patterns of settlement.

Previous approaches to Anglo-Saxon England, and particularly Kent, have recognised the importance of roads and droves. Witney for example (1976) brilliantly devoted much space to the possible antiquity of the twelfth- and thirteenth-century droves and their role within the economic web of communications and settlement from the Roman period onwards. Additionally, some attempt has been made, particularly from the perspective of palynology, to stress the importance of Roman roads in aiding the construction of the social landscape. Roads are seen as delimiting boundaries (e.g. Hooke 1985, 58); operating as hundredal meeting places (ibid., 102) and provide functional benefits to military and economic endeavours. Little attempt has been made, however, to consider the social implications of the inherent movement such routes imply. Witney for example, did little to elaborate on the social implications that annual transhumance signals. Additionally, roads, and especially Roman roads, are regarded as straightforward utilitarian products divorced from the further social and ideological structures they represented either to the indigenous sub-Roman population or the Germanic immigrants. In contrast, key elements of phenomenological interpretations take issue with this neutered evaluation of landscape. A recent evaluation of Roman roads for example (Witcher 1997, 61) stresses that “roads should not be seen as the consequence of domination. On the contrary, roads actually help to constitute that power”, whilst Tilley (1994, 31) draws attention to a landscape wherein “the importance and significance of a place can only be appreciated as part of a movement from and to it in relation to other, and the act of moving may be as important as that of arriving”. Movement therefore remains an important issue in terms of past social praxis and concepts of locale, and roads are conceived as the artefacts of this past movement. By moving through the landscape along roads, they act both to mediate the relationship with the landscape and become the locus from which interaction and structure of the landscape takes shape. By governing the perspective through which many views of the landscape take place, roads become integral to the sense of identity, territoriality and power. Key to these
concepts are questions of how roads were used socially, economically and ideologically, who used them and what linear movement through the landscape meant.

4.2 Roads in Kent: the archaeological evidence

At a very generalised level, the Anglo-Saxon settlement of East Kent appears to have appropriated a pre-existing settlement topography. Though this is not readily demonstrable with regards to settlements *per se*, evidence from the spatial distribution of cemeteries and place-names suggest that the geometric structure of Roman settlement heavily influenced the shape of the Anglo-Saxon social landscape. Continuities in aspects of the landscape structure are particularly evident with regards to the Roman network of communications. As a significant symbol of Roman political and ideological dominance, the continuity of Roman roads as primary routes of communication and perception carry further important implications. First however, it is important to illustrate how the mortuary landscape of Early Anglo-Saxon Kent is related to that of Roman *Cantium*.

The Anglo-Saxon geomorphological conditions presented in Chapter 3 offer a somewhat different picture of the regional topography and transport geography to that of today. The infilling of the Wantsum Channel and Romney Marsh estuary over the course of the Medieval and Early Modern periods for example, has done much to negate the subsequent impact of riverine and coastal movement on the integration of the region. In contrast, the network of Roman roads radiating out from the *civitas* capital of Canterbury, and some Iron Age and Prehistoric trackways, are preserved in part as contemporary routeways (cf. Margary 1946, 1948; Knox 1941). The most important of these, Watling Street (Margary 1955 ROUTE IB), linked the premier entry point into the Roman province, initially at Richborough (Margary 10) and from the second century at Dover (Margary 1A), with Canterbury, Rochester and ultimately, London. This military function of the communication network is further emphasised by roads linking the Channel Port at Lympne (Margary 12) and the Wantsum fort of Reculver with Canterbury and important roads connecting the Wealden iron resources north of Hastings, with both Rochester (Margary 13) and Canterbury (Margary 130). A coastal road linking together the Saxon shore forts of Dover and Lympne is suggested by the *Peutinger Table* (Detsicas 1983,37), but remains unsubstantiated, whilst further routes on the Isle of Thanet are hinted at by the location of later hollow-ways and archaeological finds (Perkins pers. comm)\(^1\). In addition

---

\(^1\) These inferred roads are represented on a late-fourteenth/early fifteenth-century map in Thomas of Elmham’s *History of St. Augustine’s Abbey* (Rollason 1980,7; Hull 1986) that also reliably depicts the early parochial division of Thanet (cf. Rollason 1980). On it, the major routeways of Thanet are represented by
to these Roman roads, a number of routes have been identified which are claimed, despite little direct evidence, to have their origins in prehistoric times. These trackways, generally follow high-ground for long distances and can be delineated by the close proximity of prehistoric monuments such as Bronze Age round barrows, and their sometimes partial incorporation within the Roman road network. Amongst the most important of these routes, the Pilgrim's Way, the parallel Greenway, and the North Coast Way, continued as major trackways alongside the Roman road system, as can be seen, for example, by the distribution of Roman findspots close to the Swale marshes on the North Coast Way (Wilkinson 1998, 12-13). This pre-existing network of long-distance roads, routes and trackways can be further broken down at a localised level. Evidence for subsidiary Roman roads, for example, is slowly coming to light as a result of archaeological investigations. Metalled roads uncovered close to the Saltwood cemeteries (Wessex Archaeology pers. comm.) and at Each End (CAT 1993, 379), are indicative of the residual dendritic pattern of communications criss-crossing the Early Anglo-Saxon Kentish landscape.

In addition to this fossilised network of communications, the evidence for Anglo-Saxon and Medieval detached pastures revealed from charters and other documentary sources, remains central to the interpretation of the social landscape of movement. The extraordinary prevalence of *-den* place-names, compounded by post-Conquest lists of extra-manorial demesne, present a view of the Kentish landscape much remarked upon by historians (e.g. Furley 1871-74; Reaney 1961; Du Boulay 1961; Witney 1976; Everitt 1986). Summarising briefly, evidence from manorial lists of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries indicate that major estates in the Original Lands counted amongst their possessions appurtenant demesne in the Wealden woodland forest for swine pasture. Thus for example, the thirteenth century archiepiscopal manors of Westgate (Canterbury) included dennis in Betenhame (Bettenham, in Cranbrook), and Hatzewolden (High Haldon) (Du Boulay 1961, 76).

Though grants of land, including dependant denn-land are known from the early ninth century (Reaney, 1961, 69), little real evidence exists to pull the practice of Wealden transhumance back into the Early Saxon Period. Certainly, the vast number of droves existing as trackways and sunken lanes linking the Northern coast with the Weald in the SW (e.g. Everitt 1986, 36 MAP 1.), are physical testimony to the importance of the Summer

---

2 The earliest mention of a Wealden denn appears in a charter from 762 when the Abbey of St. Augustine received confirmation that Wye was to cede rights of pasture in the wood of Andred in return for the use of half a mill at Chart (Reaney 1961, 71).
migration throughout the Medieval period, but as yet, none have been conclusively dated or phased.

In comparison, the distribution of archaeological remains from the Early Saxon Period raises a number of related issues. The prevalent impression gained from the distribution of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in north-east Kent, for example, is that they are structured around the then existent routes of communication, i.e. Roman roads, navigable rivers or the coast (Fig. 4.1). An initial survey of this heavily settled region of the Original Lands suggests that if one disregarded the Isle of Thanet, all of the Anglo-Saxon cemeteries, with the exception of the Bekesbourne I cemetery, lie within 1,000m of this communication network (Fig. 4.2).

An extension of this survey over the rest of East Kent indicates that this pattern is not restricted to the Original Lands of north-east Kent (Fig. 4.3). By charting the distribution of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries against that of the prevalent routes of communication, the particular importance of Roman roads in structuring the patterning of cemeteries becomes apparent. A comparison with the distribution of the same number of randomly generated sites over the same spatial area indicates the significance of this patterning. Kolgomov-Smirnov testing (cf. Shennan 1997, 57-65) of the two resultant data sets suggests that when a distance of 1,400m from the communication network is reached, the spatial significance is not differentiable from that of random generated points. A similar interpretation is reached by a comparison with the fall-off curve of cemetery distances (Fig. 4.4). Almost 85% of cemeteries are seen to lie within 1,200m of the routes of communications, beyond which a plateau in the curve, particularly at a distance of between 1,700 and 2,200m where no identifiable cemeteries are found, indicates the lack of spatial significance of these points. In stark contrast to this recognised pattern of cemetery location however, the identification of a small number of cemeteries located between 2,200m and 2,900m from the communication network (Fig. 4.5) offers speculative evidence for the existence of a number of droves by this period. As the general pattern of mortuary structures suggests a site location within a c.1,500m corridor of the routes of communication, this hypothesis could in turn be used to predict the possible route of a number of trackways coincident with the cemeteries.

^ As stated, the location of the Roman roads on Thanet is still rather speculative. If one however accepts that Roman roads on Thanet are roughly represented by the trapezoid network of routes still evident between Sarre, Birchington, Margate and Ramsgate (Perkins pers. comm. 1998), only the cemetery of St. Peter's, Broadstairs is located over 1,000m from either road or coast.
4.3 Denns and Drovess

In support of this hypothesis is the site location of the eight cemeteries known to fall outside the 1,700m routeway buffer. These can individually be compared with the pattern of later Medieval transhumance and inferred Prehistoric communications. Such retrogressive analysis requires the adoption of a number of core assumptions, however. First amongst them, is acceptance of the case for the antiquity of a number of routes, present on early maps such as the Ordnance Survey First Edition of 1876. These are assumed by Everitt (1986) and Witney (1976), to represent fossilised droves linking the estate centres of the Original Lands with their appurtenant Wealden pig-pasture in the thirteenth century. Such an interpretation rests on the hypothesis that, as the interdependence of coastal and Wealden areas was in decline by the thirteenth century, the pattern of routeways linking the pays must necessarily predate this period (Gardiner 1995, 43). Though this assertion suggests a terminus post quem for the establishment of many of the droves crystallised in the modern landscape, how much older one could place these routes is dependant on the second assumption - that of the antiquity of Wealden appurtenances themselves.

Indeed, the evidence that Anglo-Saxon estates operated much as their Later Medieval counterparts is somewhat sparse. Of the several hundred denns identified by Witney for the thirteenth century, only 48 are mentioned in Domesday Book (DB), and these are not individually named but included under the heading of the parent manor (Reaney 1961, 72). Some denns are cited in Anglo-Saxon charters from the mid eighth-century onwards however (eighth-century charters: S24; S25; S30; S33; S37; S123; S125; later examples: e.g. S157; S159; S165; S293; S323), and many of these have been identified with Wealden, and occasionally Blean (e.g. S300) place-names. Unfortunately, a distribution map of the denns mentioned in these charters is dependant on the correct identification of the place-name locations. The example of the Wilmington Charter (S19 & 21) granting land at Plegehelmostun, remains particularly instructive in this respect, as its name is known to have changed to Berwicker, Wieghelmestun and finally to Wilmington, Sommerfield in the nineteenth century (Ward 1936). Despite such etymological problems, it seems clear from the existent charter evidence, that dependant pasture formed part of the estate system from at least the eighth century, and that the example of the holdings of the Bexley manor in AD 814 (S175; Witney 1976, 70) with lands in the Cray valley and five Wealden dennis, probably reflects that of many other estates which are not recorded in the same detail.
The evidence from Later Medieval sources suggests that Wealden dens took a variety of forms. Some, such as Dene (Dene Court, Westwell), appear as quite extensive stretches of land, shared in DB 'between three places' (DB i, 10b), whilst others may have served as intermediate feeding-places en route to the central Weald (Gardiner 1995, 40). This pattern of a planned progression of linked dens along forest droves, which was seen as evidence of the manorial break-up of common pasture by Witney (1976, 89), is central to any attempt to identify the primary routes of transhumance. The linear alignment of dens, such as those belonging to Brasted, Yalding or Boxley (ibid., 88, MAP 8), suggest that the colonisation of the Weald took place along defined routes, forming 'corridors of advance into the forest' (ibid., 90). Thus it may be significant that Wye's thirteenth-century appurtenances form a line of small tenures in Woodchurch and Biddenden parishes leading directly along the Roman road to larger woodland holdings in Cranbrook and Hawkhurst (see Jolliffe 1933, MAP1). Similarly, place-name evidence, such as that linking Thanet with both Thanington (the tun of the men of Thanet) on the Roman road south-west of Canterbury and Tenterden (the drovedenn of the men of Thanet) 25 miles further along the same road (Everitt 1976, 19) suggests a linear association defined by the route of transhumance.

These observations offer a middle-range bridging argument with which to compare the pattern of Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries, early place-names and the structure of Mid-Saxon multiple estates. As the parent manors in the Original Lands and their Wealden outliers are linked along routes of colonisation into the Weald, which are in-part governed by functional aspects of accessibility, the pattern of routeways linking pays can be compared with a model of topographical least-cost. Thus, a mathematical model of routes linking parent settlement with denn can be contrasted, not only with that of droves deduced via retrogressive analysis, but in turn with the distribution of settlements containing selected early place-name elements and with that of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries.

4.4 A 'Low-Cost Path' Test

Recent work on the spatial modelling of prehistoric trackways, incorporating topographical and cultural considerations (Bell & Lock 2000), offers such a test of the proposed distribution pattern. Although the importance of the routes of communication with regards to the distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries has mainly been demonstrated, it remains to be seen whether suggested early droves correlate with the low cost principles implicit in annual transhumance. As the economic links between certain settlements and their appurtenant dens are known from the later Anglo-Saxon period, the predictive
modelling of low cost paths between settlement and denn can be related back to known fossilised paths.

Growing out of site-catchment applications of the Seventies (e.g. Vita-Finzi & Higgs 1970) Cost Surface analysis has become a mainstay of archaeological GIS applications (e.g. Limp 1989; Gaffney & Stančić 1991; Bell & Lock 2000; etc.). By generating a computer model of the landscape as a raster map, costs can be assigned to each cell and accumulated as a travelled path. The route of lowest cost can therefore be calculated with respect to the relevant properties of the terrain, such as slope (e.g. Gaffney et al. 1993), visibility (e.g. Madry & Rakos 1996), empirical walking effort data (e.g. Rajala 2000) or combinations of the above (van Leusen 1999). Of particular relevance in determining the low-cost paths between Foothill settlements and dependant dennis, is the work of Bell (pers. comm.) who has developed an algorithm compiling multiple least-cost paths overlaid as a single ‘road network’. The application of this calculation can therefore help to ascertain the optimum route between *pays*, as mathematically derived from the tangential slope-aspect of the topography (Bell & Lock 2000).

A topographical exploration through the use of GIS such as this is intimately related with specific technical and epistemological concerns. The environmental determinism inherent in geographically-defined optimum paths, underlying simplistic models such as this application, has been more fully discussed elsewhere (Llobera 1996). In addition though, the use of a slope-dependant cost surfaces stresses the reductionalist primacy of topography, with little empirical basis other than functional assumptions prioritising changes in elevation and slope gradients in determining the favoured routes traversed by humans driving swine-herds. With these caveats in mind, the mathematical model provided by Bell and Lock (2000) offers a possible method of exploring specific factors influencing route selection. The anisotropic cost-surface produced takes into consideration certain algorithmic confusion criticised in the case of earlier approaches (cf. van Leusen 1999) and offers a simple model of the topographical component influencing optimal paths.

The topographic slope and aspect information was derived in Idrisi from a digital elevation model of East Kent produced at 50m pixel resolution from 10m Ordnance Survey digital contours provided by the Digimap Project (http://edina.ac.uk/digimap/). The computation of optimal paths between specific settlements in the coastal zone and their historically-attested dennis were then produced in order to compare the topographic model with that of charted droves (Fig. 4.6).
The generated model immediately produces several notable characteristics. All of the paths produced appear to follow the general alignment of the Pilgrim’s Way (and Greenway) for part of their length rather than adopting more linear directions of travel - either following the Roman road from Canterbury (Margary 1955, ROUTE 130) or leading directly into the Weald. Instead, the generated optimum paths skirt the northern edge of the Weald before adopting the most direct north-south route to attached denland. Though this is slightly significant with respect to the least-cost paths joining settlements of the Swale with the Weald, it is a pattern particularly remarkable for paths generated from the settlements in north-east Kent. This is most ably demonstrated by the least-cost path joining the settlement at Eastry with its appurtenances at Walkhurst and Sarrenden (Sarnden) in Benenden, along with Henselle and Little Hearsell in Hawkhurst parish (Witney 1976, 274). Initially, the produced low-cost path leads out of Eastry in a south-westerly direction, following roughly the course of a potential Roman or prehistoric trackway linking together the known Roman settlements at Eastry and Sibertswold via Thornton Lane and the Thorntonhill trackway (O’Grady 1979). Thornton Lane is believed to have formed the boundary between the manors of Adisham and Eastry in the seventh century (Hasted 1799, 121-44; O’Grady 1979, 114) and the known Roman cremation finds from Sibertswold (Faussett 1856, 101-43) stress the likely existence in the Roman period of a route close by the later Anglo-Saxon cemeteries of Barfreston and Sibertswold. Significantly, the course of this ridgeway also leads directly by the Anglo-Saxon burials found at Eastry Mill, to the west of Eastry itself (compare Chadwick-Hawkes 1979, FIG. 4.7 with O’Grady 1979, FIG. 1).

From the outset, however, an important characteristic of the mathematically-produced least-cost path is apparent. The underlying algorithmic function of the optimum path stresses downward movement as preferable as it entails less-cost than maintaining the elevation of ridge-top paths for example. Hence, any generated pathway always produces a path running down the slope, continuing at valley floor level until forced to ascend again (Bell & Lock 2000, 91). Thus, though the prehistoric trackway defined by O’Grady (1979) maintains the elevation of the Downland spur, leading gradually up slope towards Elvington and Sheperdswell beyond, the produced least-cost path skirts first along the southern edge of the ridge to Thornton Farm before crossing the course of the trackway to follow the valley bottom to the north of the ridge as far as Sheperdswell itself. On joining the Roman road just to the south of Coxhill Farm, the optimum path significantly avoids the steep downland slopes up Lydden Hill and follows the Roman road towards
Canterbury (Margary 1a) for 4.5 kilometres. It is at this point that the significance of the Nailbourne valley for cross-Downland movement becomes clear. Correspondingly, the importance of the site location of the Anglo-Saxon cemeteries of Breach Downs (BRD; Meaney 1964, 111), Elham, Mill Down (EMD) and Lyminge (LYM; Meaney 1964, 127) becomes clear. A least-cost path generated between Bishopsbourne and its denns at Bishopenden (Great Bishopsden) and Lollesden (Leesden) in Benenden corroborates this pattern.

Rather than joining the Pilgrim’s Way at Stanford both the Bishopsbourne and Eastry optimum paths continue along the ridge-top, crossing Stone Street near Sixmile, thereby passing close by the sixth-century cemetery at Stowting (Meaney 1964, 137; Kent SMR TR 14 SW 3). This ridge-top route above the Pilgrim’s Way is maintained for several kilometres, following the course of the Wye Downs before descending into the Great Stour valley north of Wye itself. Importantly, this route follows the course of the North Downs Trackway, as marked by a number of important Bronze Age and Anglo-Saxon barrows (e.g. Wye-I & II: Meaney 1964, 142). Therefore, though not visibly associated with a Roman road, the Crundale-2 Anglo-Saxon cemetery occupies a prominent position overlooking the Great Stour valley, close to this projected route of the Wye Down Ridgeway, which splits from the Pilgrim’s Way in the south before joining the route of Margary 12 near Godmersham (Margary 1948, 61). The least-cost paths subsequently drop into the Great Stour valley and rejoin the route of the Pilgrim’s Way as far west as Lenham before forming south-westerly droves into the Wealden heartland, much along the orientation of those identified by Everitt (1986) and Witney (1976).

Similarly, the produced least-resistance paths linking early Swale settlements such as Faversham, Milton Regis or Teynham with their medieval Wealden denns can be favourably compared with visible Downland droves (Fig. 4.7). The produced path between Milton Regis and its 28 appurtenances recorded in 1575 in Marden Hundred (Witney 1976, 240-2) can be closely compared with the Maidstone and Key Street roads suggested by Payne to have some antiquity on the basis of a prehistoric enclosure at Stockbury (1893, 164 & MAP B, I). Perhaps importantly, the course of this route across the North Downs passes by both the Anglo-Saxon cemeteries at Holingbourne Whiteheath (Meaney 1964, 123; Kent SMR TQ 66 SE 14) and Thurnham Friars (ibid., 139). Equally, routes from Faversham and Teynham emphasise the importance of Lenham and Harrietsham in commanding nodal points of cross-Down communications.
Though none of the produced least-cost paths favoured a route following the Syndale between Faversham and Hollingbourne, Payne has suggested a number of reasons for the probable antiquity of this road (1893, 165-7; MAP B, N). The Roman earthwork in Syndale Wood, and a number of Roman finds at this juncture with Watling Street, probably place the location of Durolevum, noted in the Antonine Itinerary (Rivet 1970, 42-6; Blagg 1982), in the vicinity of Stone-by-Faversham (cf. Everitt 1986, 110-1). Roman burials have been found along the course of the valley (ibid.) and it is likely that the Anglo-Saxon burials in Chapman’s Pit discovered c. 1893 were also in close proximity of this road. The high density of finds in the vicinity of Newnham of all periods, and the convergence of a number of droveways at this point further stresses the importance of this valley as a topographical feature, whilst the high numbers of parish boundaries co-linear with the course of the road stress its potential antiquity. This is further demonstrated by the close coincidence of a contemporary road between Newnham and Lenham and the least-cost path produced from Teynham.

In addition to the patterning of archaeological complexes, the distribution of the place-name *ora* can be cited in support of several potential routeways (Fig. 4.8). Possibly derived from the Latin ‘shore’, the distribution of *ora* has a clear coincidence with landing-places and areas beside Roman routes (Cole 1990, 26-41) and appears to have been designated to mark topographical orientation points. *Ora* place-names such as Oar Farm and Stonor, conspicuously lie at the north and south entrances of the Wantsum respectively, and may indicate the named referencing of this major maritime routeway, possibly in keeping with the codification of landmarks by medieval mariners (Binns 1981, 20). This suggestion may also explain the location of Upnor at the mouth of the Medway and Oare close to Faversham. In contrast, none of the inland *ora* place-names find any correlation with established Roman roads, but rather appear to support many of the already identified routeways. Icknor and Broader Lane are both located on Payne’s Maidstone and Key Street road (1893, 164 & MAP B, L), whilst nearby Bicknor may relate to a cross-Downs route from Milton to Huckinge and Leed Castle (cf. Payne 1893, MAP B, M). Similarly, the now lost Sidney may relate to a droveway linking Faversham with its appurtenant dennis. In addition, three *ora* place-names further to the east may suggest the location of two further routes, closely related both to the archaeological and topographical patterns already

---

4 Payne is somewhat unhelpful with his description in this respect. Although the OS gives a location for Chapman’s Pit at TQ 9718 5917 in Norton parish, to the north side of the road, both Meaney (1964, 114) and the Kent SMR place the ‘old pit’ at TQ973590 on the south side, in Ospringe parish. However, Payne (1893, 167) quite clearly states that the location is in fact to the south side of the road near Newnham in Eastings parish, a location closer to that provided by Chadwick-Hawkes’ card catalogue, which places the site at TQ962578, over a kilometre to the south.
observed. Lynson in Upper Hadres, may delineate a route following the valley from Bifrons south-westwards towards Stone Street, thereby explaining the location of the last remaining cemetery outside the 1,500m routeway corridor at Bustead Wood, Bishopsbourne (Meaney 1964, 113; Chadwick-Hawkes 1958, 70; Faussett 1856, 36). Alternatively Argrove and Drellingore indicate a possible valley route linking Temple Ewell with the Pilgrim’s Way at Round Hill.

In keeping with this general pattern, the (possibly) isolated burials at Lenham, Harrietsham Pilgrim’s Way and Harrietsham II Court Farm, amongst others, are all associated with potentially early droves crossing the North Downs. Everitt’s conjectured droveway linking Ospringe, Eastling and Otterden passes close by the burial at Belmont Park, Throwley (Meaney 1964, 109), whilst that from Hollingbourne to its denu in Hernden (Chart Sutton), Holbrook (Boughton Monchelsea), Hawkenbury (Headcorn) and Widehurst (Marden and Staplehurst) approaches the site of burials discovered in 1910 at Leeds (Meaney 1964, 126). Similarly, the cemetery of Cliffe-at-Hoo 1 is located on the junction of the Hoo Ridgeway, a possible prehistoric route (Everitt 1986, 45), and a medieval road linking the early church at Cliffe-at-Hoo with the key settlement of Rochester. Importantly, the cathedral of Rochester is known to have been granted appurtenant meadows at Hreodham (possibly Redham-in-Cliffe) in AD 778 (S35) thereby potentially providing an absolute terminus post-quem for the manifestation of some of the droveways described. This thereby strengthens the argument that the coincidence of low-cost routes, medieval droves and Early Anglo-Saxon burials is not accidental, but reflects both the antiquity of some of the North Down routes and reinforces the established patterning of burial on the routes of communication. Furthermore, the coincidence of mathematically-projected droveways with the patterns of sixth- and seventh-century burial, suggests that certain Original Land settlements may have already been economically linked with the Weald by the Early Anglo-Saxon period.

Indeed, this pattern of cemetery and routeway association becomes even more clearly pronounced on closer inspection. For example, although burials such as those found near Deodora House (HAR-IB2; Harrietsham II, Pilgrim’s Way; Meaney 1964, 123), Court Farm Lodge (HAR-IB1; Harrietsham III, Court Farm Lodge, ibid., 123) and possibly Lenham II (LEN-IB1; ibid., 126), all uniformly appear within 50m of the Pilgrim’s Way.

5 Though Meaney gives the co-ordinates of the chalk pit in which the skeleton was found as TQ 865541 (1964, 123) the Kent SMR record states that visual inspection of the site places the pit c.315m to the WNW, i.e. within 50m of the Pilgrim’s Way (Kent SMR TQ 85 SE 2).
Again, the seemingly contrasting graves such as those from Lenham Square (LEN; *ibid.*, 126) and Harrietsham Churchyard (HAR; *ibid.*, 123) are themselves within 50m of the potentially prehistoric Greenway (cf. Everitt 1977, 18), a route not included within the initial statistical analysis. Similarly, the cemeteries of the Swale find a closer association with the road that has been hypothesised running parallel to the north of Watling Street (the North Coast Way). This route can also be seen to join the Roman villas identified along the Swale, perhaps indicating a hierarchy of subsidiary Roman routes below that of the, primarily military, long-distance roads. In addition to this close physical association with routes of communication, one could further cite a general pattern of cemeteries positioned on the slopes of spurs, highly visible from the identified roads.

### 4.5 Evidence for coastal movement: the Wantsum Channel

The pattern of the mortuary landscape presented so far has been argued from the basis of the inherited Romano-British and prehistoric road network. In addition to the inferred terrestrial modal systems, some evidence exists to suggest that waterborne travel may have also played a significant role from the earliest phases of Anglo-Saxon settlement, as has been recently argued for the Roman settlement of the Swale (Wilkinson 1998, 12-13). Unfortunately, the archaeology of England as a whole has yet to effectively present a case for the variety of Anglo-Saxon modal systems in terms of boat-types, wagons and the like, and assumptions have as such in general rested on the identification of assumed comparable finds from Continental Europe and Scandinavia. It would appear, judging from the amassed evidence, that there was a sophisticated ship-building tradition in operation at least by the early seventh century, able to construct seagoing warships such as the Sutton Hoo mound 1 vessel, coastal traders in the form of the eighth/ninth-century Graveney boat, as well as small plank-built vessels and logboats such as those of the sixth century from Snape (Marsden 1995, 172). This existing inventory suggests that, until the eleventh century, it was not necessary to construct formal harbour facilities and that tidal conditions suitable for beaching vessels were, as is evidenced by the location of Mid-Saxon London, in fact preferred (McGrail 1981, 19).

Evidence in Kent for Anglo-Saxon boat-building and seafaring comes primarily from mortuary remains and documentary sources. The recent identification of a large number of clinker-built boat fragments, as well as fastenings, such as clench-nails and roves, accompanying burials dating from the sixth century in Kent (Brookes forthcoming), lends some archaeological weight to the arguments for Anglo-Saxon naval prowess suggested by documentary sources (e.g. Haywood 1991). That these boat-remains all follow in the
established Scandinavian clinker boat-building tradition rather than that of Merovingian prototypes, however (Crumlin-Pedersen 1990), offers a contrasting picture to the nature of Kentish-Frankish contact suggested by continental documentary sources (Chapter 2; Wood 1983; 1990; 1992; 1996). Furthermore, as the distribution of these boat-fragments is restricted to the coastal cemeteries of East Kent and the Wantsum Channel, they are of some importance in charting the direction of Early Anglo-Saxon movement. This suggests, in keeping with the eighth-century royal charters already discussed (Chapter 2; Kelly 1992), that the Wantsum Channel afforded the principal route for maritime traffic into the Thames estuary and up the Eastern seaboard, avoiding the dangerous waters of the North Foreland headland.

4.6 Communications and settlements: the evidence from place-names

In contrast to the pattern established for the distribution of cemeteries, the topographical associations of early place-names are considerably more ambiguous. The relative chronology of particular place-name elements has generally been governed by core assumptions regarding the geographical significance of places. Thus early philological investigations attempted to secure an absolute chronology of place-name elements by their association with archaeological and topographical complexes. Etymologically-defined ‘early’ place-names have therefore been variously correlated to soil classes (Wooldridge 1948), on the assumption that the evolution of settlement developed from more easily worked soils to more marginal areas, or to the pattern established by archaeology (e.g. Dodgson 1966; Kirk 1972; Cox 1973; Kuurman 1975). Analyses of this type, and one documenting all written sources up to c.731, have recognised the importance and early occurrence of place-names containing topographical elements such as *burh*, *ceaster*, *hám*, *hám-stêde* and *wic* (Cox 1976; Hooke 1997) with group elements such as *-ingas*, *-inga*-, and the habitative *-hamm*, belonging to a secondary phase of settlement development (Dodgson 1966; Welch 1983).

Despite a general correlation with areas of favoured settlement in Kent (i.e. the Foothills and Holmesdale Pays) the pattern of place-names containing presumed early elements such as *-ingas*, *-hám* or *ingahám*, can be less easily inferred. Some evidence could be cited to suggest that an evolution of settlement into more marginal areas is matched by a chronology of place-name elements. The distribution of *hám* place-names throughout the Foothill *pey* (Dodgson 1973), and to a certain degree, that of *-ing* place-names (Kirk 1972, 53) finds a close correlation with the richer Thanet Bed and Head Brickearth soils of the Foothills (Fig. 4.9). Place-names containing the elements *-inga*-, *-ingas*, and possibly *-hamm* alternatively, though still on occasion coincident with Anglo-Saxon cemeteries, appear to
represent a secondary phase of settlement infilling and colonisation, as their distribution is restricted to the Downland pay and the heavier clay drift soils of the Foothills (Kirk 1972, Dodgson 1966). Despite a superficial association with Roman roads, as discussed by Dodgson (1973, 11-13), Kolgomov-Smirnov testing of the distribution of these place-names across East Kent suggests little statistical significance, however, when compared with an equal number of randomly-generated points (Fig. 4.10). A similar test of chronologically later -ingas and -ing2 place-names reinforces this negative association (see Appendix B for the place-names used in these computations).

Given that all of the defined 'primary' place-names relate to habitative features, it would be somewhat surprising if they were all to be found in close association with the known Romano-British network system. The lack of any clear correspondence with the recognised distribution of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and burials does, however, suggest that alternate criteria underline the mortuary and settlement landscapes. It is possible that the act of naming places, particularly during the Early Anglo-Saxon period, formed part of a 'colonising package' aimed at the appropriation of places not actively settled, but more probable explanations restate the importance of routes of communication in governing the distribution of mortuary structures.

4.7 Visibility

That burial may have been conspicuously sited in many cases in order to take advantage of highly visible locations has been discussed ever since Baldwin Brown's published suggestion in 1915 (III, 142-6) (4.11). Despite some supporting evidence from Beowulf, wherein the siting of Beowulf's hiorh (2802-3) is discussed, Shephard's assertion that barrow siting was determined by the economic forces of land-use (1979, 3.9-10) has generally held sway however. His analysis of a large number of Anglo-Saxon barrow burials throughout England, and Kentish Type 4 barrow cemeteries in particular, led him to stress that the apparent correlation of elevated topography and burial citing was a by-product of their position on marginal land (ibid). Thus, a distinction was drawn between the position of flat-grave cemeteries such as Bifrons (BIF) and Howletts (HOW) on arable Head Brickearth drift, and barrow cemeteries such as the nearby Bishopsbourne and Kingston cemeteries, on Upper Chalk soils less suitable for agriculture (ibid., 3.10). Though underlying soils may indeed determine the form that cemeteries, or individual burials, take, such typological sub-division glosses over the key characteristics of Kentish mortuary practice. Furthermore, given the prevalence of visible above-ground grave-markers, such as those recognised from modern excavations at Broadstairs St. Peter's Tip (BSP), it could be
argued that the concept of a 'flat-grave' cemetery itself may not be particularly meaningful. The demonstrated close association of burial throughout the period with the prevalent routes of communication suggests a deliberate rite, determined in the first instance by places in the landscape visible from the patterns of movement by the living.

Viewshed analysis offers an important additional test of the asserted spatial significance of the Anglo-Saxon mortuary landscape. Despite a sizeable body of criticism regarding the application of computer-generated patterns of visibility (e.g. van Leusen 1999; Wheatley & Gillings 2000; Wheatley & Gillings 2001 etc.) the importance of attempting to model past perception as a necessary cognitive element of the spatial ordering of landscape, is well established (Tilley 1994, 1996; Bradley 1998, 116-131; Thomas 1993; Chapman 2000 etc.). With regards to Anglo-Saxon archaeology, relatively little work has been attempted to assess the deliberate symbolic placement of mortuary structures within the landscape. It has only been in relatively recent works that the significance of ritual sites and monuments has been investigated with regards to their topographical and cognitive setting (e.g. Bonney 1966, 1976; Reynolds 1997, 1998; Williams 1997, 1999; Lucy 1998; Semple 1998).

Of these works, only Williams (1999) has deliberately attempted to demonstrate the importance of visibility for the placement of Anglo-Saxon burials. His micro-scale analysis of the Lowbury Hill barrow (Ox) in its environs usefully draws several instructive conclusions. The late seventh-century, high-status barrow burial investigated, was seen to be closely associated with a probable Romano-Celtic temple enclosure, it afforded extensive views of the surrounding area and itself was far more visible from the nearby Ridge Way than other prehistoric barrows in the vicinity (ibid., 62-74). Perhaps significantly, at the expense of visibility from the Thames valley to the east, the Lowbury Hill barrow appears also to be positioned in order to maximise the visual dominance over routes of movement approaching through the Berkshire Downs to the west (ibid., 66). Perceptual variables such as the 'openness' or 'enclosedness' of the visible landscape may be indicative of other political features within a region (cf. van Leusen 1999, 5) and it seems, therefore, significant that the barrow is located at some distance from, and is not intervisible with, the concentrations of settlement and political authority within the Thames basin. Instead, the marginal location of the barrow at the political and social extent of the upper Thames region within clear view of routeways approaching the boundary, may well indicate the deliberate demarcation of a territory to inbound travellers.
A similar pattern presents itself in East Kent. Multiple viewsheds produced for a hypothetical maritime route leading from Boulogne up the East Kent coast and through the Wantsum Channel into the Thames estuary reveals a number of significant trends (Fig. 4.12). Given the relative flatness of the Kentish landscape, the produced viewshed is typically large, with some inland parts apparently visible from over 12kms distance. Such points would clearly not be easily recognisable in reality, and in order to compensate, a corridor of 6km distance from the observation points has been selected based on empirical experience of walking the Wantsum Channel in various atmospheric conditions. From the subset of 60 cemeteries and possible isolated burials known to fall within this 6km corridor of maximum visibility, 90% are visible from the 16 selected sea-points. Importantly, many of these are located at the edges of the produced viewsheds, indicating that any above-ground mortuary structure, such as a barrow, would have been silhouetted on the skyline of the hill-top. This phenomenon is particularly apparent for cemeteries such as Mill Hill Deal (MHD) or Ozengell (OZE), whose interments centred on Bronze Age barrows that would have dominated the hill-top skyline for ships approaching the southern Wantsum entrance. Similarly, some of the burials known to fall just outside of the produced viewshed, such as those found at St. Margaret’s Bay, Cliffe (SMC; Meaney 1964, 13) may well have been visibly sky-lit before truncation denuded the original height of the Bronze Age and Anglo-Saxon barrows covering the (possibly) 1.5 acre large cemetery (SMR TR 34 SE 6). Of the remaining burials to fall outside the produced viewshed, those from Great Mongeham (GMH; SMR. TR 35 SE 48) and Wingham-2 (WGH-2; SMR TR 25 NW 57) have been sited imprecisely to the locality of the place-name only, whilst those from Wickhambreux (WHB - ibid., 140; WHB-2 (Church) - TR 25 NW 35) and Ramsgate-3 (RAM-IB3; ibid., 132) are in close association with known terrestrial routeways and may well have been visible from other sea-points not used in the computation exercise. In keeping with this pattern of visibility the two ‘öra place-names identified in the Wantsum Channel (pp.18) are also found at the edges of the produced viewshed. The Stonar spur is visible above the Shellness Spit for ships off the coast at Deal, who on entering the Wantsum proper are confronted with a southern skyline dominated by the barrows at Woodnesborough (WNB-2; ibid., 141), Coombe (CWN; ibid., 115) and possibly Guilton (GIL; ibid., 121). On passing the Ebbsfleet peninsular, the western Thanet skyline is commanded by the barrows of Minster (MTS-1; ibid., 129) and Sarre (SAR; ibid., 135), with the Oar Farm spur and possibly the burial at Hoath (HOA-IB1; ibid., 125) beyond. Similarly, the entry into the Wantsum
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6 The three pottery vessels found at Wickhambreux Church remain fairly doubtful evidence of an Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery.
Channel from the Thames estuary is marked on all sides by visible barrows at Brooksend (BRO; Kent SMR TR 26 NE 38); Crispe Road (CSP; Kent SMR TR 36 NW 216); Sarre, as well as the topographic feature Oar Farm.

The impression of a territory bounded by burials can also be gained from inland contexts. A multiple viewshed produced from seven points roughly 2.5 kms apart along the Roman road (Margary 130) and the Pilgrim’s Way near Wye produces a territory demarcated by the visible mortuary landscape (Fig. 4.13). Isolated burials enclose the presumably deforested Upper Stour valley, occupying visible spurs of the Wye Down and North Down slopes as well as prominent positions to the south at Westwell, Ashford, Brabourne and amongst the Roman ruins at Little Chart. Movement eastwards along the Pilgrim’s Way encounters a valley dominated by the Stowting cemetery, followed by that of Lymping, and to the south, Saltwood. By comparison, the medieval manor of Wye encompasses the same Great Stour valley, and with the dependant holdings of Boughton Aluph, Westwell, Pluckley, and further inland at Kingsnorth (Jolliffe 1933, MAP 1) roughly corresponds with the viewshed produced from around Wye. Although this area could equally be argued to represent that of a natural geographical unit, with no direct evidence to suggest that the mortuary structures bounding it were necessarily visible from some distance, the correlation of ‘islands of visibility’ such as those around the Roman ruins of Little Chart with the dependant tenure of Pluckley remain somewhat incongruous. Pluckley to the south-west and Kingsnorth to the south, along with the parcel holdings in Woodchurch and Biddenden parishes already mentioned (4.3) remained the only parts of the Weald potentially visible from Wye, and it is these same areas that remain in royal and then ecclesiastical hands until the thirteenth century (ibid).

Given such a pattern, it is tempting, if speculative, to suggest that political territories were already being demarcated by the mortuary structures of the sixth and seventh centuries. The concept of bounding the landscape, its division and demarcation can be construed within a view of claimancy and domination; concepts much voiced in discussions of mortuary mounds in Neolithic and Bronze Age Europe (e.g. Meillassoux 1972; Renfrew 1976; Chapman 1981; Bradley 1984, 1998). In keeping with many of these prehistoric contexts, the placing of burial sites in Early Anglo-Saxon Kent indicates a spatial manifestation of an idealised landscape. Most of the more recently-excavated cemeteries (e.g. DBU, MHD, OZE, SLT, BBS, ORP) have revealed fifth- and sixth-century nuclei associated with prehistoric or Roman monuments (Shephard 1979 - Type V & VI), indicating the likely proliferation of similar cases of monument reuse amongst the
cemeteries excavated in antiquity (e.g. HOL, LYM, etc). Such clear symbolic associations could be interpreted in terms of territorial claims, physically legitimised by the linking of a supernatural past and social present (ibid; Williams 1998). Perhaps significantly, by the seventh century, equally visible Anglo-Saxon mortuary monuments appear to replace former relationships with the prehistoric past (e.g. KGD, BRO, CSP, BAR, BAD, FGL, BSP, CHD, CHL, BRD, BRH, BSB etc.: Shephard 1979 - Type IV); a phenomenon Shephard links with joint ownership and developing forms of inheritance (ibid., 8.3).

Intra-cemetery analyses, such as Shephard’s interpretation are well developed in the context of Anglo-Saxon archaeology, however such a view does little to illuminate either how such, undeniably visible, monuments related to personal experience, why particular locales where chosen for active display, nor for whom such ritual demonstration was intended.

4.8 Discussion: Who moves? Droving, royal retinue and iter

Despite the increasing interest in the structure of the Early Anglo-Saxon mortuary landscape, and its clear association with the landscapes of movement and associated visibility, little work has been attempted to identify the significance such landscapes had and to whom. The observations outlined above do, however, present a picture of Anglo-Saxon Kent in which experience of the landscape was tied to concepts of the ‘persistence of place’ (Dubos 1972) in terms of past structures and issues of contemporary power. Furthermore, documentary evidence impresses a view of restricted social movements that manipulated the way in which the landscape was experienced. Turning first to the issue of visible mortuary structures, recent analyses of documentary, archaeological and linguistic evidence suggests that middle- and later-Saxon attitudes to the prehistoric and Anglo-Saxon barrow was suitably mixed (Semple 1998). Despite an overarching fear of barrows in, primarily Christian, written sources, archaeological evidence suggests a continued tradition of barrow reuse in various forms into the Late Anglo-Saxon period (ibid.; Reynolds 1997, 1998). Such places, particularly when sited on boundaries, appear to have continued to function within topographically-defined spheres of social practice, actively pagan, and demonised by the Church. This suggests an embedded significance of place as a product of continued structurisation and ritual knowledge. Ancestral biographies, often tied to a supernatural past, manifested in secondary barrow reuse, demonstrated a powerful symbol of the cultural landscape. The continuation and transformation of ritual at these places, beyond the period of pagan burial, indicates both the reproduction of the symbolic landscape and the significance of places in collective memory.
The emphasis on ancestry and the maintenance of the symbolic landscape further suggests the appropriation of the prehistoric and Roman past for the naturalisation and legitimisation of the present. The inherited landscape was selectively reused in order to demonstrate most visibly the authority of the social élite. Thus, whilst the majority of Bronze Age barrows evident in East Kent (Ashbee & Dunning 1960) appear to have had some later Anglo-Saxon association a few, such as those in North Foreland or Eythorne, somewhat removed from the principal routes of communication, have no evidence of reuse.

The corpus of Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery and settlement analyses from the nineteenth century onwards offers a partial explanation of the social changes underlining the Kentish burial rite. The emergence of a so-called 'princely' class in the early sixth century at cemeteries such as Finglesham (Chadwick-Hawkes 1982) has been interpreted as reflecting the developing hierarchisation of social classes beyond the general kinship and family groupings of the fifth and sixth centuries. The increasing occurrence of such burials and concomitant elaborate mortuary deposition in the form of luxury gods and individual grave structures during the course of the sixth century, is paralleled by their spatial segregation from lower status individuals within the cemeteries (Shephard 1979). By the seventh century, evidence of a social élite of unprecedented wealth (e.g. Sutton Hoo, Asthall, Dorchester-on-Thames, Cuddesdon, Taplow, Broomfield and Coombe in Kent – Dickinson & Speake 1992; Dickinson 1974) can also be recognised within the archaeology of the living, with the appearance of high-status residences such as Yeavering (Hope-Taylor 1977), Cowage Farm, Foxley (Hinchiffe 1986) and possibly other, unexcavated, sites (e.g. Hatton Rock – Hirst & Rahtz 1971; Milfield – Hope-Taylor 1977; Atcham – St. Joseph 1972) (Reynolds 1998, 234-5).

The evidence for the incorporation of prehistoric features within the Anglo-Saxon cemetery and settlement complex at Yeavering, discussed by Bradley (1987; 1993) offers a secular parallel to the symbolic associations recognised within the Kentish mortuary landscape. In contrast to the reuse of prehistoric features witnessed within fifth- and sixth-century cemeteries however, the evidence from such seventh-century settlements suggests the exclusive appropriation of ancestral links by the aristocracy. Thus, instead of the group associations fostered by secondary interment within prehistoric and Roman features during the early phase, the conspicuous use of a prehistoric form of mortuary structure i.e. round barrows, restates the symbolic ancestral links of the élite in the seventh century. A further example of such class legitimisation is offered by the near contemporary proliferation of
royal genealogies, in which historical ties were invented in order to bolster dynastic claims (Reynolds 1998, 236; Brooke 1963, 74-5).

Movement along the defined routes, on the other hand, must be seen with respect to the prevalent social conditions of the time. The Kentish law-codes of the seventh century offer some evidence of contemporary concerns for the movement of people and goods. The wording of the laws of Æthelberht, and particularly those of Wihtred and Ine of Wessex stress the importance of roads for movement throughout the kingdoms, with heavy penalties being exacted for unannounced travel off the established routes of communication (law-codes cited here as numbered and translated by Attenborough 1922). Ine’s code (Ine, 20) echoes that of Wihtred, (Wihtred, 28):

“If a man from afar, or a stranger, quits the road, and neither shouts, nor blows a horn, he shall be assumed to be a thief, [and as such] be either slain or put to ransom.”

Though it adds that it is “travel through a wood off the highway” that was deemed to be particularly suspicious. Specific laws protecting travellers on roads from robbery, such as is evidenced by Æthelberht 19 & 89 on the other hand, suggest both the importance of safe-transit through the kingdom to the king, and that highway crime was sufficiently commonplace that it required explicit measures to be suppressed. Given the significant number of laws dealing with foreigners, strangers and traders (e.g Æthelberht, 19; Hlothere & Eadric, 15; Wihtred, 4 & 28) it is conceivable that these measures indicate increasing levels of royal control placed on the movement of people and goods through the kingdom; an observation many commentators have associated with tolls and taxation (e.g. Carver 1993; Reynolds 1998, 237 etc.). Certainly other evidence suggests that systems of taxation were becoming more widespread from the mid-seventh to the eighth centuries (e.g. the Tribal Hidage – Davies & Vierk 1974, 136-41) but just how effective such legislation was, is debatable. Indeed, some support for a view of lightly-controlled seventh-century trading could be indicated by the wide distribution of a broad range of primary sceattas types throughout the south-eastern kingdoms (Metcalf pers. comm. 2000). From the context of communications however, it is quite clear that roads formed not only the most important routes of movement, with their use actively protected in legislation, but that movement beyond roads was prohibitively dangerous.

In addition, it appears as if movement, even along routeways, may have been partially restricted. Wihtred, 10, for example, stresses that a servant journeying on his own on Sundays, was to pay his lord due compensation. Most importantly however, from the
perspective of social movement, is information regarding the ruler and his military followers. Documentary sources from Tacitus onwards stress that political leadership within Germanic kingdoms was crucially tied to the personality of rulers (cf. Stenton 1971, 302). The existence of the comites of the early charters or the gesiths of the earliest laws attest to the social importance of direct kingship, and the extension of the king's rule from his household. Moreover, by the time of the composition of Beowulf, the welfare of the people themselves was ideologically connected with that of the royal family. A successful king is a necessary prerequisite for prosperity, whilst the term leodhryre meaning 'downfall of a people' is used to denote the 'downfall of a king' (Bazelmans 1999, 139). Recent critical appraisal of the Germanic relationships of Gefolgschaft as represented in the Germania and Beowulf (ibid.) has done much to illuminate a social model of the Anglo-Saxon retinue. Despite the clear introduction of Christian iconography and symbols into the society represented by the later poem, the constitution of 'worth' as a social force is suggested to represent a fragment of pre-Christian conceptions of self. Bazelmans' identification of the gift-exchange ritual underlying Gefolgschaft has further repercussions in terms of the symbolic temporal relationship between king and warrior-follower however. A ritual project is recognised within the poem, in which a lifecycle is described where:

"The king enfeofs him [the follower] at a certain age with land or confirms his rights to ancestral lands. Though these men continue to be members of the king's retinue and are to be found in the royal hall on certain important occasions, they exercise their own rule over a certain region within the kingdom....Such cases involve retainers who count themselves among the king's intimates and who even after they come of age are frequently to be found in the company of the king. Others will do so less frequently, coming to court perhaps only on very special circumstances." (ibid., 139-40).

All of this is given a further spatial dimension in that the kingdoms represented in Beowulf are delimited by sea. The kingdom is separated from the outside world by the sea, and it is beyond the sea that:

"King's sons and important retainers, following the bestowal of ancestral, renowned weapons upon them by their father and/or king, are expected to contribute to the further development of their 'worth' by undertaking manly endeavours in the social world outside their kingdom or in the non-social world of monsters." (ibid., 171-172).

A central component of this interpretation, which Bazelmans does not elaborate, is the importance of movement as a social construct. If Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, of both the pagan and early Christian period, are to be characterised in a model of gift-mediated patrimony, the physical presence of kings enforces a social hierarchy. In order to maintain the obligations and loyalties of dependants over a territorial region and with lands and villae regales scattered all over the kingdom, kings themselves must be seen as the principal agents
of communications and social cohesion. In the pre-monetary economy of the fifth and sixth centuries, peripatetic kingship was the only way of collecting subsistence goods and concomitant gifting and receiving of loyalty. The close bond between king and followers witnessed in *Beowulf* therefore stresses that retainers are required to come to court, if sometimes infrequently, so that loyalty could be constantly reiterated by physical presence and the ritualisation of gift-giving. This concept of direct rule remained the central mechanism of royal administration until beyond the ninth century. Thus, in Asser’s *Life* and Alfred’s own writings (trans. Keynes & Lapidge 1983) followers of the king sought him by various routes and were received according to status (cf. Abels 1998):

> “Consider now, in the case of men who come to the king’s estate where he is then in residence, or to his assembly, or to his army, whether it seems to you that they all come here by the same route. I think, rather, that they arrive by very many routes...” (Keynes & Lapidge 1983, 143)

Significantly, the further ritualisation of long-distance journeys in *Beowulf* suggests that it was the king, or important retainers, and they alone, who could move freely through and beyond the kingdom. With these social concepts in mind, the importance of the topographical location of the *villae regales* and estate centres (cf. Everitt 1986) becomes all the more apparent. The postulated villas of Sturry, Milton Regis, Faversham Eastry, St. Martin’s and Dover for example, are all located on tidal inlets (cf. Rady 1987, 204-5). Similarly, royal assemblies appear most commonly to have taken place at the landed royal estates (Sawyer 1983, 277) with only slight evidence for urban equivalents and it is these same villas that remain under elite, if not necessarily royal, control in the later Anglo-Saxon period. If the function of such royal estate central-places was both social and economic, it is not surprising that they were located at the nodal points of the routes of communication and continued as the focus of lordship into the later Anglo-Saxon period. Equally, the pattern of so-called Saxon estate-centres (the origins of which are discussed in Chapter 5), including the *villa regales* is clearly associated with the prevalent routes of movement (Fig. 4.14).

The restrictions on movement evident from the law-codes of the seventh century, indicates the importance of roads for regional communications. The specific legislation forcing long-distance travellers and foreigners to adhere to these routes in turn fits well with the patterns of the visible mortuary landscape identified. The social significance of these structures,

---

7 Some sense of the intransigence of later Anglo-Saxon kingship can be gained from Edward’s elaborate network of “farms for one night” which by the eleventh century virtually subdivided all of Wessex (Stafford 1980).
within the viewshed of travelling kings, aristocrats and foreigners, underlines both the territorial claims of the local élite and the fragile basis these claims of landed legitimacy may have had. As powerful symbols of competing legitimacy, the distribution of these ostentatious burials indicates, not only key areas of contested authority, but also the established routes through which peers were expected to travel. In contrast, the identification of a number of droves and the historically-attested links between regions in Kent suggests that not all middle-distance movement was restricted to the aristocracy. Significantly, proportionately few burials have been identified on these routes, suggesting a possible hierarchical structure underlying the communication network. In favour of this interpretation, the distribution of royal woods in the Weald forms a continuous band along the northern margin, following the Roman road from Sutton Valence to Great Chart (Margary 131; Witney 76, 61), intersected perpendicularly by the Wealden droves leading to the common lands beyond. This example emphasises the division of the experiential landscape. The Late Anglo-Saxon/Medieval pattern of denns and droves suggests an established and regulated structure of routes functionally linking the Mother settlements of the Original Lands with their detached Wealden common. Local populations were therefore limited to a conception of the landscape restricted to this annual pattern of droving - the seasonal toing and froing of the rural economy. The laws governing the movement of servants and the restrictions placed on travellers from afar demonstrate further evidence of this. Although some concept of serfdom must be expected within a model of multiple estates, the experience servants had of the wider landscape was, by the seventh century at the latest, controlled within the economically-determined roles of the estate's maintenance. Physically and psychologically, daily praxis and the social construction of the world was defined by the permitted routes of movement. Freemen and the élite alternatively, interacted more widely with the landscape, though still it seems, from the locus of the defined routes of communication. The importance of the hundred in its Late Saxon form stresses movement to the local assembly at monthly intervals (Stenton 1971, 299) whilst the military obligations of the warrior class ensured a regional and inter-regional landscape perspective. Accordingly, a definition of Anglo-Saxon space can be inferred wherein conceptions of the landscape coincided with the hierarchical nature of the social order. The sea, the road and the drove are envisaged within a stratified concept of geographical movements, schematically relating to the tiers of society, and it is as a reflection of this, that they embody crucial issues of ideology, power and identity.
4.9 Conclusions

In summary, the use of movement as a unit of investigation, and the routes of communication as evidence of such fossilised movements has demonstrated:

- There is a clear tendency for sites to be located close to roads or routeways, to the extent that it is possible to argue that cemeteries not on Roman roads or waterways, mark the course of other, prehistoric or Anglo-Saxon, routeways.
- The evidence from archaeological finds for such additional routes can be supported by topographical place-names such as *ēra*.
- The visibility of burials from the routes of communication was important, as is demonstrated by the form and location of Type 4, 5 and 6 cemeteries.
- The close correlation of burials and routeways is not matched by that of inferred ‘primary’ place-names, but is by that of Middle-Saxon estate centres.
- There is some archaeological and documentary evidence to suggest a possible hierarchy of routeways and their social and functional use.
5.1 Introduction

In the previous two chapters the positioning of structures of socio-economic organisation and landscapes of mortuary deposition were demonstrated to intersect with the framework of past life-paths. In both cases, clues as to the regionalisation of societal institutions were identified with respect to existing structures of geopolitical and geophysical distribution. The identification of environmental *pays* and an appreciation of the importance of past routes of communication in other words, were argued to aid structure the patterning of archaeological complexes and past settlement. Whilst the routine actions of economic production and movement underlying these distributions can only be indirectly surmised, the positioning of these structures suggest situated interactions, not unrelated to further contemporary life-paths (Giddens 1984; etc.). Accordingly, the emphasis on the structuring influence of geographical space and movement through it, as discussed in the previous two chapters, has implicitly skirted a broader issue of societal positioning: the geography of settlement.

This vagueness of approach is unavoidable in one crucial respect. In keeping with numerous other areas of Lowland Britain, Kent has so far failed to produce the significant concrete archaeological evidence needed to reconstruct a geography of regional Anglo-Saxon settlement. The known pattern suggests an important addition to our knowledge of Anglo-Saxon settlement in Kent. It seems clear from the available evidence that the site location of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries was, in every observable case, crucially tied to the pre-existent network of communications. Should this distribution in fact reflect that of associated Early Anglo-Saxon settlements, as is suggested by evidence from other sites in southern England (Welch 1985; Arnold 1988/1997, 41), one could argue that the geometric structure of settlement is dependant upon the route system of communications. An inferred spatio-temporal model of local settlement is therefore reliant on a number of core assumptions and hypotheses, as defined by analogous work both in Kent and the other Anglo-Saxon territories. With the aim of discussing these lines of argument, the following chapter outlines the known archaeological and documentary evidence for settlement in Early- to Middle-Saxon Kent. As this evidence is documented in considerable detail in the ASKED gazetteer and related publications, the outline as presented here is primarily of a discursive nature. In keeping with the aforementioned remit, special interest is attributed to the spatial patterning of settlement with respect to geographical attributes.
5.2 Archaeological evidence for Anglo-Saxon settlement in East Kent

5.2.1 Introduction

Unambiguous archaeological evidence for Early- to Middle-Saxon settlement within the study area was, until very recently almost wholly restricted to excavation within the major Roman and Medieval settlements of Canterbury and Dover (e.g. Philp 1973; 1977b; 1978; Rahtz 1976; Webster 1973, 145; 1976, 164; 1978, 147; Wilson 1971, 126-7; etc.). Although recent rescue excavation has significantly enhanced the number of known sites with excavations at Church Whitfield (Parfitt 1996), Saltwood (Glass 1999, 199-200), Manston, Tesco (Wessex Archaeology 1997) and Newington (Duncan et al. 1989) very little is still understood of Anglo-Saxon settlement within the region; particularly as all of these sites have yet to find their way into publication. Accordingly, cited settlement histories of East Kent rest predominantly on a combination of place-name, documentary and cemetery evidence, in addition to traditional sources, find-spot evidence and ecclesiastical history (e.g. Tatton-Brown 1984; 1988b; Everitt 1986; Witney 1982; etc. and see below). Archaeologically attestable Early to Middle Anglo-Saxon settlement sites are summarised in Table 5.1 and shown in Figure 5.1.

This small, but representative sample of settlements, broadly matches those excavated elsewhere in the country both in the types of excavated features and the general form and environmental placement of the settlements (e.g. Welch 1985). Given the proximity of the features from Dover and Canterbury to Roman precursors, this evidence should probably be understood as part of the process of sixth-century suburban reoccupation of Roman centres as understood from such settlements as Winchester, York and London (cf. Clarke & Ambrosiani 1991). Sandtun remains the best investigated example of a Kentish wic settlement (2.2.2; Hill & Cowie 2001; see below), and the remaining features fall broadly under the rubric of ‘rural settlements’ as generally understood from excavated sites such as West Stow, Sf (West 1985); Church Down, Chalton, Ha (Addyman, Leigh & Hughes 1972); or Cowdrey’s Down, Ha (Millett & James 1983). None of the Kent settlements have been completely excavated, and most have been inferred from isolated features or find-scatters. It follows that this discussion and some of the conclusions drawn about regional Anglo-Saxon settlement patterns may well be premature and subject to revision following more extensive archaeological survey.

5.2.2 Zones of colonisation

Despite a broad date range, the majority of excavated settlements are located in those areas identified by Everitt as the Original Lands: the Foothill northern coastal strip and the fertile
tracts of the Holmesdale \textit{pays}. Although Richardson (2000) has argued that this pattern may be weighted by the scale of modern regional development, the absence of Anglo-Saxon material from heavier soils bisected by large-scale archaeological transepts such as the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (Glass 1999; 2000) suggest that the general pattern may be a true representation. Significantly, although the investigated route diverted through Wealden and Chart landscapes for approximately 40\% of the 64km stretch within the study area, none of the four Anglo-Saxon sites discovered fell within these \textit{pays}. Certainly, this distribution finds broad agreement with that of contemporary mortuary remains (Figs. 4.1 & 5.1), and a general - though not statistically demonstrable - relation with routeways could be suggested (see below). If Everitt’s model of colonisation is accepted, this distribution pattern could be taken as evidence of primary lowland settlement - though the site of Dover should probably be added in this respect. In support of this thesis, Sorensen (1999, 203-4) has argued that amongst all the excavated settlement material, only some of the ceramic material from Marlowe Car Park, Canterbury (SFB S30) and Royal Victoria Hospital, Dover can be directly compared with that from fifth- to sixth-century Jutland or Frisia. Certainly, the distribution map of all Early and Middle Anglo-Saxon finds in East Kent clearly shows the prevalence of find spots in the northern half of the county, with a high density of sites particularly visible in the Foothill zone of north-east Kent. Somewhat in contrast with Everitt’s interpretation, however, it is apparent from the archaeological evidence that the colonisation of the eastern Downland in particular, was already well advanced within the Early Anglo-Saxon period. Though he is correct in pin-pointing the three river-valleys connecting the Foothills with the Holmesdale; those of the Darenth, the Medway and the Stour, (Everitt 1979, 98) an important pattern of sixth- and seventh-century finds is also recognisable along the Roman roads crossing the Downs, the Nailbourne River valley and in the Downland-like combes of Dover and St. Margaret-at-Cliffe. A similar cluster is visible within the northern fringe of Romney Marsh, but this sample is statistically biased by the high density of archaeological sampling undertaken in this area by the Romney Marsh Research Trust and others (e.g. Reeves 1995), and there is little other supporting evidence to suggest that settlement in this area was nearly as intense as that in the northern part of the county during this period.

Important evidence for this settlement penetration of more marginal lands is afforded by the excavations at Church Whitfield (Parfitt 1996) and the Anglo-Saxon find-spots from Barham (Youngs & Clarke 1982, 187). Datable to the late sixth and seventh century on the basis of organic-tempered ceramic finds, excavations at Church Whitfield revealed evidence of two small post-built structures and at least four sunken-feature buildings (SFBs)
probably representing a small, hamlet-sized complex of farm units (Parfitt 1996). Despite, its distance from the coast (c.4.8km), oyster and limpet shells from SFB VII, suggest that the resident community had access to littoral and marine resources, in addition to probable local cultivation and pasture. A possible loom, interpreted from stake-holes in SFB III and animal bones from SFB VI complete the evidence for a subsistence pattern comparable with numerous Downland settlements excavated in other regions (e.g. Church Down, Ha; Bishopstone, Sx; etc.). In keeping with these observations, find scatters from Barham, including an early eighth-century sceatta coin, could represent a similar Downland settlement (Youngs & Clarke 1982, 187).

The location of both sites in close proximity to cross-Down routeways and Roman find scatters, suggest that the process of colonisation adhered closely to established patterns of movement. Similar network utility can be inferred from the location of the sixth-to-eighth century Newington Biggin's Wood SFB and the eighth-century Folkestone, Cherry Garden Hill and Cheriton Hill sites. All three sites are located within 1,300m of each other along the chalk escarpment close to the Pilgrim's Way and might represent a chronological sequence of hamlets migrating along the Down terrace, as has been recorded elsewhere, notably on a gravel terrace at Mucking, Ex (Hamerow 1991). Settlement shift or not, the close proximity of all three sites to a major routeway, indicates the important structuring influence these corridors of movement played in the developing settlement topography, particularly in more marginal landscapes. By contrast, network utility is not as clearly important within the Original Lands. Whilst settlements such as those at Dover and Canterbury are, by definition, linked to Roman nodal points, other sites, such as Manston, Tesco or Shrubsoles Hill, Sheppey have no clearly definable association. As was demonstrated in Chapter 4, however, the nature of local transport geography is only vaguely understood, particularly on these islands, and it may be premature to stress this pattern unduly. In support of this caveat, excavation at the site of Saltwood, over 1,000m from the major Lympne-Dover Roman road (Margary 131), revealed a substantial Late-Iron Age/Roman hollow-way junction directly adjacent to the excavated isolated SFB and later Medieval settlement (Glass 1999, 199-200).

Closer inspection of the cemetery distribution in north-east Kent provides further evidence of the colonising migration of settlement into the Downland pays. If the pattern of cemeteries can be assumed to represent that of their associated settlements, a clear distinction in site location can be drawn between the pattern of the fifth to early sixth centuries and that of later periods. During the late fifth century (Fig. 5.2), cemeteries are
seen to cluster either on, or close to the richer lowland loams (Head Brickearth and Thanet Beds) and to be closely associated with either riverine or coastal resources. The cluster of early burials along the Nailbourne River in the cemeteries of Howletts (i.e. grave 26), Bifrons (grave 23) and possibly slightly later at Beakesbourne (grave 16) for example, hint that this river valley operated as the primary corridor of communication onto the Downs; a notion supported by an additional stray spearhead find made at the river's edge in 1913 (BKB-FS1).

Though this pattern of mortuary contexts continues into the next phase (Fig. 5.3), with the increased infilling of the river and coastal margins, the pattern of the late sixth and seventh centuries witnesses the additional settlement of the Upper Chalk Downland. Though still closely associated with the communication routes of the riverine and road network, the earliest phases of the Chartham Down, Kingston Down and Barham cemeteries indicate the occupation, or at least the territorial claimance, of the Chalk Downs. Further similar colonisation of the more marginal soils is demonstrated in the seventh century (Fig. 5.4) both in Thanet, with the communities of Broadstairs St. Peter's Tip, Half Mile Ride and Crispe Rd, and on the mainland with Beakesbourne, Adisham Down and Breach Downs.

Beyond the loose general label of *pays*, further evidence of colonising settlement patterns is afforded by a study of medieval woodland. A clear case where these broad environmental bands of settlement is contradicted for example, is provided by the Blean¹ (Fig. 5.5). Ostensibly part of the Foothill *pays*, the place-name, charter and Domesday evidence suggests that even in 1086, the Blean formed a large stretch of woodland between the Stour valley and the northern coast. A rough plot of its dimensions by Witney (e.g. 1982, 11) offers a useful explanation for the lack of archaeological material in this area, and further evidence suggests that for the Anglo-Saxon settlements in this Sturry lathe area, the Blean formed a territory of Wealden-like exploitation. Chetherste, is named as appurtenant swine-pasture for Swalecliffe and is likely to have been in the Blean (Everitt, 1979, 109 note 5; Wallenberg 1931, 308) whilst the chapelries of Blean and Herne appear to have been late foundations, parished up out of dependant Chislet lands scattered throughout the woodland (Rigold 1979, 26). A similar pattern is presented by the Domesday woods of Haradun and Buckholt on the eastern Downland, but a number of finds of Early Anglo-Saxon material within the Bircholt wood in the Holmesdale and Chart *pays* suggest that the

¹ This is of course grossly unfair to Everitt, who not only is fully aware of the Blean as an area of later colonisation, but also stresses that the evidence of *pays* of settlement must be interpreted in only the broadest of terms.
colonisation of this important woodland within an area of Original settlement may have been well underway from as early as the late sixth century. The location of the secondary place-names containing the element -ing has already been commented on in reference to the settlement of the Downs (4.6), and the identification of names such as Eddington and Ruckinge (Kirk 1972, 57-8) in these areas of early hypothesised woodland, suggests that these coincident regions of colonisation could be speculatively dated, in concordance with the archaeological data, to the seventh century.

5.2.3 A model of parcelisation

Although the rural settlements have only partially been excavated, the available evidence suggests that most of these settlements were composed of significantly larger numbers of sunken-feature buildings (SFBs) than post-built hall structures. The identification of single SFBs at additional sites such as Sarre, Saltwood and Shrubsoles Hill does not contradict this pattern in this respect. Perhaps significantly, the highest proportion of post-built halls so far recognised has been from the Church Whitfield settlement; geographically - sited high on the North Downs - the most marginal of all the hamlets excavated to date. As a similar general trend has been recognised elsewhere in England (cf. Welch 1985, 3), there is little reason to suspect a sampling bias amongst the available evidence. More problematic is the lack of comparable hall buildings from any of the other rural sites, though three are known from seventh to eighth-century Canterbury (Blockley et al. 1995; Bennett 1980). At Manston, Tesco, the excavators argued that it was unlikely that post-built halls might have existed, but not survived, given that a Bronze Age timber structure was identified within the excavation (Andrews, Hutcheson & Allen 1997, 48). This observation notwithstanding, it seems unlikely that all of the SFBs functioned as domiciles given the evidence for craft production, in the form of iron slag, spindle whorls and quern stone fragments (Jay 1995, 476; Wessex Archaeology 1997, 10) and more general ancillary workshop and storage functions are perhaps to be inferred.

Similar convergence between the Kentish material and settlements excavated elsewhere is evident from the size and layout of the hamlets. The possible small, migrating settlement near Newington/Folkestone has already been mentioned. By contrast, the apparently hamlet-sized settlement of Church Whitfield represents an essentially single phase site with no other reported finds or features in the immediate vicinity. Alternatively, the numbers of find-spots near Manston suggest either a further case of settlement migration, or more probably, a widely dispersed community of small farm units (Fig. 5.6a). Although it was suggested by the excavator that the northern and southern extent may have been reached it
seems probable that the settlement extends further to the west and possibly east of the
scatters of apparently contemporary date both with the Manston, Tesco material and the
nearby cemetery of Ozengell are known from Nethercourt Estate, 850m to the south-west
(MTC-2). Taken in combination with the large numbers of isolated burials, small groups of
inhumations and the larger cemeteries found along the south-facing slope of the island of
Thanet, the archaeological evidence appears to indicate fairly dense settlement across the
whole area. Perhaps significantly, the only so-far convincing evidence of actual settlement
is located on the lighter soils beyond the corridor of mortuary sites bisected by Dunstrete; a
pattern in fact supported by the further possible settlement at Nethercourt Estate. Given
the proximity of these settlements to the Lord of the Manor site, it is unlikely that the
resident communities are not represented amongst the interred at Ozengell. Despite this
suggestion, the size of the Ozengell complex 2 in addition to the further cemetery evidence
from Nethercourt Farm 550m to the east and West Cliff to the south-east, all appear to
point to the possibility of more substantial settlement downslope from the cemeteries on
the fertile head brickearth soils of the coastal bays below (cf. Millard, Jarman & Hawkes
1969, 29). If adequate landing-places to some extent determined the location of head
settlements, the position of mortuary sites on visible spurs above these inhabited coastal
combes may have acted to clearly delineate community complexes made up of both coastal
sites and secondary dispersed hamlets further up the same valleys. The importance of the
location of the Ozengell cemetery becomes clear in this model, occupying both a visible
point along the main valley Hollin’s Bottom linking the settlements of Nethercourt Estate,
Manston, Tesco and a hypothesised landing-place settlement at Cliffsend, as well as the main
inter-community thoroughfare of Dunstrete (Fig. 5.6b)

Support for this coastal-inland link is reflected in the archaeological evidence. Economically, the Manston community was ideally situated to exploit both local dryland
and lowland soils for pasture and/or cultivation, as well as the estuarine, littoral and marine
environments near Ebbsfleet. Environmental evidence from SFB 88 confirms that littoral
and estuarine salt marshes were exploited in addition to some limited marine resources
(Wessex Archaeology 1997, 42). Additional charred plant material indicates the likelihood
of cereal cultivation on the lighter dryland soils, as well as lowland clays (ibid, 50). Taken
with evidence for textile production in the form of excavated spindle-whorls, a pin-beater

2 An assessment by the excavator suggested a total buried population in the region of 700 individuals, if we
include the graves destroyed by railway cutting of the 1840s and the extension of the cemetery as visible from
cropmarks and excavations of 1966 (Perkins 1978; 1987; Charles Roach Smith 1854b; Millard, Jarman &
Hawkes 1969).
and needles/weaving tools, as well as ironworking slag and animal bones, this suggests a sophisticated subsistence strategy incorporating all available local resources within a five-kilometre radius. Whilst the archaeological evidence for similar parcelisation cannot directly be offered for most of the other excavated sites, the ecotonal location of many of the identified rural settlements suggest a similarly diversified subsistence strategy. The cluster of sites near Folkestone, Newington and Saltwood occupy a central zone at most seven kilometres from Downland, Holmesdale, Chart and coastal resources, as well as enjoying easy transport links to both the Weald and Romney Marsh. Similarly, the importance of central locations such as Faversham or Cliffe-at-Hoo, must be seen with respect to cross-pays catchment areas. It is within this model that the important link between settlement location and routeways on the Downs must be recognised. Despite its apparent isolation, similar diversification has already been noted at Church Whitfield, and the likely success of a possible settlement at Barham probably depended on its crossroad position straddling the junction of Margary 1a, the identified cross-Down denn route (4.4) and the upper reaches of the Nailbourne River.

5.2.4 Specialised sites and inter-regional contact

In addition to the excavated rural settlements, a small number of further sites have been argued to display evidence of specialised functions. Clearest archaeological evidence supporting this thesis is offered by excavations at Canterbury, Dover and Sandtun. Whilst the latter two have traditionally been interpreted as forms of wic sites, Canterbury itself is generally regarded as a non-agricultural specialised central-place, or proto-town (e.g. Tatton-Brown 1984; 1988b; Hill & Cowie 2001). Without re-treading all of the well-versed case for urban criteria (e.g. Biddle 1976; Reynolds 1977; 1987; Scull 1997; etc.) it is important to identify certain common features distinguishing these settlements from those already discussed. Although an inherent teleological basis exists in arguing retrogressively from sites that had become burhs by Domesday, in the case of Dover and Canterbury it is suggested that certain morphological criteria contributed to the long-term pre-eminence of these settlements.

Foremost amongst these criteria is network utility. Whilst the importance of settlement location for a model of commercialisation will be further discussed below (8.1.3), specialisation is dependant on a social and economic hinterland. “A town,” in Reynold’s definition of the word, “lives off the food of the surrounding countryside and supplies this countryside with other goods and services in return” (1987, 296). Distance from this central-place is a significant determinant of different production costs of agricultural goods,
and one would expect, following von Thünen, the pattern of land use to reflect these prices (1966; Christaller 1966; Smith 1976). However, as Hodges has already demonstrated with respect to Early Medieval marketing, a solar system develops anisotropically along dendritic channels (1988b). As such, in the purely functional terms of an integrated regional system, nodal settlements could therefore be predicted at the junction of major modal networks, where the costs of transfer are minimised. In fact, closer inspection of the transport geography of Kent confirms, as one would expect, not only the important network locations of Dover and Canterbury, but also Sandtun and further sites identified from other evidence as early central-places. Though this economically-deterministic concept runs the risk of oversimplification, some evidence does seem to support this thesis in Kent. The importance of Sarre has been seen with respect to its location at both the major Roman crossing point and at the confluence of the double tidal waters of the Wantsum Channel (Brookes 1998, 29-32). The importance of Fordwich alternatively, has been stressed due to the settlement’s position at the tidal head of the Great Stour, and its probable role as the *emporium* for the nearby *villa regalis* at Sturry and Canterbury itself; whilst also offering the most likely point of trans-shipment between the sea-going Channel and coastal vessels and the inland riverine modal network. Equally, Sandwich’s strategic position at the southern entrance to the Wantsum, adjacent both to the Roman roads to Dover and Canterbury and the large sheltered haven of the *Meacesfleote*, endowed it topographical attributes which secured its importance until well into the medieval period. Finally, as a product of its close location to the Saxon Shore fort of Lympne, Sandtun profited from established road links along Stone Street (Margary 12) to Canterbury and Margary 131 to Maidstone, Rochester and Dover, as well as the riverine and marine links that underlay its specialised function.

The second important criterion enabling high-order functions is also predicted by classical central-place theory: the expected range of goods and services. Given relatively high transportation costs, one would expect a local diversified agricultural hinterland supporting these specialised sites. Whilst the topographical and generally coastal location of all sites appears to substantiate this view, archaeological evidence is more elusive. One approach, presented in greater detail in the following chapters, is to look at the saturation levels of community consumption. This is seen most clearly with imported goods. The importance attributed by Hodges to inter-regional trading links predicts that a dendritic central-place system forms hierarchically inland from the coast. Accordingly, consumption close to primary centres is advantaged by lower production/service costs. As a direct comparison reveals, rubbish from the Manston, Tesco SFBs produced 94 fragments of imported wheel-thrown pottery, fifteen fragments of vessel glass and an amber bead, whilst those from
Church Whitfield contained only a single small sherd of imported Frankish pottery (Wessex Archaeology 1997; Sørensen 1999). This discrepancy is probably in part a reflection of the relative proximity of both communities to the trade route of the Wantsum Channel and Dover-Deal coast.

Perhaps tellingly, a direct comparison between these two sets of SFBs and those excavated in Canterbury at first glance appear to contradict this model. Discarding the evidence from contemporary pits and occupation layers, deposits from the thirty excavated Early- to Mid-Saxon SFBs from Marlowe Car Park (S.1-S.27; S.30-S.32; Blockley et al. 1995) revealed only two sherds of imported Ipswich ware (ibid., FIG. 364). Whilst the evidence is presently unforthcoming, all archaeological indications appear to suggest, however, in keeping with the interpretation presented from historical research, that the Canterbury/Fordwich/Sturry area represented a focus for regional economic and jurisdictional functions from at least the sixth century. The important surveys by Tatton-Brown (1984; 1988b) have sketched a history of the environs of the former civitas capital for the fifth to ninth century, which detail the local development of the numerous paraphernalia associated with towns: complex religious organisation from AD 597; a mint by c.AD 630; and a market by AD 762. How far these institutions were centralised is less clear, however, and numerous lines of argument appear to suggest that many of the central-place functions were dispersed throughout a three kilometre long zone enclosing the eastern part of the Roman walled city and the extra-mural area to the north-east comprising the vill of St. Martin, the vic of Fordwich and the villa regalis of Sturry (Brookes 1998) (Fig. 5.7). Archaeological evidence from St. Martin's Hill and the Outer Court of St. Augustine's Abbey (Rady 1987; Bennett 1986) provide some of the best archaeological evidence for eighth-century activity in or near Canterbury, whilst recent finds of similar date from Fordwich attest to the occupation, if not directly the operation of this site as the trading centre for the Canterbury population (Brookes 2000; Brookes forthcoming b). Taken in combination with the importance attributed to the villas of St. Martin and Sturry in documentary and place-name evidence, intra-mural Canterbury may well have existed in a service capacity for the extra-mural estates, until the reorganisation of manors and burgesses in the ninth century (Brooks 1984, part 1; cf. Blockley et al. 1995, 350). In this interpretation, intra-mural deposits are indeed less likely to display evidence of privileged access to imported goods than contemporary rural settlements. Indirectly, the restricted range of material from the Marlowe SFBs could therefore be argued as negative evidence supporting early zonation of activities.
Possible evidence for similarly dispersed functions is provided also by an archaeological and historical survey of Dover (Fig. 5.8). Such archaeological data as there is indicates: a monastic reoccupation of the Saxon Shore fort by the seventh century at St Martin-le-Grand (Philp 1978; Webster 1978, 147; Evison 1987, 177); an associated intra-mural settlement to the north (Philp 1976; 1977a; 1989, 39); a possible Saxon harbour-side settlement at the Dour mouth below (Parfitt 2001); secondary settlements represented by Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries for three kilometres north-westwards along the river to Temple Ewell (Evison 1987, 176); and a possibly defended *burh* at the site of the later Medieval castle (Tatton-Brown 1984, 23).

With this kind of evidence for an extensive area over which central-place activities are dispersed, it is perhaps important to look for links between the excavated site of Sandtun and wider social and administrative organisation. Whilst the topographical suitability of this settlement both as a seasonal landing-site/beach-market and as a gateway for regional distribution has already been discussed, further documentary evidence appears to suggest that both Sandtun and nearby Lympne, were important economic appendages of the monastery of Lyminge and monks of Christ Church, respectively (Gardiner 2001, 100; Ward 1939). The stipulation of 'Welsh' ale or wine in Lympne's ninth-century food-renders certainly appear to suggest that trade through Sandtun was earmarked for wider dispersal (Gardiner 2001, 101). Perhaps significantly however, Sandtun is identified as land rather than a settlement in a charter of AD 732 (S 23), and it may be that the topographic suitability of a sheltered, sandy beach close to inland routeways, was a prime factor in the abbey's economic planning. As part of an early multiple estate, therefore, Sandtun, by its very definition, formed a discrete element of manorial parcelisation, but, as was also recognised with Wealden appurtenances, it was the resource rather than physical settlement that determined the shape of landholding. Some further lines of argumentation, considered below, appear to substantiate this point.

5.3 The question of water

5.3.1 The hydrology of East Kent

In addition to the geomorphology and topography of the region already discussed, the agrarian potential underlying the historical settlement of different *pays* is in part a reflection of the geography of hydrology and drainage. It is not coincidental that the zones identified by Everitt as regions of continuity, the Foothills and Holmesdale, are also recognised as areas of well-watered fertility (Fig. 5.9). The three major waterways of Kent - the Medway, Darent and Stour - were navigable throughout the Foothills, and the numerous tributaries...
and lesser rivers that criss-cross the comparably easy worked soils of Oldhaven Beds, Thanet Sands and Bricearths of the pays significantly contributed to the historical development of the area. In keeping, the Holmesdale pays, at the intersection of Greensand drift and the numerous springheads and streams of the Weald, can also be defined topographically by this coincidence of hydrology and better soils. By contrast, the significantly larger Downland pays, at c.121,500ha of relatively infertile permeable chalk and Clay-with-flint drift, is only cut by running water in a few, but very significant, river valleys. These are the aforementioned Medway, Darent and Stour, and the lesser river valleys of the Little Stour (or Nailbourne) and the shorter Dour above Dover. A final significant waterway - the Rother - with a catchment area of almost 47,000ha, defines the southern limit of East Kent. Formerly known as the Limen, its present course marks part of the boundary between Kent and Sussex, and historical changes in its course and estuary development underline both the evolution of the Romney Marsh landscape and associated settlement (Eddison 1988).

5.3.2 Spatial tests

The terrain model and modern stream information digitised from 10m O.S. data allows for the derivation of a hydrologic model of East Kent at 50m pixel resolution using watershed delineation functions developed by the Centre for Research in Water Resources at the University of Texas at Austin (http://www.ce.utexas.edu/prof/olivera/prepro.html). This programme extracts a topologically-correct schematic network of sub-basins and reaches with hydrological parameters from digital spatial data (Oliveira, Reed & Maidmont 1998). The defined polygons describe the extent of sub-basin drainage areas related to each reach segment. Whilst this computation suffers from temporal inaccuracies as the result of changes in past watercourses, this model does successfully define watersheds for areas without modern running water, but which may well have been periodically served by water resources before recent drops in the water-table. This is because it is defined by topological, rather than modern hydrological, data. The temporal qualification here is important, as the modern water information relates only to perennial water availability, and not to short- or moderate-duration water resources of debatable importance in structuring past settlement.
The produced pattern of hydrological sub-basins and reaches can be compared with the distribution of cemeteries using the Kolgomov-Smirnov test outlined above (4.2)\(^3\). In this respect, two models regarding the location of cemeteries could be hypothesised:

a) Cemeteries are expected close to watershed boundaries. As basins are defined by topological criteria, watershed boundaries form the highest points circumscribing reach segments. Following from the issues of visibility encountered in the previous chapter, it might be expected that cemeteries would be located at strategic and/or visible locations above river valleys.

b) Cemeteries are expected close to rivers. The spatial organisation of cemeteries may be closely related to that of associated settlements, and these - for whatever functional reasons - might be expected to lie close to waterways.

In fact, cumulative frequency curves generated for both data sets reveal little significant patterning when compared with expected frequencies (Fig. 5.10). Only at a distance of between 1,000-2,000m are cemeteries recognised to be more closely associated with rivers than might randomly be expected, whilst no correlation is recognised between cemetery location and watershed boundaries at any distance (Fig. 5.11). Statistically, given the observed association of mortuary structures and roads, this pattern could indeed be argued to reveal more about the correlation of routeways with rivers than anything meaningfully interpreted with regards to cemetery location (Orton pers. comm. 27/3/02).

Comparison can be drawn between this result and the location of estate-centres identified above (Figs. 5.12 & 5.13). Although a correlation exists between the location of these settlements and waterways (though not watershed boundaries), the problems of their real antiquity in many cases remain. By contrast, seventh-century, archaeologically-attested settlements such as Manston, Tesco and Church Whitfield, both at a distance of over 2,000m from either riverine or marine resources, have no spatial relation with permanent watercourses at all. Taken in combination, although river valleys formed essential corridors for early colonisation, there is little evidence to suggest that water resources were particularly important in structuring later patterns of settlement.

5.4 ‘Seminal Places’: villa regales, minsters and estate centres

5.4.1 The argument presented by Everitt

The outlined lack of direct archaeological evidence for Early- to Mid-Saxon settlements has to some extent been countered by studies of the onomastic (e.g. Wallenberg 1931; 1934)

\(^3\) For statistical robustness and illustrative clarity, a full cumulative frequency curve of all points within the study area has been calculated with which the following cemetery and settlement distributions are compared.
and documentary evidence (e.g. Tatton-Brown 1984; Du Boulay 1966). A compilation of these secondary sources has prompted Everitt, to outline a case for a number of settlements he regards effectively as ‘seminal places’ (1986, 69-92). These are seen to occupy key positions throughout the Original Lands and although at these sites, there is no direct archaeological evidence for the continuity of structures, the prevailing impression is one of maintained local settlement patterns.

Key to this interpretation of the overall settlement pattern of early Kent is a bridging argument linking recurring observed phenomena rather than verified empirical data. An example of this line of argument is offered by the settlement of Eastry (Fig. 5.14), though it could just as easily be applied to Faversham, Milton Regis or Maidstone. Eastry appears as a Roman roadside settlement occupying the crossroads of the Richborough-Dover road (Margary 100 or Stane Street) and the prehistoric trackway from Sandwich to Wootton referred to earlier (4.4). Roman finds are also known from the immediate environs (O’Grady 1978, 113) and a Roman cemetery at Walton (Gibben 1902) indicates a level of pre-Saxon settlement. A number of Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and burials surrounding the village at Updown (Chadwick-Hawkes 1974; 1976; 1979, CEMETERY III) Buttsole (Meaney 1964, 113; Chadwick-Hawkes 1979, CEMETERY I), Eastry Mill (Chadwick-Hawkes 1979; CEMETERY IV) and at Eastry House (Chadwick-Hawkes 1979, CEMETERY II), are testimony to a substantial local population, often linked to an inferred Anglo-Saxon \textit{villa regalis}. The latter suggestion relies on the validity of some Late Saxon documentary evidence detailing seventh-century events as having occurred at Eastry (Hasted 1799: 4, 216) and the association of the place-name with the modern settlement (cf. Arnold 1982, 121). ‘Eastry’, documented as \textit{Eastorege} in a ninth-century charter, has been interpreted as ‘the eastern district capital’ (Chadwick-Hawkes 1982, 75) and is taken to indicate both the existence of administrative sub-districts in Late Saxon Kent (3.2) and the importance of the settlement within the royal estate system. The latter argument has even prompted the identification of Eastry Court Farm as a potential Anglo-Saxon administrative centre or royal residence (Chadwick-Hawkes 1979, 95) despite little archaeological justification (Arnold 1982, 135; Parfitt 1999, 50). It has also been suggested that Eastry might be the unnamed twelfth great church listed in the \textit{Domesday Monachorum} (Tatton-Brown 1988a, 107). The correlation of Iron-Age, Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon archaeological complexes, topographic suitability, place-name evidence, historical

\footnote{Although recent excavations in the immediate vicinity of this burial, suggests that this may be an isolated burial (Parfitt 1999, 52), conceivably marked by a barrow (Welch pers. comm. 2002).}
allusions and early ecclesiastical associations, therefore, all indicate a form of ideological, if not necessarily, physical, continuity.

Everitt's reasoning for the "magnetic influence" of 'Seminal Places' in many respects echoes that of Tilley (1992). Rather than promulgating the archaeological tradition of the static site distribution map (e.g. Willey 1953) which camouflages the nature of landscapes as a "cultural construct, shaped by myth and tradition, and invested with social meaning" (Tilley 1992, 18) it is important, they argue, to attempt to reconcile the archaeological material with these provisos of lived experience and perception. Although, in some ways the Wantsum Channel and the Foothills of Kent could be seen to resemble physically the original homelands of coastal Friesland and Saxony "with settlement on low rises separated by strips of alluvium giving rich grazings but periodically inundated" (Brandon & Short 1990, 76), this takes little account of the differing influence of previous societies. Everitt's contention (1986, 339-441) that a relatively established system of 'estates', with its origins in the Romano-British settlement system, formed the basis of seventh-century ecclesiastical foundations, in contrast, offers an important addition to the model of Anglo-Saxon processes of social production and reproduction.

5.4.2 Examining the Roman precedent
Given the general lack of excavated settlement evidence in East Kent, the conjectured correlation between Romano-British and Early Anglo-Saxon settlement has traditionally been argued on the basis of place-name and cemetery evidence (e.g. ibid.; Chadwick-Hawkes 1982, 74). The case presented from these lines of reasoning appears to substantiate a topographical relationship between 'Seminal' settlements and the same soils and landscapes favoured by pre-existent settlement. The Eastry example could be restated for a number of different settlements, and it seems likely, particularly when early ecclesiastical centres and villae regales coincide, that an association with the Roman past was deliberately fostered. Roman precedents have been identified close to Sturry (Rigold 1972; Brookes 1998); Faversham (Philp 1965, lii; Jessup 1970, 189; Detsicas 1983, 131-3; Everitt 1986, 109-112); Milton Regis (Kelly 1978, 267; Detsicas 1983, 81), Lyminge (Kelly 1962, 205; Detsicas 1983, 143-4), and Wester Linton, near Maidstone (Detsicas 1983), amongst others. The influence residual Romano-British features had on the siting of early churches is equally apparent. It is demonstrated by the association of Roman buildings with churches at Lyminge (Detsicas 1983, 143-4); or the church foundations within Roman forts such as at Reculver and Richborough, for example.
Given the demonstrable economic basis of parcelisation underlying all settlement, the important location of Everitt’s ‘seminal place’ estate-centres, forming the nuclei of colonising tenurial holdings in the North Downs and Weald, is evident. His hypothesis has stressed the importance of diverse economic conditions in the make-up of early estates by looking at the ancient patterns of land usage in terms of the detached lands and ancient common rights (cf. Witney 1979; 1982; Everitt 1979; 1986). Significant links between the more intensively cultivated lowland estates in the northern coastal fringe and Holmesdale valley and dependant appurtenances in the Weald and North Downs have been argued to reflect, not merely the pattern of economic settlement, but also the underlying basis of later administrative structures. Thiessen Polygons constructed around these settlements confirm the contrasting economic zones of agrarian resources underlying their topographical shape, and the importance of their location almost equidistant, along the routes of communication (Fig. 5.15). Parallels for this type of ‘multiple estate’ system are known from elsewhere in England, in particular southern Hampshire, Dorset and the Upper Thames region (Hooke 1988; Jones 1979; etc.), and it seems reasonably certain that this system of manorial estates formed the basis of seventh-century ecclesiastical foundations (cf. Pearce 1982; Everitt 1986, 339-341; etc.).

As central-places for tenure spanning a variety of agrarian resources, and the further administrative implications such a pattern of estates suggests, it would be surprising if the distribution of these manorial centres did not, at least in part, resemble that of pre-existing land exploitation (cf. Yorke 1995, 75-6); particularly given the importance of inland network utility in tying discrete resources together. Indeed, correlations have been found between Roman precedents and Anglo-Saxon manorial centres throughout areas of Lowland Britain, perhaps arguing for a continuity of landscape structures from the Late Roman villa organisation (e.g. Finberg 1964, 21-65; Pearce 1982). In Kent, partial explanation of the roots of *gavelkind* could fancifully be correlated with the state-run organisation of the Roman Wealden iron industry, which lacking permanent civilian settlement (Cleere 1974; 1976; Cunliffe 1988) may have continued to have been regarded as a communal resource by Anglo-Saxon populations.

Whilst numerous examples of so-called “magnetic influence” exist however, closer inspection of many of Everitt’s ‘seminal places’ suggests the need for a note of caution. Table 5.2 summarises the available data-sources for the settlements of the East Kent region which could lay claim to some form of special pan-historical importance. The immediate impression gained from this summary is the vague definition of ‘place’. Whilst
archaeological complexes of Roman to Medieval date are all seen to lie within a radius of c.500m of sites such as Eastry, Milton Regis or even Teynham, archaeological evidence for settlements such as Charing, Hollingbourne, Harrietsham or Lenham is often over more than a kilometre apart, if present at all (Fig. 5.16). Given the suggested spatial correlation of contemporary burials and settlements and the substantial evidence for Early Anglo-Saxon burials directly adjacent to medieval and modern settlements such as Eastry, Milton Regis and the like, direct continuity of settlement is difficult to argue for some of these ‘places’; particularly given the lack of any clear Roman precedent in certain cases. Rather than negating Everitt’s assessment, however, this survey reinforces the strong impression of continuity and colonisation underlying much of the settlement pattern of East Kent. Accordingly, settlements are recognised to fall into four clear groups (Table 5.3):

1. Settlements with both some Romano-British and Early Anglo-Saxon archaeological evidence; an early Minster/Nunnery or church foundation; and a location within the Foothill pays, or with close proximity (i.e. 5km) to the sea, e.g.: Canterbury (intra- and extra-mural); Dover; Eastry; Faversham; Folkestone; Lyminge; Lympne; Milton Regis; Minster-in-Thanet; Northbourne; Reculver; Rochester; Richborough; Teynham; Wingham. Although Stowting never develops as a Minster foundation, it fulfils all the other criteria. The only exceptions to this pattern are Maidstone and Aylesford, which although situated within the Foothill pays, are located over 5km inland. As the River Medway is still navigable at these reaches however, it is argued that their location may indicate the furthest inland settlement penetration of a ‘primary’ phase.

2. Settlements with no visible Romano-British precedent, but clear Early Anglo-Saxon evidence. Always located within the Foothill pays, but not necessarily associated with an early church foundation, i.e. areas of either ‘primary’ de novo settlement or ‘secondary’ infilling, e.g.: Sarre; Monkton; Wye; Minster-in-Sheppey.

3. Settlements without consistent Romano-British or Early Anglo-Saxon archaeological evidence; possible evidence of an early ecclesiastical presence or some tentative Middle Anglo-Saxon finds; located in the Holmesdale or on the margins of the Downland, but generally over 10km from the coast; i.e. areas of possible ‘secondary’ colonisation, e.g.: Hollingbourne; Westwell; Wickhambreux; Boughton Aluph; Boughton-under-Blean; Lenham; Harrietsham.
4. Settlements with and without a Romano-British precedent, but no Early Anglo-Saxon archaeological evidence; possible evidence of an early ecclesiastical presence or some tentative Middle Anglo-Saxon finds; are located either within the Foothill or Marsh pays, i.e. areas of possible ‘secondary’ infilling, e.g.: Ruckinge; Appledore; Lydd; Newington; Rainham; Fordwich; Chilham; Cliffe-at-Hoo; Godmersham; Sturry; Charing; Hoo-St. Werbergh.

This processual model of colonisation is provided with temporal fixed points by both archaeological evidence and the *terminus post quem* of church foundation. With excavated settlement features from Canterbury and Dover dating to the later fifth century, Group 1 settlements are likely to originate in the late fifth/early sixth century. Graves such as Sarre 63, 85 and 148 and Monkton 7 and 26 provide evidence for settlement of Group 2 sites from the first half of the sixth century. Occasional Early Anglo-Saxon material from sites of Group 3 tentatively places ‘secondary’ colonisation in the seventh and early eighth century, whilst the lack of similar material from Group 4 settlements, in addition to corroborating evidence of late seventh-century foundation dates for Hoo-St. Werburgh for example, suggests a later seventh and early eighth-century date for the start of ‘secondary’ infilling.

Importantly, only Group 1 settlements consistently display a Romano-British association, suggesting possible ‘primary’ settlement related to pre-existing patterns of land-use. Perhaps tellingly, certain Group 2 settlements may yet provide positive evidence of similar continuity. As the only inter-visible point between the Saxon Shore forts of Richborough and Reculver, Sarre has been hypothesised for a possible Late Roman signalling station (Perkins pers. comm. 2000) despite a lack of confirmatory finds. Similarly, scanty evidence for Romano-British activity at the site of Wye (Detsicas 1983, 84, 97 etc.) may well yet serve to reinforce the view that Roman precursors played an important structuring role by providing the framework for initial settlement. Similar landscape continuity has been argued to exist in other areas of early Saxon settlement, such as on the river terrace gravels of both the Lower and Upper Thames and areas of East Anglia (Hamerow 1992) but it may be more important to note the distinction between the location of early hypothesised sites and later secondary settlement within East Kent; i.e. between Group 1 and 3 settlements.

In part this phenomenon can be simplistically accommodated within a theoretical model of migration. As people are immersed in a landscape of experience and association, the
process of migration and colonisation makes landscapes both the context of contested ownership and heightens the importance of landscape structures as visible demonstrations of power displays associated with absorption and dominance. As the constructions of power only make sense within a view of the landscape as historically-constituted, places with specific biographic meaning become especially significant (cf. Brück & Goodman 1999, 14). In this model, areas of primary settlement are therefore expected to reveal more signs of Romano-British/Anglo-Saxon continuity, as these are the areas where existent landscape symbols take on greatest political value. Arguably, a similar phenomenon underlines the correlation of early ecclesiastical centres and Roman precedents in the seventh century, as these places too, retained specific meanings that could be manipulated as contexts for human experience.

The economic rationale of 'primary settlement' notwithstanding, it is perhaps significant that both secondary colonisation and infilling, represented by Group 3 and 4 settlements, does not appear to find consistent correlation with known landscape structures. Following on from the proposed model, one could argue that power had been sufficiently consolidated by this phase that overt symbolic connections with an historic past no longer needed reiteration. Whilst the inland settlements represented by these groups do occupy similar economic zones as their Romano-British predecessors, arguing for similar forms of landscape exploitation, the distribution of these estate-centres is, in almost every case, significantly different. Although partial explanation for this phenomenon may lie in the operation of different Romano-British argicultural practices between the inland and the coast, the lack of Early Anglo-Saxon finds is nevertheless significant. An examination of the distribution pattern of 'early' place-names predating AD 731 such as *ham*, *-ing* and *-ingaham* (Cox 1976), for example, reiterate this pattern. Although clearly coincident with that of favourable soils, the distribution of these place-names cannot as Dodgson (1973) suggested, be correlated with Roman settlement as represented by archaeologically-identified villas, buildings or Roman roads (Fig. 5. 17). All indications do appear, as Everitt quite rightly points out, to demonstrate a maintained landscape - a suggestion apparently supported also by environmental evidence (3.2.5) - but these same indicators refute a model of sustained continuity. Taking this argument one hypothetical step further, it is difficult on this evidence to present a case arguing that the 'multiple estate' system necessarily pre-dates secondary colonisation, say in the seventh century.
5.4.3 The ecclesiastical pattern

Whilst continuity from the past is therefore unsustainable in many cases, some evidence suggests that many of the 'Seminal' places identified by Everitt retained their importance throughout the Early Medieval Period. The pattern of early find-spots in northern Kent can also interestingly be compared with that of 'old minster' foundations and hundreds (Fig. 5.18). A distribution of the ten 'old minsters' (Tatton-Brown 1988a) with the two Canterbury foundations, in addition to the early churches of Boughton-under-Blean; Boughton Aluph; Northbourne; Minster-in-Thanet; Faversham; Reculver; Fordwich; Ruckinge; Appledore; Lympne and Lenham (ibid., 109) presents a number of correlations when plotted against the hundreds in the Canterbury Diocese. All of the 'old minsters' are to be found on ancient royal vills, and all of these churches are in association with a hundred in the Original Lands (i.e. the Foothill, Downland and Holmesdale pays). On only two occasions is more than one of these foundations to be found within a single hundred; these being in the hundreds of Milton and Wye. Milton hundred/half-lathe has been commented on previously for its unusual nature, and this pattern is mirrored by its incorporation of three early foundations: the early minster of Milton (Regis); Newington (a possible daughter foundation of the former) and the seventh-century double monastery of Minster-in-Sheppey. The hundred of Wye, by comparison, contains in addition to the minster from which it takes its name, the possible early site of Boughton Aluph. Though there is some debate as to whether this foundation is in fact the Boughton church noted in the Domesday Monachorum (East Kent has four Boughton parishes), a number of Anglo-Saxon finds from this area do suggest possible early settlement. Boughton Aluph comprises the only parish within the Wye hundred which does not form part of the inland, outland or other tenures doing suit to the Abbot of Battle in the late eleventh century. It is just possible that it originally formed the ecclesiastical centre for the more northern neighbouring hundred of Felborough and was later absorbed within the bounds of Wye. In addition, a number of important gaps appear in the ecclesiastical organisation of the hundreds. The lack of early foundations in the hundreds of Whitstable, Petham, Stowting, Bircholt, Barham and Bridge can only partially be explained by the profusion of woodland in these territories. Certainly, in the case of Bircholt, Petham and Whitstable, the absence of any Anglo-Saxon find-spots appears to substantiate the claim that they still formed areas of colonisation into the Late Anglo-Saxon period. On the other hand, the high number of finds in the remaining hundreds, particularly Barham, requires further explanation. One suggestion, inferred from its marginal location, is that this community at first functioned as a specialised, possibly seasonal, settlement and continued to be dependent on a head Minster in the Foothills until the Late Anglo-Saxon period.
5.5 Conclusions

The investigation of the physical patterning of settlement, as inferred from archaeological, place-name and documentary sources, has suggested a number of clear trends:

- The archaeological evidence for settlement, as well as place-name and cemetery evidence, broadly supports Everitt's model of settlement colonisation away from the Original Lands (i.e. Foothill and Holmesdale pafs), but can be further refined to show evidence of several phases of colonisation and infilling, for which tentative dates are given.
- Further refinement of this general model recognises primary colonisation along established corridors of movement (i.e. Roman roads, denn routes and river valleys), as well as the secondary infilling of woodland zones and Marsh within the Original Lands.
- Secondary settlement infilling (recognisable from place-name evidence) suggests the establishment of a marginal hinterland, beyond the routes of communication.
- The model of settlement parcelisation, encountered in chapter 2 (2.2.2.4), appears to be supported by the ecotonal location of archaeologically-identifiable settlements and the range of environmental evidence sampled from these sites.
- This preference for settlement location between environmental zones stresses the importance of network utility in marginal zones. This appears to be substantiated by the archaeological settlement pattern of the North Downs.
- Whilst the location of 'primary' settlements finds general correlation with Roman precedents, this link with past landscape structures cannot be supported with respect to secondary infilling and colonisation.
III - Human landscapes: consumption and distribution
6.1 The nature of the sample

6.1.1 Introduction
Given the examined paucity of settlement evidence for the Early to Middle Anglo-Saxon period in Kent, the archaeological record of mortuary remains provides the single major source for understandings of the diverse aspects of this significant period. Accordingly, beyond the examination of a context for past action, a social archaeology of socioeconomic behaviour is importantly informed by the study of the historical contexts of past burial. Archaeological strategies for enumerating individual biographies through a study of their material remains and context of deposition remain highly contested arenas of theoretical debate (e.g. Binford 1971; Shanks & Tilley 1982; Shennan 1982; Bradley 1984; Whittle 1988; Barrett 1990; etc.). Beyond theoretical issues, the archaeological record itself (almost universally) represents a fragmentary dataset both in terms of the status of the material remains (or lack thereof) and representative population coverages.

In eastern Kent, mortuary deposition primarily takes the form of furnished inhumation burial. Of the 175 identified Early Anglo-Saxon burial sites within this region, only three have produced convincing evidence for cremation burial (i.e. HOL; WSB & CWN), with possibly three further cases suggested by circumstantial evidence (i.e. FLK-IB1; CAT-4; SDM). With the exception of CAT-4 (Canterbury, Old Westgate Farm), all of these sites represent pre-1925 finds, however, and such contextual and dating evidence that has been recorded is insufficient to derive any clear understanding of these particular burials. On the whole then, the dataset on which this study ultimately relies, represents a relatively homogenous burial rite across the whole study area. Further problems exist both at a theoretical and practical level. Before specific theoretical approaches are discussed in greater detail in the following chapter, it is the aim of this section to establish the nature of the mortuary dataset.

6.1.2 Spatial biases
Compounding the problematic theoretical underpinnings involved in an attempted study of past economic behaviour such as this, are issues of the dataset itself. Although the eastern Kent case-study area has witnessed numerous antiquarian and archaeological interventions over the past c.250 years (1.3) varying methods of recovery, details of recording and post-depositionary processes have distorted the nature of the sample. This data deficiency has
consequent repercussions both on the levels of inferences that can be able to be made and the validity of certain predictive models.

An examination of the distribution of sites with respect to pays clearly illustrates some of the spatial biases underlying the patterning of archaeological complexes (Fig. 6.1 & Table 6.1). Although combined, the North Downs and Foothills make up only 50.9% of the eastern Kent study area, nearly 90% of all identified burial sites/cemeteries are located within these environmental zones. From the perspective of excavated graves, this bias is as much as 97.5%. The aforementioned general lack of Wealden sites offers a partial explanation of this spatial tendency, comprising as it does the second largest single pays after the Downs, and a similar low percentage of sites can be identified from Marshland areas. Holmesdale and Chartland sites, which together comprise nearly 11% of eastern Kent, alternatively find approximate correlation with the expected number of total sites, making up 8% of the total.

Richardson (2000), looking at the sample of Anglo-Saxon sites from the whole of Kent, has compared these ratios with the context of archaeological discovery. Of all of the potential means, he argues that modern aggregate extraction has proved the single most important influencing factor, thereby biasing the sample against Wealden areas, where relatively little quarrying is likely to lead to many fewer numbers of discoveries. Similar spatial biases are not recognised with respect to other forms of development such as civilian/military construction, road/railway building work, pipe/cable/drain trenching, which are arguably not pays specific, however, and it is unlikely that the proportional distribution of sites does not provide at least some measure of historical deposition. The line of the Channel Tunnel rail link through Kent provides a useful demonstration revealing just two new cemeteries (at Saltwood and Cuxton), both within the Original Lands (i.e. either Foothill or Holmesdale pays), despite transecting Chart and Wealden landscapes for nearly 26kms (5.2.2).

Further support for the belief that the spatial patterning of archaeological complexes is indeed a reflection of past dynamics as much as a result of modern sampling biases is offered by a comparison of the distribution of burial sites with respect to pays by period (Table 6.2). In the model of settlement presented in Chapter 5, it was argued that more marginal regions were colonised from the 'Original Lands' of the Foothill and Holmesdale pays over the course of the Early- to Middle-Saxon periods. Although it is impossible in many cases to assign a close date to excavated burials, it is possible to statistically divide all
graves into broad temporal bands. Comparison of the distribution of graves dated to before and after AD 600, clearly show, not only a general population increase, but also the greater importance of Downland burial; itself arguably linked to widening patterns of settlement. Perhaps tellingly, these centripetal forces of settlement expansion are accompanied by a decreasing proportion of graves from early settlement areas (although even here there is an increase in total numbers) perhaps reflecting the secondary diffusion of Christian practices from these same core areas.

This pattern of secondary 'pagan' burial can be compared with the distribution of place-names of primary 'early' forms such as -hām, -ing-hām, and -ingas (Fig. 6.2). Dodgson's suggestion that these place-name elements represent post-immigration colonisation (see section 4.6) is supported by the distribution of such names in areas of early colonisation, such as the Downland and Chart pays. Emphasising this spread of settlement into more marginal areas, the distribution of secondary 'early' place-names, of -ingas, -ing, and -hāmm forms, by contrast, finds little correlation with the pattern of Early Anglo-Saxon burial (Fig. 6.3). Taken in combination with documentary evidence for settlement colonisation away from the Original Lands, as elaborated by Everitt (1986), it seems reasonably certain on the basis of this evidence, that the known Early Anglo-Saxon burial distribution can be regarded as a valid indicator of the extent of contemporary settlement. In favour of this interpretation, similar patterns of settlement expansion have been identified in other parts of England (e.g. Davies & Vierck 1974).

By way of comparison, certain caveats must also be stipulated regarding the spatial patterning of Middle Anglo-Saxon coins discussed in Chapter 8. Although the sample includes all coin finds listed in the Early Medieval Corpus of Coin Finds up to the 6/7/2001 (http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/Coins/ems.html), modern coin-finds listed in this corpus are heavily biased towards regions of intensive metal-detector activity and to those regions where effective links have been created between archaeologists, numismatists and detector users. Although Kent has profited from the Kent Archaeologists and Detectorists Liaison Group (KADLG) since the early 1990s and a Finds Liaison Officer since the 1996 Treasure Act, county coverage is still somewhat patchy. Some detector groups have established good relations with professional and amateur archaeological groups. Dover Museum and the Canterbury Archaeological Trust, Dover Group have maintained important relations with the White Cliffs Metal Detecting Club, whilst liaison between the Thanet and Wantsum Relic Hunters Association and the Trust for Thanet

1 See 6.4.2 below for an outline of the arithmetic method of date designation.
Archaeology and local groups with the Kent Archaeological Rescue Unit have equally profited recent field-survey and the precision of find-spot information. Despite such inroads, recorded find-spots were down over the year 2000 (Kent Archaeological Review 2001, 94) and although relatively frequent contact has been established with some groups, the same does not hold true of many individual prospectors. One example of the biased pattern of recording is provided by the dense cluster of coins found near Lympne, which underwent an intensive metal-detectoring survey under the auspices of the Romney Marsh Research Trust (Cross pers. comm. 11/2000). Although these biases would account for local irregularities, it is nevertheless argued here that the regional pattern reflects a valid sample. Whilst individual detectorists cannot always be traced, the Corpus includes most coins identified at auction, club meetings and rallies, and the sample is based on over a hundred years of numismatic studies. Thus, while the degree of coin density may in some cases be suspect, the distribution of coin finds across the county is probably trustworthy, bearing in mind that the record of many of the find-spots is only accurate to a field or plot of ground designation.

6.1.3 Levels of inference and tiers of analysis

Beyond issues influencing the spatial patterning of archaeological complexes, further substantive problems are evidenced within the excavated dataset itself. Variation in the level of recording, a backlog of unpublished excavations, lack of standardisation and related issues have meant that the often localised and particular datasets produced cannot easily be considered in anything other than the framework within which the data has been constructed. Accordingly, in general, inter-regional analyses can therefore only be carried out at the artefact level, thereby divorcing the data from the primary social context in which it was deposited. Whilst this data deficiency creates certain theoretical problems to be discussed in the following chapter, at a practical level, the sample of East Kentish artefacts must therefore be broken into groups determined by the level of recording, preservation and coherence. These groups alternatively, determine the types of questions that can fruitfully be asked of the data, classed here as three separate tiers of investigation.

First-tier analyses take the form of spatio-temporal models determined by the geographical location of sites, without the introduction of additional artefactual data. Analysis of this type, encountered in previous chapters, can therefore usefully incorporate all the Early- to Mid-Saxon find-spots within the study area. The 175 sites within the case-study area have produced a minimum number of 4,904 Anglo-Saxon individuals in addition to a minimum of 31 undatable burials from 19 further sites and 31 Mid- to Late-Saxon burials from four
urban sites in Dover and Canterbury (Table 6.3). Of these 4,904 burials, 3,244 are recorded in sufficient detail to be included in second-tier investigations. As the total individual grave composition of these burials has been recorded, these analyses can include artefact frequency and trend-surface investigation over East Kent and spatio-temporal statistical patterning. Finally, a subset of 1,202-recorded individuals lend themselves to the third tier of weight analysis as outlined below. These form a small group of burials, which are both complete and where all of the included artefacts have been available for investigation individually for both weight and derived raw material composition. This set forms the basis of the economic indices, which are then related back to the frequency distributions developed under second-tier analyses. Unfortunately, although many more artefacts were recorded as part of data collection, it was in many cases impossible to record all artefacts from a specific burial. For example, whilst over 500 objects from SAR were weighed and recorded, in the end, no meaningful subset of complete grave assemblages could be reconstructed for inclusion in third-tier analyses.

The nature of the depositionary contexts has serious implications on further models of exchange activity however. Given the ceremonial nature of mortuary deposition outlined below, the overt focus on artefacts derived from cemeteries can only reveal a model of community consumption in death. With this interpretation of social action, certain levels of exchange activity are assumed to be inadequately represented in the sample. Ideally comparisons should be drawn with artefact assemblages from settlement sites, where depositionary processes reflect accidental as well as deliberate discard. Although such a study would be useful in providing an additional check on the spatio-temporal distribution of raw materials and artefacts, nevertheless, there are a number of reasons why such data cannot be incorporated within a model of interpolated artefact or raw material use. The lack of comparable settlement evidence from much of Kent certainly complicates such an endeavour. Perhaps more important are issues of comparing domestic and ceremonial assemblages. Some use is made of artefacts from settlement sites to complement the model of regional and inter-regional exchange activity, but there can be no straight comparison in terms of quantity or weight of these artefacts. Methodologically, the closed context of a grave-good assemblage provides both a discrete comparable unit of analysis and the population control. In contrast for example, although the contents of a Grubenhauß pit often represent single-event deposits as rubbish dumped from middens on the abandonment of the settlement structures, no straight comparison can be drawn between these contents and those of mortuary contexts or other settlement features. Hypothetically, comparisons can be made between the contents of different Grubenhäuser on the assumption that these
structures were globally used for similar functions, and a model of the spatial distribution of objects derived from these analyses could then be compared with that derived from ceremonial contexts. Given the lack of any form of population control in the case of an interpolation from such domestic contexts, however, no medium of comparison can be applied to incorporate such extant domestic data within a pattern of objects derived from grave assemblages. The advanced null hypothesis states differential spatial processes underlining the distribution of artefacts from settlement complexes, from accidental loss to deliberate discard and ritual deposition. Aside from the problems involved in dating settlement contexts, post-depositionary processes play a more significant factor in the formation of settlement assemblages, and a qualitative assessment in terms of population control will always remain hypothetical.

Issues regarding the comparability of data are similarly significant with respect to the extent excavated from different cemeteries. It may be true that different communities adopted contrasting burial practices, and that statistical comparisons of the type adopted here run the risk of biasing interpretation in favour of larger cemetery samples. Equally, it could be argued that partially-excavated cemeteries cannot viably be compared with more completely-investigated sites, as this approach assumes a broadly consistent attitude toward burial practices across a relatively large geographical area. Whilst acknowledging that this form of standardised analysis runs the risk of glossing over some local patterns, it is nevertheless argued that enough archaeological evidence now exists to justify cross-cemetery comparisons within specific areas based on sometimes limited evidence. Nearly 5,000 Early Anglo-Saxon inhumations have now been identified in eastern Kent and all are recognised as having adopted a generalisable repertoire of burial practice traits, ranging from cemetery layout, grave structures, orientation to grave goods. Beyond this suggestion, the statistical implication of the distributional approach is that individuals form the basis of comparison only with respect to consumption at a communal level. Although this method certainly has a homogenising effect in terms of individual burial customs, it is the aggregate pattern, rather than localised decisions, that are the ultimate area of investigation in this thesis. Accordingly, whilst the following discussion is put forward with full acknowledgement of the limitations of the data sample, it is in the context of general socio-economic trends that conclusions have been drawn.
6.2 ASKED database: structure, coding, input and data detail

6.2.1 Typologies in previous scholarship and the Kentish phase chronology

Given the methodological constraints of the research agendas set by Sue Harrington and myself and the format of the ASKED database, a level of primary interpretation was required to simplify the dataset. All artefacts were divided into c.150 types defined on the basis of previous scholarship, excavation evidence and/or visual inspection (Appendix C). For the purposes of the latter, a reference handbook was developed to aid the on-site identification of over 6,000 objects, which allowed for existent artefact listings to be updated with new examples. These object types were then further discriminated within the database by artefact typology and provenance (Fig. 6.4).

Despite the theoretical critiques of past approaches to funerary behaviour, one of the primary products of Anglo-Saxon scholarship has been the establishment of fairly tight artefact typologies and relative chronologies. Developments in these traditional fields remains an important element of study within the discipline given interests in establishing archaeological material within the historicist framework of wider international developments and written sources (Jensen and Høilund Nielsen 1997; Hines, Høilund Nielsen and Siegmund 1999). Continental studies have been particularly successful in establishing the chronology of many individual artefact types, partly due both to the larger number of deposited coins (ibid.) and the availability of much greater numbers of individual grave assemblages within excavated cemeteries for seriation. In the sense that these can provide absolute dates for associated assemblages, and in view of the large number of coins and other Frankish material in Kent, this region is perhaps uniquely suited in England to the establishment of a fine regional chronology (Høilund Nielsen 1997; Brugmann 1999). Recent progress towards this goal has been made with Brugmann’s analysis of sixth-century female grave assemblages and the construction of a Kentish phase system related to the main continental chronologies (ibid.) as well as the re-analysis of Conversion Period artefacts by Geake (1994).

As one of the primary aims of this study is an attempt to elucidate economic trends in various communities over the course of the Early Anglo-Saxon period, some effort has been made to place the available contextual material within a relative timeframe. The structure of the database defines individual entries according to datable artefacts and the overall date assignment of the burial complex based on artefact combinations. Wherever possible the date assigned in the original excavation report has been followed. Nevertheless, the inclusion of data from unpublished reports has required additional dating...
of material. Relative dating of this sort is subject to the usual caveats of the manufacture and deposition date of individual artefacts within grave assemblages as outlined by Wilson (1959) and Steur (1977). In most cases it does not attempt to include additional relative dating evidence from horizontal stratigraphical means.

Past individual artefact studies remain the most important source of information for these entries. A number of difficulties are involved in this endeavour however. The chronology of Kentish material is closely tied to that of Continental phasing, with local absolute dates deriving from West European frameworks (Brugmann 1999, 51). So far, these links have only been achieved from female graves however, as “weapons are not so closely datable as jewellery” and continental object-types in male graves are “generally limited to buckles and vessels” (ibid., 40). Thus, although female jewellery can often be dated to within a half-century, the dating of most male weapon graves is much less well defined. This problem was particularly evident during the attempt at dating the two most common types of weapons encountered (i.e. shield and spears) on the basis of their established chronologies (Swanton 1973, 1974; Dickinson & Härke 1992). Wherever possible, spearheads were assigned to a type, following the series outlined by Swanton, whilst bearing in mind the critique of the typology by Härke (Swanton 1973; Härke 1992b, 85-7). Swanton’s spear classification was found to lack a certain transparency and provided little dating evidence for many types. The Dickinson & Härke shield study, alternatively, is strictly-speaking valid only “for the Upper Thames region for the earlier types and for the south-eastern areas of England for the latter types” (Hoilund Nielsen 1997, 74), although a recent study has successfully re-evaluated by seriation the Kentish shield corpus (Spain 2000). In addition to these methodological constraints, close dating such as is outlined by Brugmann, is of limited value for the dating of poorly-furnished burials where diagnostic artefacts and combinations of artefacts are lacking. Unfortunately, the adopted typology for knives (the most common type of grave-good encountered) was that developed by Evison for the Dover Buckland cemetery, derived in turn from Böhner’s continental series (Evison 1987, 113-5; Böhner 1958, 214-5; Härke 1992b 90-1), which offers little chronological guidance in this respect.

The occurrence seriation utilised for the dating of artefacts is outlined in Table 6.4 below. Comparative analysis with current chronological frameworks, such as those established by Evison (1987) and Brugmann (1999), formed the basis of general phases adopted whilst further usable dating criteria were provided particularly by Geake’s (1997) analysis of ubiquitous post-AD 600 material (such as double-tongued buckles, silver wire rings and
amethyst beads for example). In many cases a close date assignment was impossible due to the lack of any diagnostically-datable material, however, and then only a general AD 500-700 date has been ascribed.

6.2.2 Analysis by weight and count

Following the methodology outlined by Loveluck (1994) an attempt was made to quantify temporal changes in the raw material and artefact distribution throughout the East Kent study area. The “distributed raw materials only exist in artefact form - as finished objects or, very rarely, in intermediate forms of storage e.g. ingots of metal. Artefacts therefore provide the information on both distributions of raw materials and particular forms of artefact” (ibid., 50). In contrast to Loveluck’s methodology, in which counts of raw material components making up artefacts were made, two complementary methods were adopted in this study to attempt a quantification of raw material distributions. All Anglo-Saxon artefacts with unambiguous contexts in the East Kent area were individually entered within the designed database. This recorded their primary raw material composition, and their quantity, in the case of multiple items such as beads or keys. A natural by-product of this form of data management was a spatial distribution of all artefacts by type over East Kent, allowing for the creation of trend-surfaces of artefact density and displacement.

In addition, it was deemed prudent to attempt a quantification of raw material distribution by weight. This involved the individual weighing of 5,096 artefacts from a variety of contexts throughout the study area. To fulfil the aims of spatial analysis some attempt was made to select as many artefacts from as many contexts with the widest spatial distribution as possible, thereby circumventing problems of bias and/or under-representation. In practice, the statistical analysis of raw material density requires the weight of all objects within a context for inter-site comparison, and this severely limited the available sample size primarily to modern excavations. Further factors influencing the selection of artefacts for analysis were travel costs, the granting of access both to museum collections and excavation unit stores, the completeness of the artefacts and varying states of conservation and preservation. As one aim of the survey was an inter-cemetery comparison by phase of raw material consumption, it was crucial furthermore to include all artefacts from all individuals within a phase to ascertain the relative proportion of community consumption. In order to compensate for social hierarchies within a community, relative community wealth is determined as the product of total weight of raw materials per phase divided by population.
Given the small numbers produced by this calculation, the absence of even one wealthy grave within a phase could seriously distort the shape of the sample. For example, if the rich early-sixth century female grave 20 was missing from the Dover Buckland sample, which contains nine other graves within the AD 475-525 phase, although there would be minimal difference in the derived local iron consumption per person, the phase would record no consumption of local gold or silver, no Kentish/Frankish silver, and a severely distorted picture of copper-alloy use, due to the omission of the copper-alloy bowl and so on. By the same token, graves with objects of extraordinary raw material weight, such as copper-alloy bowls, can be seen to distort the general wealth of a community during a particular phase. In the case of the DBU grave 137 bowl, the inclusion of the vessel (weighing a staggering 2,001g) within the computations meant that the community of 22 people comprising this AD 650-675 phase would average 93.12g of copper-alloy each, almost ten times more than any other contemporary community in East Kent. Without that single vessel, the Dover group takes on a wealth profile in line with that of other communities with a paltry 2.2g of copper-alloy per person. Such analysis raises a number of social issues to be discussed further below (Chapter 7). In a very small number of cases, it was considered desirable to ascribe a weight to missing artefacts on the basis of comparable material, size, illustrations, average object weight (see below) and so on in order to complete contexts.

The comparison of the raw material compositions of artefacts within the cemeteries of Kent presents a number of methodological problems. These include the differential degradation of the iron objects in particular. Antiquarian methods of conservation, including the 'waxing' of ironwork, are clear causal factors for the difference in weight of shield bosses from Faversham King's Field, for example, and the weight of a similar type from modern excavations such as Ozengell. Moreover, the condition of much of the older material was found to have been in a generally better condition than that from more recent excavations despite more antiquarian methods of conservation. Most of the Kentish cemeteries are found on similar areas of chalk upland and are assumed to have been subjected to roughly similar forms of site-formation processes. Most of the modern excavated cemeteries have provided evidence for a generalisable pattern of deposition. Graves were cut into the chalk subsoils, and backfilled with a mixture of calcereous earth, flint and crushed chalk (Riddler pers. comm. 2000), providing roughly similar forms of alkaline environment. This pattern of deposition does give rise to some variation in the amount of aeration within individual graves, however, and ensures that the interred objects are subject to quite alkaline conditions due to the natural leaching effect of surface water.
When antiquarian archaeologists discuss evidence of the grave-structures, it appears that fairly universal forms of site-formation processes are encountered across most of eastern Kent. Visual inspection of many of artefacts gained from pre-War contexts appears to suggest that, in particular, iron objects have undergone more serious degradation during the post-war period. This is possibly an effect of the increased use and draining down of pesticides and fertilisers into the buried mortuary structures. A comparison by weight of objects across Kent, therefore, suffers somewhat from problems of comparability.

In the general lack of any ecofacts from Kent, this methodological problem is restricted to the buried iron objects, rather than those composed of, for example, copper-alloy, glass, amber or ceramic materials, which are not subject to the same degree of corrosive factors, and have been assumed to be roughly comparable in terms of weight across the area under investigation. Certainly, although copper-alloy objects do undergo some chemical corrosion, usually in the form of powdery green chloride products and patchy crystalline red oxide, these are not seen as substantial enough to alter the either the weight of the artefacts, nor to justify treating copper-alloy objects differently in different areas.

Iron corrosion on the other hand is prevalent on all recovered iron and steel artefacts, and objects are recognised to have undergone substantial deformation and degradation due to the oxidation of the constituent iron oxides. These artefacts therefore often appear blistered and cracked and are particularly fragile. Despite the prevalence of corrosive factors, however, it is argued that comparisons by weight still represent a sound methodological practice, as some evidence exists that this pattern of degradation is roughly similar throughout the majority of Kentish contexts. Although it could be argued that differential artefact decay reflecting the soil chemistry could bias inter-cemetery analysis of this kind, in practice little differentiation in the preservation of the material was noted either visually or by weight. Artefacts showing some form of standardisation, such as spearhead, shield-boss or sword types for example, can be seen to correspond closely in both dimensions and weight irrespective of point of origin or depositionary conditions. Thus, for example, the very similar sized and shaped Type 3 shield-bosses from Broadstairs Bradstow School 66, Dover Buckland 96/a and Mill Hill Deal 17 can all be seen to weigh within 4g of each other at around 350g despite being geographically separated by over 26kms. Similarly, other iron objects such as the Evison Type 1 knives of MHD 66, BBS 51, BSP 319/158/165, OZE 118 and DBU 1/6 all weigh 16g despite the variable geographical and geological situation. Further examples could be cited for other object types, and it is generally assumed on this basis, that a comparison of the material from the more recent
excavations at least offers a sound sample for comparison. A partial explanation of this phenomenon could be suggested by the geographical siting of many of the Kentish burials on visible spurs, usually made up of Upper Chalk soils. Therefore, despite originating from a sizeable geographical setting, the examined artefacts had all undergone similar post-depositionary processes as a consequence of the common geological distribution. In comparison, a number of objects weighed as a control sample from the anerobic marsh conditions found at Faversham (FAV) revealed visibly different preservation and weight ranges. Thus, although a discrepancy in artefact preservation and associated weight can be seen in a few cases, the provenance of the utilised sample, the geological setting and consequent modes of conservation are not deemed to have altered the weight of the artefacts significantly from one site to the next.

Further considerations were made to incorporate composite constructions and partial artefacts within the sample. As it was not possible or desirable to destroy artefacts to weigh component raw materials individually, the few composite artefacts were weighed in entirety with percentage allocations of weight accordingly distributed amongst the constituent raw materials. Similarly, partial artefacts were gauged against known complete examples and multiplied proportionately. On this basis, although the corrosion of iron objects in particular has meant that they are usually incomplete artefacts, mention was made in the ‘Comments’ field of the database of the approximated percentage of the total object represented. This approximation, allowed for the later conversion of measured weights to assumed total weights for incomplete artefacts. Though neither technique is in any way an exact representation, the derived weights were all ascertained using standardised visual and comparative criteria. As the ultimate function of the weighed raw materials is a relative comparison between sites rather than an absolute derivation of raw material consumption, this methodology could be deemed satisfactory if universally applied. Thus, a form of subjective coherence encompasses the whole dataset, which naturally records both true weight and subsequent amendment.

6.2.3 Average artefact weights

The investigation of artefacts by weight adds an additional dimension to the discussion of Early Anglo-Saxon typologies. Although cluster analysis has effectively demonstrated the grouping of artefacts by measured dimensions, the addition of weight information allows for further inferences regarding the level of standardisation of artefacts. Additionally, the analysis of individual artefacts by weight has allowed for qualitative assessments to be made regarding the allocation of weights to missing data and grave-assemblages.
The analysis of artefacts shows that, although some standardisation by weight is recognised within typological groupings, the range in terms of standard deviation is quite high. Thus for example, although 62% of all Type 6 shield-bosses cluster within 15% (or 37g) of the mean weight for this type (249g), the actual range in differential weight can vary by almost 63% of the mean (i.e. 157g) (Fig. 6.5). Similarly, although almost 60% of all swords weighed within 15% of the mean recorded sword weight (913g), swords could still be seen to vary from as little as SAR 156 at 590g to as much as BSP 288/a at 1,172g (Fig. 6.6). In addition, little increased standardisation is noted over time with large variances in weapon weights present throughout the sixth and seventh centuries. Given these analyses, it must be stressed that although the increase in weapon size noted via typological means such as Swanton’s spear series can be paralleled in increased average weight, little intra-type variation can be noted. Thus for example, although the average weight of spears can be seen to increase from sixth century D3s at 144.4g to sixth/seventh century C3s at 217g, weight cannot be used as a further criterion of sub-division within these type groupings (Fig. 6.7). C2 spearheads were in use throughout the pagan Anglo-Saxon period, yet no chronological weight increases are noted within the spear-type. Similarly, early spearheads such as fifth/sixth century H3s at an average of 326.25g contrast significantly with the aforementioned types D3 and C3 as well as seventh-century types such as the C4 at 188.2g.

6.2.4 Provenance
As is discussed below (7.2), artefacts can be seen to represent a variety of meanings, frequently combining utilitarian, ornamental and private associations, whilst also tied to notions of identity and social ideology, both at the level of the individual and the community. The use of new goods in this line of argument, must therefore be equated with new forms of social practice, and the individual interpretation thereof. Given these observations, some attention must be given both to the provenance of artefacts and their consumption over time. The cosmopolitan nature of much of the Kentish material remains the basis both of regional relative dating chronologies and inferences of socio-economic development. Leeds’s definition of a ‘Frankish Phase’ (early to late sixth century) lying between a migration ‘Jutish Phase’ (c. AD 450-500) and an established ‘Kentish Phase’ (late sixth century onwards) (Leeds 1913, 1936) has persistently encapsulated a model as much reliant on socio-political interpretation as artefactual evidence. Perhaps reflecting these views, Kentish graves containing Frankish artefacts, for example, have often been interpreted as the burials of immigrant Franks (e.g. Evison 1965; 1981; Chadwick-Hawkes 1976; 1982; 1986) despite many of the critiques of traditional ethnic groupings outlined.
below (7.2.2). In contrast, a recent reappraisal of female assemblages in Kent has suggested that the use of Continental objects tended to be unorthodox (Brugmann 1999, 38). Although a strong Continental influence is felt in the sixth century, Kentish dress was constructed out of a partial selection of current continental fashion, mediated within general Anglo-Saxon tastes (ibid). Certainly, migration or exogamy could be one of the causal factors of artefact displacement, as is argued also in the analysis of comparable Anglo-Saxon material in France, but the selectivity of assemblages, particularly in women, makes such an interpretation somewhat contentious (Welch 1991).

While it is not the place here to discuss the way in which certain social discourses were mediated through material culture, these observations do have some relevance to the study of exchange. Differential consumption processes may be as much a result of issues of ethnicity and social expression as economic concepts of accessibility, as is ably demonstrated in modern contexts by migrant ‘consumption folkways’ in North America (Fischer 1989). These ‘folkways’ comprise the normative structure of values, customs and meanings that exist in any given culture (ibid., 7). In Fischer’s study, ‘folkways’ were shown to be a process of cultural persistence, acting either as an actual cultural artefact transmitted from generation to generation, or normative habits accepted as tradition by society. As the socialisation of individuals comes from a number of mutually-sustaining institutions, such as school, church or family, cultural change only comes about through a fundamental alteration of a number of conditions. With this caveat in mind, Fischer nevertheless went on to show the importance of élite conduct in determining cultural change: “they do so by controlling institutions and processes, so that they become the ‘governors’ of a culture in both a political and mechanical sense” (1989, 896). It is on this basis that a specific focus on the movement and displacement of artefacts and their raw material constituents is argued to be central to further explorations of consumption discourses. By correlating distribution patterns with a model of hierarchical value it may be possible to suggest important centres of consumption and/or diffusion. Different modes of exchange and material appropriation form the first step in modelling patterns of artefact use and the social meaning and significance of goods. Several base-line assertions underline this study:

a) Increased access to raw materials/artefacts causes the decreased value thereof, given the existence of local skilled labour.

b) Point (a) can lead to growing per capita consumption of commodities.
c) Geographical variation of consumption may reflect the supply networks making finished goods available, particularly when the focus of study is on 'neutral' goods i.e. ones divorced from wealth/status hierarchies.

With these aims in mind, the ASKED database was structured to include the provenance of all individual artefacts recorded, based on existent artefactual studies, in order to attempt to chart the geographical variation and the movement of goods. Unfortunately, the lack of much scientific sourcing of artefacts means that most decisions are made on the basis of stylistic interpretation, though in the case of some raw materials, provenance is more easily inferred by analogy with modern geological sources. The assignment of inflexible, searchable texts for use in the “object provenance” field of the ASKED database implies a certain number of methodological problems (from the ASKED User-Manual, Brookes & Harrington 2000):

- Stylistic changes in artefact design over time, such as local imitations of developing Continental types.
- Uneven typological knowledge about various artefact types due to past academic foci underlying assertions of provenance (e.g. brooch vs. knife typologies).
- Curated objects remaining in circulation well beyond the period of manufacture may negate qualitative assessments of provenance (e.g. Roman coins from Trier reused as balance weights in the sixth century).
- The necessary global designation of provenance within the database forces certain shorthand assignations that may mask more complex economic patterns. Thus it is asserted that virtually all ironwork is produced locally for example, including knives and buckles, unless there is clear stylistic evidence to regard them as imports; a statement that carries implicit assumptions regarding the continuity of Post-Roman iron production and control.
- The inclusion of residual culturally-active material within the burial rite e.g. Roman and Prehistoric pottery sherds, animal bone, worked flint etc., though potentially deliberate inclusions, have been ascribed as ‘object-type: Grave Equipment, provenance: local’ so as not to bias further analyses.

On this basis, the terms used to ascribe provenance within the database can be summarised as follows:
Term | Definition | Example
--- | --- | ---
**Local** | Artefact or material probably produced locally or arriving via local trade. Includes domestic artefacts and tools | Knife; Hand-made pottery; Bone tools

**Anglo-Saxon** | General term covering non-specific/non-typed cultural material, with wide geographical variation. Material requiring more detailed typological analysis | Strap-ends; Spears; Shield-bosses

**Anglian**
**Kentish**
**Saxon**
**Upper Thames Valley** | Discrete regions that are the main area of distribution for that artefact type – insular development of styles | Anglian girdle-hangers; Kentish small square-headed brooches; Saxon saucer brooches

**Roman; Romano-British** | Artefacts from the fifth century that were culturally active at the time of deposition, relating to indigenous culture | Quoit Brooch Style; Penannular brooches

**Curated/Roman (Jutlandic; Southern Scandinavia; other known sources)** | Material that was not produced in the period of deposition, but had been curated from a different cultural or temporal source, therefore acting only as a terminus post quem for the dating of the grave | Brooch fragments; Roman spindle-whorls

**Kentish/ Frankish; Kentish/ Jutlandic** | Artefacts found in both areas, probably coming from the second-named into Kent. Suggests that the object may also have been made in Kent, as stylistic development of Continental prototypes | Shield-on-tongue buckles; Bracteates; Frankish deniers

**Imported** | Probably not made in Anglo-Saxon areas of Lowland Britain | Polychrome Beads; Crystal Balls

**Imported: source** | E.g. Imported: Baltic, where source is the best guess for provenance | Amber beads; Cowrie shells

**Imported/ specific source** | Known to come from specific areas and imported into Lowland Britain via trade, exchange, or migration. Specific sources may be further indicated, e.g. Imported/Frankish/Meuse Valley | Radiate-headed brooches; Coptic bowls; Bracteates

**Table 6.5** Thesaurus for Kentish grave-good provenances used in the ASKED database (from the ASKED User-Manual, Brookes & Harrington 2000)

Certain artefact analyses have ascribed provenance on the basis of the past raw material sources (i.e. usually ‘Imported: source’ entries). As such it is likely that the amber beads found in Anglo-Saxon contexts originate from the Baltic, despite some localised deposits in north-eastern Britain (Huggett 1988, 64-6). Similarly, rock crystals and amethyst beads are most likely to have been imported via the Rhineland, given major outcrops in Germany, Switzerland and Scotland of the former and visible links between the Rhine valley, the Eastern Mediterranean and India, the probable ultimate origin of the latter (*ibid.*; Meaney 1981, 76; Welch 1999). In most cases, the provenance designation suggested by Huggett...
(1988) has been adopted for these raw material sources. Unfortunately, in a number of cases, certain decisions were made in the field to accomplish data-collection within the permitted time limit. Thus, for example, it was not deemed necessary at an early stage of data-collection to record either the diagnostic shape or decorative motifs of beads, which were only subdivided in terms of melon, monochrome or polychrome, or on the basis of their raw material composition. As a consequence, all monochrome and polychrome beads have subsequently been designated as 'Imported' artefacts despite some Anglian polychrome bead production during Phase I, limited local production in Phase III (Brugmann pers. comm. 2001) and the potentially indigenous production of monochrome blue cylinders (Guido 1999, 50). Similarly, without detailed description of all individual examples, in the main wheel-thrown pottery has been provenanced to Frankia, despite the suggestion that there may have been some limited local production in certain vessel types (Evison 1979, 48-49).

Decisions on artefact provenance from the basis of typological studies alternatively, have been equally uniform. Diamond-shaped roves and clench-nails with round, low-domed heads and rounded shafts for example, have been ascribed to local manufacture due to their iron composition and inland distribution, despite the Scandinavian origin usually suggested for these objects (Brookes forthcoming; Bill 1994, 58). Similarly, almost all iron objects have been ascribed to a local provenance, despite the possibility that they may originate from any number of locations within Anglo-Saxon England. The reasons for these decisions are illustrated by the constellation of knowledge model outlined in 2.2.1.2.

Given the general lack of consensus (particularly regarding 'mundane' artefacts such as clench-nails) on how to provenance most artefacts not characterised by diagnostic 'implementation', ‘techniques’ or ‘desired end-points’ the source of artefact manufacture can only be argued as a best guess from the basis of raw material provenance. The case for assumptions adopted in this thesis is outlined in 6.3 below.

Such an endeavour is not without problems however. The scientific provennancing of Anglo-Saxon artefacts has not been particularly successful on a number of specific artefact types due to the abundant reuse of, in particular, metalwork throughout the period. Some ways around these problems is offered by Birgit Arrhenius’ (1985) important contribution to the study of artefact provenance. Her scientific analysis of paste techniques in Merovingian garnet jewellery led her to postulate central workshops in Constantinople and Trier as supplying cut and polished garnets and mounted cloisonné jewellery both to local satellite workshops and directly to consumers. Thus the paste in the Bifrons 42 Frankish
disc brooch is suggestive of cloisonné manufacture in a proposed satellite workshop in the Mainz region (ibid., 131) whilst the sand putty paste work with pure calcite paste (such as is found in the disc brooch from Dover Priory Hill - Avent 1975, no.174, the Sutton Hoo shield or the Taplow buckle) and fused paste work with calcite/wax paste (e.g. Kingston 18 keystone garnet disc brooch – Avent 1975, no.120) could represent satellite workshops operating in Anglo-Saxon England or elsewhere on the North Sea coastal lands (Arrhenius 1985, 181). Unfortunately, the limited number of Anglo-Saxon objects analysed in her study make a wider assessment of backing-paste traditions difficult, though it seems not unlikely that correlations between paste work and typological traditions will be forthcoming given the apparently similar pastes found in Kentish composite brooches for example (Avent 1975, 18).

6.3 Raw material sources in Anglo-Saxon England

Despite the relatively detailed treatment of exotic raw material provenances addressed by the works of Huggett (1988) and Arnold (1997) amongst others, important issues of provenance remain in the discussion of the major metal groups. Although the increasing use of scientific analyses has aided this endeavour in recent years, certain broader repercussions of the investigations require more detailed treatment before wider economic themes can be addressed.

6.3.1 Gold

Although some mineral gold sources exist in western Britain, the appearance of this metal in Early Anglo-Saxon England prior to the mid-sixth century has generally been linked to imported Late Roman and Byzantine gold solidi (Chadwick-Hawkes et al. 1966; Chadwick-Hawkes & Pollard 1981, 341) and contemporary Merovingian coinages. A number of studies utilising X-ray fluorescent analysis of gold objects from Kent have matched comparative gold purity within these artefacts and foreign predecessors. Thus Chadwick-Hawkes and Pollard's analysis of the metal content in bracteates from Finglesham and other sites in East Kent, suggested that these had probably been alloyed by Scandinavian craftspersons with silver and copper, due to their lower gold content than contemporary solidi (ibid). The visible debasement of gold coinages minted and imported from Frankia during the seventh century has been utilised as an additional relative chronology tool from which to match and date Anglo-Saxon artefacts on the basis of comparable gold fineness (Avent 1975, 8; Kent 1972; Brown & Schweizer 1973, 184-5). Utilising a similar line of argumentation, it has been suggested that the later sixth century witnessed an increase in the amount of gold used in ornamental metalwork, such as Type 2 cruciform brooches,
possibly as a reflection of greater metal availability during this period (Mortimer 1990, 297; Arnold 1980, 91). In fact, a comparison of the average weight of gold interred per individual from a selection of cemeteries in East Kent reveals the fairly static deposition of gold until debasement occurred in the seventh century (Fig. 6.8). Whilst this evidence cannot therefore be taken as support for increased Continental contact in the later sixth century, it does suggest that wider Anglo-Saxon consumption of gold ran parallel with seventh-century Continental inflation. Issues of gold provenance underline these assumptions, however, and the change in the distribution of coins to include most of Anglo-Saxon England after AD 625 is paralleled by a change in the source of coin from Continental mints in southern Frankia and the Mediterranean coast to mints in the Meuse and Moselle regions (Blackburn & Grierson 1986, 108-9). Similarly, the debasement that occurs in Merovingian gold coinage over the course of the seventh century is reflected in the emergent Anglo-Saxon coins and later degenerate ‘pale gold’ issues such as the ‘Pada’ coinage discussed in Chapter 8. What seems clear from this evidence is that Anglo-Saxon gold and silver exchange rates were directly tied to an international balance of trade, and consumption was therefore as much a reflection of Continental political and economic reorganisation as indigenous changes in fashion.

6.3.2 Iron

The origins of iron by contrast, pose an important problem for the analysis of exchange mechanisms in Early Anglo-Saxon Kent. Although there is so far no direct evidence for iron working in the Weald at this early date, some of the underlying assumptions about the wealth of the kingdom assume a level of local industry. Two sources of evidence do however exist to suggest the possibility of early iron working in the Weald. The first is a royal charter detailing a grant of land near Lyminge in which iron had been mined to St Peter’s Minster, Canterbury in AD 689 (S12). Although this area of Greensand drift does contain some isolated ore pockets, the grant may relate in fact to appurtenant Wealden lands of the Lyminge estate where ironstone is more plentiful (Cleere & Crossley 1985, 87; Birch 1885: I, 107). Secondly, modern rescue excavations in Millbrook, Sussex, have revealed evidence of Anglo-Saxon iron making in the Weald dated to the mid-ninth century (Tebbitt 1982). That the excavated furnace there has been recognised to correlate closely with the ‘non-slag-tapping furnace’ tradition of the Germanic homelands, rather than the more efficient tapping traditions of Roman Britain and later Anglo-Saxon England (as has been found at, for example, Ramsbury) offers some tentative support for an imported early tradition of metal-working in the Weald which may date back to the earliest phases of colonisation (ibid.; Cleere & Crossley 1985, 85). Additional intrusive technologies are
suggested also by the introduction of slag block smelting at sites such as Romsey, Hants (McDonnell 1988), Mucking, Essex (McDonnell 1993) and Little Totham, Essex (Cranstone 1988) and the recognition of higher levels of smithing skill in the form of iron artefacts than is found either in the Roman or Medieval periods (McDonnell 1989). Certainly a number of identified bloomeries exist that cannot be attributed to the Roman or later Medieval iron industry and it may well be that these represent the missing evidence for Early to Middle Saxon iron-making (ibid.).

Alternatively, the lack of archaeological evidence could reflect a real Early Anglo-Saxon hiatus in Wealden iron exploitation. In this view, it is possible that iron tools and weapons were imported into the kingdom from either the Midlands production sites (Schubert 1957; Cleere & Crossley 1985, 85) or Frankia. Charlemagne’s AD 779 capitulary banning the export of swords may well be evidence of such trade in iron weapons (Loyn & Percival 1975), but finds of iron slags in some Kentish graves (e.g. Ozengell 222) and in larger amounts in contemporary settlements such as Mucking or Romsey (McDonnell 1993) suggests that at least some small-scale local smithing and smelting was common-place (cf. Gilmour 1990).

6.3.3 Copper-alloy, silver and related metals (lead, zinc and tin)
Copper ore and silver bodies are known in Wales, Cornwall, Yorkshire, Scotland and Ireland, with larger sources available on the Continent, especially in the Harz Mountains of Northern Germany. The distribution of lead and zinc ore is quite similar, with pockets in Britain also known in the Mendips and the Peak district, whilst tin historically is generally sourced to Devon and Cornwall (Mortimer 1990, 344). Metallurgical analyses of copper-alloy artefacts suggest a continuity in alloy composition from Late Roman to Early Medieval periods, with a more general change from bronzes to higher-zinc brasses in the Middle to Late Anglo-Saxon period (ibid., 341). Copper-alloy objects manufactured during the period are generally of fairly robust design, requiring little by way of hot-working techniques after casting. Consequently, the Anglo-Saxon metalworker did not generally require specific alloy properties and could easily use metals ranging from modern bronzes to brass, gunmetal and copper to create their brooch and buckle objects. Scientific analysis of copper-alloys found in a number of artefacts in Southern England suggest that there is both a large degree of homogeneity in trace element content and general alloy composition, with a general chronological trend away from purer alloys with trace elements over the period (ibid., 377). Given this latter observation and the recognition that the pattern of trace elements is neither regional nor artefact-type specific, a number of authors have gone on to
assert that Early Anglo-Saxon metalworkers appear to have relied on scrap metal found in older Anglo-Saxon, Continental Germanic or curated Roman artefacts (Brownsword & Hines 1993, 2). The highly random composition of constituent metals in, for example, great square-headed (ibid), cruciform and saucer brooches (Mortimer 1990) suggests that “brooch casters exercised little or no control over the precise composition of their alloys, as they might have done with regards, for instance, to whether the brooch cast was to be gilded” (Hines 1997, 213). Indeed, some tangential evidence for the recycling of scrap can be suggested from the extraordinary amount of Roman coins excavated from the settlement of West Stow where 289 Roman coins were found, often in SFBs. Within these general observations, Kent does stand in isolation from the rest of England in the unusual appearance of zinc-rich copper-alloys, not found consistently outside the kingdom. Mortimer tentatively links these types of alloys with those found in Frisia, on the basis of a small corpus of scientifically-analysed objects, suggesting that in addition to local metal recycling, Kent may also have had some limited imported copper-alloy from the Low Countries (ibid., 393).

The suggestion, raised by Mortimer (1990), that increasing impurities within copper-alloys over the period may represent scientific evidence for the process of metal recycling, can be bolstered by a further line of argument. An examination of the average weight of buckles over the Early Anglo-Saxon period reveals a number of important trends, most usefully highlighted by the Dover Buckland dataset (Fig. 6.9). The 33 buckles excavated from this cemetery (Table 6.6) reveal a chronological pattern in which the average weight of iron buckles steadily increases from the fifth to the eighth centuries. In contrast, buckles made predominantly of copper-alloy decrease rapidly in average weight from c.AD 600. Stylistically, this change in personal accessories has been well documented. Shephard (1979a, 4.39-4.40) in particular has noted the change from large, heavy belt-sets of the sixth century to double-buckled belt and plate sets of the seventh and smaller fastenings of all types (though see also Geake 1997, 76-79 and Evison 1956, 92-93). In addition to this phenomenon, the seventh century sees an increasing trend to openwork buckles, which, although of similar size to buckles of the previous century, are comparatively lighter and less metal rich. Hypothetically, this could imply that fashion was at least partly determined by the increasing scarcity of available raw materials.

An increase in the sample to include the 104 buckles both weighed and assignable to a relatively close date phase in East Kent (Fig. 6.10; Table 6.7) shows a similar, though less clear, pattern. As with the Dover sample, the average weight of these copper-alloy buckles
shows a general decrease in weight, again assignable to the mid seventh-century, with buckle weights from the late seventh century remaining relatively static. In contrast to the evidence from Dover however, the average weight of iron buckles remains relatively unchanged over the period. This curve fits the model of easy and continuous accessibility to the raw material. The flattening out and slow increase in the consumption of copper-alloy through the seventh and early eighth century may similarly indicate the opening up of new raw material sources following the late sixth-century decline, perhaps indicating an increase in imported copper-alloy objects throughout this period.

The surface treatment of copper-alloy and silver artefacts comprised a number of different production techniques. Mercury gilding is likely to have been a popular technique, though difficult to trace metallurgically. Support for its use, probably in the form of a gold-mercury amalgam, and exchange, is offered by the discovery of a glass phial containing the metal in the metalsmith grave at Hérouvillette (DeCaens 1971, 12-17) and small amount from the industrial areas of Middle-Saxon York (Bayley 1992, 789) and Hamwih (Andrews 1997, 220). Mercury can probably be sourced to Spain (Mortimer 2990, 296) even though the extractive industry there may have been in decline at this time. Mortimer also draws attention to the fact that most surface treatment of cruciform brooches, and most white metal surface treatment is produced by riveting or other mechanical means (ibid., 299). This may be evidence of the lack of certain key alloys for chemical treatments, such as mercury, rather than the interpretation that Anglo-Saxon jewellers were incapable of manufacturing using these methods. Tinning similarly appears to have been quite a rare form of surface treatment except on certain disc brooches and in general it seems that silver was more readily available as a decorative material that many other types of metal. Although, this extensive recycling of metalwork provides one of the probable origins of silver, it is assumed that imported Germanic coin from the late seventh century increasingly replaced previous sources of metal (Arnold 1997, 136).

Beyond these major metal groups, numerous further types of raw material are known from Early Anglo-Saxon burials. As many of the origins of these materials has been discussed elsewhere, a summary of assigned raw material provenances and bibliographic sources is offered in Table 6.6:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw material</th>
<th>Probable source</th>
<th>Bibliography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron/Iron slag</td>
<td>Local-Weald; Frankia</td>
<td>Cleere &amp; Crossley 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper-alloy</td>
<td>Curated Roman</td>
<td>Brownsword &amp; Hines 1993; Arnold 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold (coin and jewellery)</td>
<td>Frankia; Eastern Mediterranean</td>
<td>Chadwick-Hawkes &amp; Pollard 1981; Arnold 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver</td>
<td>Curated Roman; Frankia</td>
<td>Arnold 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Baltic shores</td>
<td>Huggett 1988, 64-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amethyst</td>
<td>India via Eastern Mediterranean</td>
<td>Huggett 1988, 66-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory (walrus)</td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>Huggett 1988, 68-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Crystal</td>
<td>Germany; Switzerland</td>
<td>Huggett 1988, 70-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowrie shell</td>
<td>Red Sea *(cyprea panthenina); India; Europe <em>(cyprea europa)</em> in sixth century</td>
<td>Huggett 1988, 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass</td>
<td>Various: Curated Roman; Frankia; Mediterranean; Middle East</td>
<td>Huggett 1988, 72-4; Guido 1999; Evison 1987, 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic</td>
<td>(wheel-thrown) Frankia; (hand-made) Local</td>
<td>Huggett 1988, 74-6; Evison 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Curated Roman</td>
<td>Evison 1987, 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandstone/Shale/Iron</td>
<td>Local; Curated Roman</td>
<td>Huggett 1988, Evison 1987, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrite/Jet/Limestone</td>
<td>Indian sub-Continent</td>
<td>Quast &amp; Schüssler 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garnet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Bone/</td>
<td>Local; North Sea region</td>
<td>MacGregor 1985, 30-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antler/Horn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggshell/Leather</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapis Lazuli</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Mooey 1994, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agate</td>
<td>Russia; Scandinavia</td>
<td>von Carnap-Bornheim &amp; Weisgerber 2000, 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercury, for gilding</td>
<td>Italy; Yugoslavia; Spain</td>
<td>Arnold 1997, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>porphyry</td>
<td>Red Sea; Egypt</td>
<td>Meaney 1981, 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arsenic (only recorded as trace element in iron)</td>
<td>Local-Weald</td>
<td>Tylecote 1962, 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jasper/apatite</td>
<td>Local; Curated Roman</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.6** Probable provenance of raw materials identified amongst the Kentish artefacts.

6.4 Analysis of data

6.4.1 Percentage of raw materials per population

Rather than the investigation of the inclusion of artefact types within graves, the derivation of raw material inclusions within graves can potentially suggest the availability or use of raw materials by the interred population. By utilising the criteria of raw material rather than artefact type, inferences on the status of the interred individual is mostly negated. For example, a grave containing a single iron knife is subsumed within the same group as a grave with a sword or shield-boss. Additionally, by utilising the phased community group
as the referential unit of analysis, broader issues of social ranking, or indeed gender, can be
negated on the assumption that all elements will be similarly included within a random
_generational grouping. The characterisation of a community in terms of the proportion,
weight or count of raw materials, therefore, enables useful inter-site comparisons. Before
these concepts are discussed further in the following chapter, this section clarifies a number
of the methodological steps involved in an analysis of the data.

6.4.2 Deriving populations

The derivation of population figures for the respective cemetery phases is based on a
method of equal division. Graves and their constituent grave-goods are allocated equally to
all phases covered by their date range. Thus, a grave and its grave-goods dated to 500-520
is placed in the 500-550 date phase, whilst one dated to 500-650, is divided equally between
the three phases 500-550, 550-600 and 600-650. Undatable Anglo-Saxon graves with no
grave goods were distributed equally following the same methodology. On this basis, it is
possible that certain date phases can be allocated partial burials, and as such any phase
accorded less than one individual has been omitted from subsequent computations.
Certainly, from a statistical point of view, it would have been prudent to avoid any
computations based on populations of less than one, but such omissions would have
reduced the sample size almost irrecoverably. Further calculations such as the number of
artefacts (be they imports, Kentish or of general Anglo-Saxon manufacture) per
population, or the percentage of the total number of artefacts per population are based on
these derived population and artefact figures. The proportion of graves containing various
raw materials has been derived in a similar fashion. Percentages of raw material inclusions
were calculated for all grave dates and then averaged over the date phases these graves
cover. For example, 2 graves dated to 500-600 with 60% iron and 2 graves dated to 500-
550 with 40% iron were divided into two groups, one from 500-550 of three individuals
with 46.67% iron, and one from 550-600 of one individual with 60% iron. Again, produced
populations per phase of one or less, were discarded for the sake of computational
coherence. The relative weight of raw materials per population was determined using the
method of proportional division outlined above. The total weight of raw materials and the
number of individuals for a phase were divided amongst a new phase division of 25 year
intervals. The individual weight per person figure was then determined from the calculated
weights per phase. On this basis therefore, the total weight of iron per phase at EUP could
be broken down as such:
The amount of iron per person of date phase 650-675 is determined by a subdivision of the original date phases 600-700, 625-700 and 650-750. Through this computation, the weight per population figures for phases 700-725 and 725-750 are disregarded due to their inclusion of less than one individual. Similarly, as a result of this computation, a late sixth century population is derived, even though the cemetery taken as a whole is unlikely to have stretched back into the sixth century on the evidence presently available (Welch pers. comm. 2001). For the sake both of arithmetic and dating coherence across the whole spectrum of investigated sites, these computations have been included within further spatial analyses.

6.4.3 Trend-surfaces

In order to investigate the spatial interrelationship of derived data, surfaces of interpolated data were produced from the sample values, in order to predict the value of unsampled locations. This form of trend surface analysis uses the technique of regression to derive a mathematical function describing how point samples vary with respect to their geographical co-ordinates. The interpolated surfaces produced in ArcView assign estimated values to non-sampled locations on the basis of an inverse distance weighting (IDW) regression function from the twelve closest sampled points. This assumes that sampled points influence other locations in direct relation to distance. Closer points are therefore weighted as more important in the computation to sites further away. Optimally, interpolations of any kind require both a large number and regular distribution of sampled points to increase their predictive power. Thus in the case of the East Kent trend surfaces, the lack of sampled sites either in the Milton/Faversham region or further west, undermine the exactness of the produced regression model. In addition, inverse distance weighting in the case of the East Kent interpolations, was defined without respect to geographical barriers such as the Wantsum Channel. In this case, as it was not believed that the watercourse significantly impeded contact between the sites on the Isle of Thanet and those on the mainland, sites on either side of the Channel were included within the regression function. Values in these computations were assigned to grid squares of 270m x 270m.
Trend-surface analysis was applied to demonstrate the pattern of artefact densities in the form of:

a) The numerical count of raw materials per population in each date phase.
b) Raw material weight per population in each date phase.
c) Percentage of population within each date phase with raw materials.
d) The percentage of the total number of objects for each date phase at a given site.

To compare with the provenance of artefacts by:

a) Numerical count of artefact provenances by phase and population.
b) Percentage of the total Kent numerical number of artefact provenances per head of population.

In order to graphically present various models of artefact distribution, the assigned artefact provenances in ASKED (Table 6.5) were simplified into four distinct categories. Various sources of objects throughout Continental Europe were grouped within a single 'imported' category, whilst both Local and Kentish artefacts were classified within the same 'Kentish' provenance category. General Anglo-Saxon artefacts (that may or may not have a Kentish provenance) were included in computations with artefacts defined as non-Kentish, Anglo-Saxon, whilst curated objects have remained essentially the same. Similarly, in the case of composite objects, some attempt was made to classify constituent parts accordingly. As an example of this form of simplification, necklaces were broken down into constituent parts on the basis of provenance. Thus, all the amber beads of a composite necklace were counted as a single 'imported' necklace, whilst the glass beads were defined as separate 'local' necklace.

6.5 Conclusions

In the preceding chapter a number of issues surrounding the dataset were highlighted in order to clarify the methodological assumptions underlying the interpretations made in the following chapters:

- The range and scope of the dataset was shown to lend itself to varying forms of analysis dependent on the completeness of associated contextual information.

---

2 Although some of these calculations have been attempted by Loveluck, the approach adopted here is significantly different in a number of key ways. The introduction of additional variables such as provenance, the incorporation of populations as a statistical unit of comparison, and the derivation of spatial patterns of deposited artefact assemblages by trend surface analysis are believed to be, so-far, unique attempts at elucidating socio-economic phenomena.
• A number of lines of argumentation could be adopted on the basis of this data, incorporating location analysis and artefact studies, without requiring a qualitative assessment of grave-groups.

• Although incomplete and biased, the existent data should theoretically be able to provide evidence of a number of broad regional trends, with the caveat that the predictive power of these models is directly dependent on the scale of local information.

• Despite the necessary simplification of data for analytical purposes, a uniform approach to issues of dating, provenance and quantification across the whole dataset is argued to be the only way to assess broad spatio-temporal trends.
Chapter 7: Anglo-Saxon artefacts and articulating value

7.1 Introduction: the archaeological context for value and wealth

"Economics...is a science which is forced to recognize this duality...[The] study of political economy and of economic history constitute two clearly distinguishable disciplines belonging to one and the same science. Recent work in this field emphasize this distinction [which is] required by an inner necessity of the subject...The reason is that, as in the study of political economy, one is dealing with the notion of value. In both cases, we have a system of equivalence between things belonging to different orders. In one case, work and wages; in the other case, signification and signal" (de Saussure 1916, 80).

The archaeological derivation of value is crucially tied both to theoretical concepts of societal structuring principles governing how prestige, fame and status are articulated in material terms, and the context of archaeological evidence itself. Given the important contribution mortuary evidence in particular makes to these debates, discussions of past wealth measurement have traditionally been further embroiled within broader arguments on the identification of social status and differentiation from an archaeology of death. Following De Saussure's terminology, many contemporary analyses have questioned how one is meaningfully to interpret the signified, given our possession of only the signifiers of social value? What are the behavioural systems underlying the different orders of social and economic value? Can one, indeed, separate the formal pattern of social situations from the combination of primitive symbols recovered? Although these subjects are undeniably related, there is nonetheless (understandably) little disciplinary consensus on how best to examine aspects of past social structuration and value assessment. As such, from the point of view of the study of mortuary behaviour, the reality of the Kentish Early Anglo-Saxon dataset is in many ways no different to that of other prehistoric societies, in that the information on past value regimes is inexorably tied to further issues of past agent identity and expression as viewed from the specific restricted conditions of burial.

What follows, therefore, is a tentative attempt to shift the attention of study to the analysis of the formal structure of social value, stripped of many of the referential signs. Given the restricted format of this chapter, such an exploration can only proceed at the level of broad brush-strokes. A brief overview of past theoretical approaches to the study of Anglo-Saxon mortuary structures (7.2) serves as an introduction to a discussion of wider ahistorical behavioural issues of value articulation (7.3). In the final section (7.4), the Kentish data-set is examined with respect to some of the issues raised. Several caveats are implicit. This work does not seek to expand on current debates in behavioural studies in anything but the most cursory fashion. Similarly, important ontological concepts of the game theory metaphor are not elaborated here, as they have been more fully discussed elsewhere (e.g.
Sigmund 1993; Leonard 1997). Finally, inadequacies of the Kentish data-set, already discussed (Chapter 6), mean that an analysis of inter-cemetery variation in Kent is primarily restricted to the few sites, such as Mill Hill Deal and Dover Buckland, for which publications of sufficient detail exist.

7.2 Recognising the value of Anglo-Saxon grave-goods

7.2.1 Early work

Although historically, the archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England, and especially Kent, has been one of the mortuary landscape, pre-World War II scholars placed greater emphasis on the value this evidence played in supporting common cultural conceptions than in attempting to define the economic value and meaning of excavated objects amongst the various Germanic societies themselves. Whilst doubts about the reliability of Bede’s narrative of the English settlement were well established from Kemble onwards (1849; Higham 1992), early archaeological analyses of the Anglo-Saxon migration maintained an orthodox depiction of an unquestioned Germanic Gesamtdarstellung. Accordingly, Anglo-Saxon archaeology up until c.1965 continued to be determined by nineteenth- and twentieth-century assumptions of ethnic specificity, regionalism and cultural homogeneity whilst providing evidence for these self-same agendas (R. Morris pers. comm. 2001; Austin 1990; Shennan 1989). The cherished view of a landscape moulded by the Anglo-Saxon invasions recorded in Bede and Gildas imposed a teleological model of national progress, for which archaeology could offer physical evidence (Fig. 7.1). The pervasion of such historically-driven agendas, determined the main thrust of archaeological research, and prejudged the interpretation:

“There are two ways in which archaeology may help us to understand the settlement [of the migrating Anglo-Saxons]: the distribution of the pagan cemeteries may reveal the areas which were first or most thickly populated, and the grave-goods which they contain may throw light on the cultural affinities of those who used them” (Collingwood and Myres 1937, 359).

To earlier Anglo-Saxonists such as Hodgkin, writing in 1952, the material-culture of these migrants, provided evidence linking the past with the present. Where the “articles of the women’s graves...[demonstrated] points where this oldest England is in touch with modern times”(1952, 228) the migration itself “was a land-hunger like that which has carried men of Anglo-Saxon stock as migrants around the globe” (ibid., 36). Concomitant culture historical agendas accordingly aimed at elaborating the spatio-temporal model of historical colonisation, both by refining the dating precision of archaeological complexes, and describing the characteristics of the various historically-attested Kleinstämme.
Given this over-riding early importance of funerary analysis in Anglo-Saxon archaeology, it is perhaps not surprising that foci on issues of social identity and artefact analyses have remained a mainstay of research. Recent artefact typologies such as those produced by Hines (1997), Palm and Pind (1992), or Dickinson (1993) for example, can be seen within a long tradition of chronological refinement (e.g. Åberg 1926; Evison 1979; Leeds 1913, 1936; Myres 1937; 1969; 1977; Swanton 1973). In contrast, the post-modernist exposure of the social science concept of “autonomous, self-regulating and self-justifying society and culture” has begun to deconstruct nationalistic views of historical identity (Wolf 1982, 18; e.g. Armory 1993; Austin 1990; Champion 1987, 1990; Geary 1983; Hedeager 1993; MacDougall 1982; Wormald 1983). As part of this re-evaluation of tacit assumptions, recent investigations in Anglo-Saxon burial archaeology have come to question, not only the integrity of early historicist interpretations, but also that of subsequent anthropologically-determined alternatives. Evident from all these contemporary analyses is a recognition that mortuary complexes represent more than mere passive reflections of past social systems. As such, any attempt at investigating value from the perspective of burial data is therefore dependent on the theoretical tools developed at understanding the historical and ideological context of burial.

7.2.2 New Archaeology and value from social organisation

In a number of key essays, Saxe (1970), Binford (1971) and Tainter (1975; 1978), invested considerable effort in developing techniques aimed at deriving the social organisation of past communities from their mortuary remains. Based on the assumption that a direct underlying equation between funerary evidence and past social complexity exists, these authors put forward a number of hypotheses linking interred material culture and burial data to forms of past personification, such as age, gender, social position or affiliation. As part this movement, the development of Tainter’s ‘energy expenditure principle’ came closest to addressing the relationship between value and identity. This stipulated that the higher the social rank of the deceased, the greater the amount of corporate expenditure involved in the interment ritual (Tainter 1978). Energy expenditure could be reflected in the size and elaborateness of the grave structure, the types of grave goods, the treatment of the body and so on. Taking this lead, a number of Anglo-Saxon studies have consequently attempted to determine the differential ‘wealth’ and ‘status’ markers within associated contexts in order to recreate both past social hierarchies and the social status of the interred (Pader 1982, 53). These differential markers have been sought amongst: the grave
goods (e.g. Arnold 1980; 1985; Alcock 1981), grave structures - in terms of the effort invested in the grave itself in the form of the mortuary structures or variability in grave depth or size (e.g. Hogarth 1973; Shephard 1979; Hirst 1980, 248; Martin 1976, 11); orientation (e.g. Chadwick-Hawkes 1976) and spatial distribution of burials (e.g. Shephard 1979), which through Boolean correlation have been assumed to represent varying degrees of wealth and social standing. Several methods have been employed to cluster goods into hierarchical distributions of social value. Arnold, taking his lead from Shennan, derived wealth scores for interred objects based upon the quantity of the various artefact types and their assumed prestige potential, which was determined “a priori on the basis of distance and difficulty in obtaining the raw materials and the estimated time taken in producing the artefact” (Shennan 1975, 284; Arnold 1980, 108). Others, saw the recurrence of particular items in association with each other as evidence for a ‘status uniform’ or status-specific ‘badge’ based upon the assumption that ‘higher status’ burials will also contain objects visible within the ‘lower class’ (Brenan 1985, 128). The value of objects in this interpretation relied on hierarchical frequencies tabulations of commonness and rarity.

Processualist interpretations such as these were paralleled particularly by historicist archaeologies of Early Medieval row-grave cemeteries on the Continent. Here a tradition of legalistic and religious assumptions had been applied to the interpretation of burial status since the 1920s (e.g. Veeck 1926). Through retrospective historic analysis, it was assumed that associated grave-goods represented inalienable possessions of the interred, known in later law-codes as the male’s Herbgut and woman’s Gerade. As this moveable wealth could be related to the social roles and wealth of the interred, an orthodoxy of interpretation remarkably similar to that of later Processualists ensued. Thus in the works of the German archaeologists Stein (1967), Steuer (1968) and Christlein (1973)1 archaeologically-defined groupings of artefacts could be collated with social divisions derived from written sources such as Noble, Free, Half-Free and Unfree (ibid) (Fig. 7.2). Christlein, in his analysis of south-west German Alammanic inhumations, correlated the clustered objects within a grave assemblage with pre-selected ‘status-symbols’ such as snaffles, Spatha or bronze vessels. All artefacts could then be assigned to status groupings on the basis of the inclusion or absence of the status markers within graves (ibid) (Fig. 7.3). Thus the group classified as ‘Unfree’ contained no grave-goods, whilst a ‘Noble’ burial contained, not only the Spatha of the ‘Free’ group, but also a snaffle or a bronze vessel. Similar interpretations

---

1 Christlein, in contrast to other German authors, argued that legal definitions should be replaced by economic ‘Qualitätsgruppen’, however, thereby paralleling the developments in New Archaeology.
of the social organisation of Anglo-Saxon burials soon followed, deriving status from the inclusion of: a sword (the highest class), seax (freeman), spear (semi-free and freemen) and no weapons (semi-free and serfs) (Chadwick-Hawkes 1973, 186-7; Alcock 1981).

Despite offering a practical means of investigating burial data, many of the underlying premises of these Processualist approaches have been widely criticised (e.g. Hodder 1980; 1982a; 1986; O'Shea 1984; Samson 1987) as summarised recently by McHugh (1999, 1-18): 2

- The assumption that burial data represents 'mirrors of life' stands in some contrast to more recent analyses which emphasise the role of burials in structuring society, both real and imagined.
- There is little consideration of structuring principles, beyond vertical hierarchies of status, age or wealth, such as lineage, clan or community affiliation.
- The lack of attention to the role of ritual and ceremony in constituting the archaeological evidence.
- Status differentiation can be through the distinction of material culture and practice rather than linear accumulation. Individual strategies for demonstrating these distinctions may run contra to normative social behaviour, particularly with respect to economic factors.
- Status in death may be a dynamic area for competition, both by masking and exaggerating social difference. Equally, burial may not be used as an arena for status display at all.

7.2.3 Age, gender and horizontal distinction

An appreciation of some of these criticisms has been demonstrated in a number of Anglo-Saxon studies. Ellen-Jane Pader first suggested that the burial rite 'reflects' not the social system of the society, but part of a ritual form of communication characterised by the use of formalised or patterned behaviours, or symbolic action (Pader 1980, 143; 1982, 53; Parker-Pearson 1984; Richards 1987). As such, the pattern of grave-good deposition can be interpreted as reflecting, not only hierarchies based on status and wealth, but also distinctions based on age and gender. Her contextual analysis of both 'stratified' material objects and their positioning and use within individual burials from two partially explored

---

2 Specifically from the Anglo-Saxon perspective, further criticisms have been voiced by historians highlighting problems of retrogressively assuming Early Anglo-Saxon social groups on the basis of Late Anglo-Saxon sources (Brooks 1978) and indeed equating legal status with social status (James 1979, 78; 1989, 38).
East Anglian cemeteries suggested differential burial treatment according to such genetically-determined groupings. Although the relatively primitive computer technology adopted and sample size rendered the experiment somewhat inconclusive, it was nevertheless demonstrated that there was a close similarity between women and child assemblages in contrast to those found in male graves. Grave-goods from these contexts appear to be restricted to a specific 'status-uniform' not visible amongst the female assemblages, and in which weapons may also have been partially age dependant (Pader 1982, 129). More importantly, the demonstration that objects in situ conveyed social identity emphasises the burial rite as part of group symbolism beyond that of individual agency (cf. Arnold et al. 1988, 3).

In keeping with these findings, the emphasis in recent interpretations of funeral assemblages away from one of a simple reflection of past social status to one of "the fortuitous outcomes of a reordered funerary ritual" (Barrett 1994, 63) stresses the importance of viewing mortuary data within a concept of funerary performance (Pearson 1998). This view raises at least two important interpretative issues: the nature of the performance as a form of communication, including the relationships between deceased and spectators, and the role objects play within this performance (ibid). In Pearson's view, grave-goods only take on a value through their theatrical role; the choreography of their inclusion, omission or placement being used to establish the location, period and character of the (deceased) actor.

Somewhat paradoxically, this interpretation has helped redirect attention back towards identifying ideological signifiers of social identity; the tokens comprising Binford's social persona or 'status markers' in German scholarship. Beyond rigid status distinctions, more recent investigations into Anglo-Saxon mortuary remains have elaborated the importance composite hierarchies play in structuring social relations and identity. Partially a product of increased interest in issues of past gender-relations and the availability of biologically-sexed skeletons, a number of current reassessments of Anglo-Saxon funerary evidence bear testimony to a renewed interest in cemetery research (Lucy 1997 contra Dickinson 1980). Coming out of this research is a picture of mediated identity and symbolic assemblages, undermining some previously held assumptions. The correlation of biologically-sexed individuals and grave goods has confirmed the existence of certain standard gender criteria such as weapons with males and jewellery, dress fastenings, weaving equipment or girdle items with females (Arnold 1980; Stoodley 1999), but these categories reveal only a partial
image of social construction. Härke's important work on the weapon burial rite demonstrated, that whilst weapons were clearly associated with males, this accounted for only approximately half of the biologically-sexed men and boys in the cemeteries analysed (1989; 1990; 1992a; 1994). In addition, the correlation of weapon assemblages in the fifth and sixth centuries with stature offers tentative evidence of a symbolic rite wherein ethnic identity rather than, or as much as, social status is expressed. The inclusion of jewellery within grave assemblages has similarly been reinterpreted as a potential cultural and social signifier, whilst a number of artefacts were seen to remain genderless (Lucy 1997, 163). Certain wealth/status hierarchies do appear to be visible amongst the accompanied burials, though this may say little about the relative status of the unaccompanied (cf. Welch 1992, 64). The small number of specific male artefacts appear to cluster into, what has been interpreted as, homogenous status groups whilst female indicators defy such tiered statistical patterning (Arnold 1980, 120; Stoodley 1999). Instead, there appears some evidence that female assemblages in part represent changing gender assignments by age. The correlation of older members of the community with neutral gender articles may indicate, not their lack in status, but the decreased need for these individuals to actively signal gender in death (Stoodley 1999, 140).

Whilst these approaches circumvented some of the problems of how to quantify energy expenditure, the explicit focus on social roles and material symbols of affiliation, complicate an appreciation of past modes of valuation. Moreover, Härke's illustration of different individual and communal attitudes to death suggest potential difficulties for quantitative analysis except along biologically-determined criteria. In keeping with this view, statistical interpretations of many of the cemeteries may indeed be better served by a model of 'family' groupings, rather than broader concepts of social organisation. The generalised minimum size of 50 burials required for analysing mortuary practices (Arnold 1980; Hirst 1980, 251), must be seen within a chronological time-span. If say, a cemetery of 50 individuals remained in use for 100 years, this restricts the size of the associated community to 20 or so individuals, or two to four households; a situation which in isolation would usually be associated with ranked, rather than stratified societies. This would appear to be mirrored within the excavated settlements, such as Mucking, where little evidence for a structured hierarchy is visible amongst the buildings. Steuer has used this premise to explain differentiation in visible assemblages, preferring to see the 'poorer' graves as representing the individual's distance from the familial head rather than as specifically low status (Steuer 1982). If this interpretation is accepted, generalisations derived from status
scores or established rituals, need not carry the same connotations or status in cross-cultural, or even cross-regional analyses.

In conclusion, critiques of generalising models of social organisation of the type forwarded by Saxe, Binford and Tainter, have demonstrated a number of important dynamics comprising the formation of mortuary remains that were not adequately addressed in earlier works. Although many of these illustrations usefully criticise the traditional view of graves as ‘mirrors of life’ and reinforces the need to read the ritual symbolism of burial in terms of cross-cutting issues of social identification and/or misrepresentation, there is nevertheless still a need to “study the physical data itself to determine what type of society (real or otherwise) is represented” (McHugh 1999, 2-3). In support of this view, certain correlations between symbolic markers and social roles/differentiation have been suggested, particularly from the basis of biological classifications such as age and sex. In light of questions on how past social groupings and positions were indeed organised, attempts at defining further hierarchies such as wealth and status, social roles, or lineage have been more problematical. The recognition that value as a socially-constructed phenomenon is linked to these self-same social relationships has in most quarters contributed to the abandonment of studies of ranked artefacts of the sort predicted by Tainter’s energy expenditure argument in favour of studies of status-specific badges or contexts, divorced from hierarchical categorisation.

In some respects, this appreciation of social structure as “greater than the sum of its parts” (McHugh 1999, 15) has forced quantitative studies of mortuary practice away from cultural determinants, in favour of more objectifiably-recognisable biological determinants such as age and sex. In partial explanation of this trend, Härke, in particular, has argued an alternate case for two discrete methods of analysis addressing two forms of archaeological data (1994). Taking his lead from German ethnographic and historical theory, Härke distinguishes between two aspects of life, consciousness and activity, and their concomitant material culture (1994 citing Mühlmann 1938; Droyson 1937, 37-8 & Bernheim 1903, 230-34). Thus: “‘tradition’ [or consciousness] reflects thought and therefore contains intentional data; ‘remains’ [or activity] are the result of action and therefore contain functional data” (Härke 1994, 33). From the point of view of burial archaeology, skeletal material would constitute ‘remains’ in contrast to grave-goods that are intentional ‘tradition’ inclusions (ibid). Building on this interpretation, current studies of mortuary behaviour are arguably more robust when qualified by biological determinants. Conceptually, this division of
material culture into two identifiable data-types presents an exciting addition to the epistemological canon. Although 'intentional data' are subject to the critiques of 'meaningfully constituted' data espoused particularly in post-processual dialogue, 'remains' can potentially be interpreted without respect to theoretical considerations of context or meaning underlining social behaviour. Whilst skeletal data offers one possible line of research, it is argued that further evidence can be construed as 'remains' data. Before this idea is elaborated further the contribution of both forms of data to an assessment of Anglo-Saxon value regimes will be discussed in turn.

7.3 The segmentation of value

7.3.1 The interpretation of ‘intentional’ data: agency, material culture and value

Much contemporary work on material culture and exchange theory has, as we saw in Chapter 2, stressed the importance firstly, of the commensurability of goods (things) and services (people), and secondly, the effects of the structure of exchange. Drawing particularly on theoretical foundations to be found in the works of Giddens (1979; 1984), Bourdieu (1977) and Foucault (1994), a number of archaeologists have at length discussed the condensation of potential hidden meanings in material culture (e.g. Hodder 1989). Artefacts, in these works, are a product of past action; action that operates both within social practice and reproduces social practice (praxis). The core tenet espoused in these works, is that of the habitus, which consists of a series of:

"Principles which generate and organise practices....objectively 'regulated' and 'regular' without being in any way the product of obedience to rules, they can be collectively orchestrated without being the product of the organising action of a conductor" (Bourdieu 1992, 53)

Society, therefore, exists as a plurality of interrelating individuals, who are not only operating within a framework of antecedent conditions, but reproduce and change society through the daily praxis of material production (cf. Dobres & Robb 2000, 5). In this interpretation, habitus offers an epistemological framework for the investigation of past societies through material culture. If the manufacture and use of artefacts is structured within an "embodied history, internalised as second nature and so forgotten as history" (Bourdieu 1992, 56), the meaning of material patterning is both context dependant and an active medium of the actor's social identity (Hodder 1987; Hegmon 1992). On this basis, value judgements, are both conscious and unconscious individual decisions of the relative value of different material objects, power, love, freedom and so on, and the shared universal values, both economic and social, of any given society. Value from the point of view of the habitus therefore forms one of the recognisable features of social cohesion:
"Communities and societies are made up of people but we only recognise them as a 
community or as a society, because people who belong share some ideas about how 
things should be: they have a common set of categories with which they 'word' the 
social and the natural world around them and they share a definition of the good 
things and the bad things in life. From this point of view a community is a set of 
shared values and categories" (Bailey 1971, 9).

Whilst core values therefore help the constitution of society, it is nevertheless important to 
recognise the hierarchical ordering of ideas and values within society (Dumont 1980; cited 
in Bazelmans 1999). Universal economic values in society, although directly linked with 
social structures and idea-values, cannot however always be given assumed paramountcy. 
Following Althusser's view of the 'complex structured unity' (1969, 198-9) semi-
autonomous instances (political, ideological, economic etc.) alternate in primacy. Thus the 
role of the economic instance can only be assumed to be dominant in capitalistic societies 
though it is still intrinsically linked to the ideological and politically-structured social 
relations of pre-capitalist systems by providing the context for specific structures of 
dominance (Miller, Rowlands & Tilley 1989, 9). On this basis, the relative value of, for 
extample, traded luxury goods can move from economic value to social value within specific 
geographical and political environments. Material patterning and movement is also a 
reflection of "energy, trade, social institutions and ideas" however (Shotman & Urban 
1987, 67-8); a concept that has been effectively stressed by, for example, Hedeager in her 
discussion of Migration-Period Denmark (Hedeager 1992). In her view, the importance of 
Early-Medieval luxury goods must be seen not only as necessary objects within social gift-
giving relations, but also as legitimising a warrior élite through the conspicuous use of 
Roman and Frankish ideological symbols, and finally as ethnic markers.

Although exotic objects may at times have been crucial to the legitimisation of social 
inequalities, certain caveats exist both in the nature of value creation and in the concept of 
'élite goods' as a material category. Beyond the culturally different valuations discussed by 
Hedeager, Appadurai (1986, 6-7) has further effectively demonstrated the need to view the 
value of objects within a dynamic continuum of social discourse. Rather than static 
élite/non-élite markers, objects in ethnographic examples are seen to move between 
commodity and gift states during differing contingent relationships (e.g. Thomas 1991; 
Weiner 1992; Lesure 1999). Thus, whilst heirlooms, for example, may have little 
commodity value in certain horizontal relationships (i.e. between members of different 
groups), as they do not represent accepted vehicles for demonstrating inequality, in vertical 
relationships (familial or kin) they can take on a powerful social value. Objects of this type, 
are often inalienable goods, wherein the value of the object is often specifically within the
context of a social relationship, time or place. Other objects, alternatively, may have a broader, more commodified social value. These will tend to be those objects that are widely traded, are organised within an accepted hierarchical commodity value regime, and have widely been accepted as media for local competition. Neither category is fixed in time, however, as the dynamic of competing élites requires the constant manipulation of object values. On this basis, the power of emerging élites may be founded in the manipulation of valuables used in social payments (Collier 1988; Friedman & Rowlands 1978; Godelier 1991, Meillassoux 1981; Lesure 1999) as has been argued for the introduction of coins for tribute (Carver 1993), or indeed, the archaeologically invisible, though historically-attested, concept of food-rent (the forere of Anglo-Saxon law-codes).

As power in this model is a function of dependence, predicting behavioural inequality requires identifying those variables that affect an actor's relative dependencies (Molm, Peterson & Takahashi 2001, 160). Artefacts in this sense must be understood to objectify social identity not merely as hierarchies of value, but also as demonstrations of power, tokens of remembrance and social symbols (CsIKszentmihalyi 1993, 23). Objects which take on special importance, in other words, are those which are contingent with specific forms of exchange. Power relations, it follows, are manipulated on the one hand by controls on the structure of exchange (i.e. by influencing the actor's access to partners who control resources they value), and on the other hand, by the stressing the benefit of resources to potential exchange partners (Molm, Peterson & Takahashi 2001). In this model, competitive élite monopolies of commodities could therefore be seen to act to maintain sumptuary exclusivity (as in the monopoly of imported gold brooches perhaps), commercial advantage (coins?) and the display of rank (swords?) (Appadurai 1986, 22) (factors which are further cross-cut by issues of ethnicity and gender) as a way of maintaining power inequalities in society. The ritualisation of exchange in terms of the ritual-cosmological relationships illustrated by Bazelmans for Beowulf (1999), therefore carry with them both explicit messages regarding the value of objects in maintaining social position, but also reinforce the position of the élite (and especially kings) as arbiters of these social markers.

The recognition on the one hand that exchange networks are an important determinant of power relations, and on the other that hierarchical valuations help maintain these inequalities within society, offers a number of possible routes for further exploration. Certain values, translated into behavioural rules and norms within society, are evident from
sources such as Beowulf. The most important relationships, those between king and warrior-followers, king and God, kings and other kings, are named and valued in terms of objects of exchange. Five categories of objects are distinguishable: 1. armour, standards and horses, 2. gold, rings, jewels and gems, 3. silverware, 4. land and 5. women (Bazelmans 1999, 150) and each is related to a specific form of exchange. It is clear from the context of use in the poem, that raw material properties of certain objects helped their valuation as 'treasure'.

Moreover, even when objects as finished products are alluded to, intrinsic properties are named to accentuate their perceived value. Thus, the noble Geats are described as carrying "goldplated shields, grey-mail shirts and masked helmets, a multitude of battle-shafts" (334-35a), “Their mail-shirts glinted, hard and hand-linked; the high-gloss iron of their armour rang.” (321-24), whilst Heorot itself “rose before them, radiant with gold. Nobody on earth knew of another building like it.” (308-310). On this basis, it is possible to suggest that the value of objects, at least for Anglo-Saxon societies, comprised both of intrinsic properties of goods, combined with the extrinsic role of objects in symbolising exchange relationships. Given the model of power relations outlined above, these two forms of valuation are mutually reinforcing. Certain objects as gifts - in particular gold and silver rings - are commensurable with the ‘worth’ of individuals by embodying their ritual-cosmological positioning:

“in the relationship between lord and warrior-follower, in the transition both from child to young warrior and from young warrior to adult; in the relationship between bridegivers and bridetakers; and in the relationship between royal families. From this we may carefully draw the conclusion that the different categories of gifts, and ultimately therefore also the ‘worth’ associated with specific person, are convertible into these objects, or into the anonymous gold and silver that underlies these and from which new objects can be made” (Bazelmans 1999, 191).

The value of gold, silver (and gemstones) circulation therefore lies both in its ability to reproduce a socio-cosmic universe of relations, and - as long-distance traded articles - maintain elite power through imported exclusivity. Whilst material scarcity helps to underline the importance of the structure of exchange in maintaining power relations, the constitution of a ritual-cosmological network of relationships reinforces the perceived value of specific exchanges. Bazelmans’ final comment suggests one further potential interpretation: intrinsic properties of specific raw materials may have been valued because they represented flexible media, used both for social reproduction (long-term exchange) and commodity exchange (short-term exchange) (cf. Bloch & Parry 1989). Raw materials are valued in their own right, in other words, because they are symbolically assimilated with traditional social relationships but can also operate in short-term transactions between strangers of the type attested to from a variety of sources (2.2.2.5). This issue is related to the anthropological concept of ‘regimes of exchange’ as elaborated particularly in the works
of Appadurai (1986); Bloch and Parry (1989) and Myers (2001) amongst others (e.g. Kopytoff 1986, Thomas 1991; Weiner 1992), and becomes a key element, further discussed here in Chapter 8.

From this interpretation it follows that, although value must be understood within the framework of material, behavioural, ethical and ideological use, the archaeological remit must focus firstly, on the relationship between social values and material objects, and secondly, on the patterning of this social consensus. Value, in other words, can be approached through an investigation of the social behaviours towards certain types of objects temporally and spatially. Changes in the visible use of objects within society may reflect alterations in their assigned social role, whilst geographical patterns can be the product both of differing value regimes and exchange structures. By stressing that the value of objects is determined by behavioural judgements based on economic and extra-economic grounds, it is important to identify the different principles by which societies assess prestige and status in material terms. As the Beowulf example demonstrates, concepts of the value of objects may relate to their scarcity, originality, quality or diversity. Some of these issues are directly related to the raw material composition of artefacts, both in terms of the physical property and the scarcity of the raw material. The value of other objects alternatively, can be defined by the form of their exchange (be it alienable or inalienable) or in their use to display prestige or power. Which of these is prioritised will probably depend on the way such objects are used in society and the social taboos in place against certain forms of outrageous display. Finally, it is suggested that certain raw materials themselves were valued as they provided flexible media for individual competition and could, in effect, be ‘laundered’ for use in the reproduction of long-term social and cosmic order. Notions associated with some of these prized raw materials are specifically mentioned in near-contemporary texts. Gold (gold), silverware (discas ond fatu), jewels (sighu and sin) and precious stones (eorclanstans and gimmel) are often specifically mentioned in relation to hoards or treasure (Bazelmans 1999, 154), but equally represent the major type of gifts used to cement social relationships. Even in the quasi-religious arena of weapon-giving, the dual segmentation is valuation is clear:

“Then Halfdane’s son presented Beowulf
with a gold standard as a victory gift,
an embroidered banner; also breast-mail
and a helmet3; and a sword carried high,
that was both precious object and token of honour” (1018-22; my italics)

3 The helmet, which the poem goes on to describe, is further valued for its “embossed ridge, a band lapped with wire” (1028); a probable allusion to silver-wire inlay.
7.3.2 The value of scarcity, originality, quality and diversity

Given that the creation of value structures can therefore be both socially and economically dynamic, how can the relationship between social and economic value usefully be explored? In fact, the derivation of the relative value of artefacts from their absence or presence within socially-constituted assemblages does offer a methodological point of departure in determining local cultural values. Many of the previous approaches to defining Anglo-Saxon social valuations have followed the principle of material scarcity or perceived workmanship of objects. Value and wealth were determined on the assumed availability of objects or the labours invested in their manufacture, and were graded on the derived accessibility (e.g. Shennan 1975; Arnold 1980). Similar approaches have assigned score systems to object-types on the basis of the relative frequency of artefact types within a grave sample (e.g. Hodson 1977; Jørgensen 1988; 1990; 1992a; Brenan 1985). These have simply counted the number of different types of objects within a grave assemblage (e.g. Arnold 1980; Hedeager 1980; Hirst 1985), or else have counted the number of objects themselves (Arnold 1980; Shephard 1980). Values in both methods of counting could be argued to be dependent on the units taken for classification however. A 'type-value' derived by dividing the total number of graves by those containing a specific artefact type will always reflect modern archaeological classifications rather than how objects were perceived and used in the past, as well as emphasising the importance of artefacts in vogue during a short period of the cemetery duration. Whilst studies of near-contemporary documentary sources, such as those discussed for Beowulf (7.3.1), lend credence to analyses of certain types of objects (e.g. weaponry), discrimination between others introduce issues of modern subjectivity. An example, that of counting individual beads within a grave assemblage, has rightly been criticised by some authors, whilst the debate on whether sets of brooches constitute one or more artefact types remains contentious (Hirst 1985, 96-102). As already noted, whilst documentary sources do lend support to a relationship between weaponry and specific social roles, those same sources relate the wider social-use of artefacts and raw materials as coming under the general heading of 'treasure'. Beyond the special case of weaponry, it follows that there is indeed no a priori basis for assuming a linear relationship between the number of artefacts and the social value of those artefacts (cf. Pader 1982, 57; contra Hirst 1985, 97).

---

4 This interpretation is in fact supported by most of the attempted statistical surveys (e.g. Arnold 1980, 120; Shephard 1979, 59) which, although producing linear progressions from 'poor' to 'richest' amongst the female assemblages, showed no indication of forming tiered social patterns as would be expected from both the baseline anthropological assumptions and can be inferred from the pattern of the male assemblages.
This argument takes on greater resonance if one views the accumulation of grave objects (either by the deceased or those burying) as a form of procurement strategy (e.g. Blurton Jones 1984; 1987; Minnegal 1997). According to such researchers, the value of a procured resource is not only in its size, but is also dependent on the amount of that resource already available (ibid., 26). If one views artefacts only in terms of their raw-material composition, it follows that greater expenditure was invested in the procurement of a wide variety of materials, than a large amount of a single material such as iron for example. Although the cost of procurement may be the same, the relative value of the resource may differ with the amount obtained. The marginal value of a commodity, object or resource will therefore begin to decrease in accordance with declining demand; itself dependent on how the material or object is used. On this basis, for example, there is a significant difference between a spearhead with gold-inlay and one without any inlay, irrespective of the size of the weapon (Fig. 7.4). Similarly, a comparison of the raw materials interred with the sixth-century weapon burials at MHD shows that only people deposited with swords could lay claim to artefacts made of materials other than iron or copper-alloy. This is despite the fact that the average weight of their iron shield-bosses and spearheads was lower than that of individuals buried with shield and spear(s). On this basis, the greater weight or scale of individual artefacts in an assemblage cannot be seen as valuable as an assemblage composed of a wider number of resources. Despite this observation, the fact that the average weight of these objects was higher in the shield-and-spear group and that the weight of spearheads in both the sword and shield-and-spear groups was significantly higher than that for individuals with a spear only, suggests that the scale of some objects may have been used to articulate certain social inequalities. By contrast, very little difference in the average weight of knives exists between the three groups, suggesting that such objects were not regarded as useful in demonstrating social differences. This pattern is also true of the DBU weapon-bearing population, although a comparison between the sword and shield-and-spear groups is not possible due to the limited number of the latter.

Beyond issues of the diversity of raw materials discussed, there is some further evidence to suggest that graduations of value were also determined by the perceived quality of objects. Despite the similar utilitarian function, character, and indeed provenance (6.2.4) of most buckle types, for example, certain raw materials appear to have been preferred to demonstrate social inequalities. Half of the sword-bearing population of MHD were

---

5 A consensus in previous archaeological and historical analyses has been that swords as objects can be equated with a certain form of special status (e.g. Arnold 1980, 132; Welch 1980, 266).
interred with copper-alloy buckles as opposed to just one third of other weapon-carrying burials, despite the probable local re-use of copper-alloy. Similarly, although exotic objects may have been crucial to the legitimisation of inequality, by simple virtue of their rarity value, a further characteristic of many of these objects, that of glittery visibility, may have further contributed to their cultural evaluation. Gold-embroidered braid, silk textiles, gemstones, both composite and cast garnet-jewellery, silver and other 'luxury' imports may well have been highly prized due to their physical material properties; those self-same properties that ensured that they were accepted as valuables by the rest of society. Corroborating evidence of this belief is offered by a number of examples. Cited references from Anglo-Saxon poetry have already been mentioned (7.3.1). Similarly, it has been suggested that the optical properties of objects were highly valued, as a plausible reason for the use of high phosphorous ores in pattern-welded sword blades (Gilmour 1991, 227). The use of gold-sheet 'reflectors' in garnet jewellery hint at similar visual emphases. Alternative ranking of properties in terms of colour and texture could also be suggested by the social discrimination of certain textiles or bead types.

This proposed emphasis on the material properties of objects interestingly suggests a further hypothesis. The observed phenomenon of Kentish female dress suggests that the élite sometimes appropriate existing evaluations of objects to further accentuate inter-élite and intra-élite inequalities. It is on this basis that 'foreign' brooches could acceptably be incorporated within Kentish dress, as the socially-accepted valuation of objects was on the basis of their raw material composition. By using a universal medium of value-expression, further ethnic labelling, or the scarcity value of these imports merely provided an 'added value' criteria to these objects in terms of inter-élite competition, much in the same way that local craftsmen could draw formative inspiration from common socially-valuable Germanic styles, iconography and mythological symbolism in jewellery (Fig. 7.5).

The examples cited above offer some archaeological evidence in support of theoretical considerations, that objects were valued, at least in part, in terms of their raw material properties. Moreover, there appears to be some evidence that the valuation of grave assemblages, and indeed artefacts, can be explored fruitfully on the basis of their raw material constituents. Although clearly such an analysis of socially-circumscribed accessibility cannot be interpreted in straight isolation from other, artefactual analysis of status, the posited methodology does have the advantage of minimising modern classification criteria.
7.3.3 Game-theory and value through co-operation

Given the outline of mediated valuations presented above, the major unanswerable problem of wealth distributions of past societies remains that of establishing the rates of exchange between commodities. Within the system of inalienable and alienable objects posited for Anglo-Saxon Kent, there is indeed no absolute means of measuring wealth. Instead, the individual construction of present identity is a composite mixture of objects defining self in a historical framework, representing success, fame, power and wealth. The objectification of identity through artefacts can be used, however, to express individual or collective subjects. There is, following Thomea (1991, 25):

"as it were, a one-to-one relationship between a material thing (or a particular array, such as a style of home decoration) and the expression of belonging or difference. Idiosyncrasy, for instance, can be expressed through unusual choices, or by avoiding clothes or kinds of furniture which could convey affiliation with a subculture".

This assumes, however, that individual biographies are in part drawn from collective scales of value. Such wealth indices are certainly not static. Alienable objects (ones dislocated from producers, former users, prior contexts or social exchanges) are rare. Thus objects exist in a nexus of socially-mediated valuations; valuations that are specific to further social relationships. Weaponry for example, may be essential possessions of a warrior élite, as they form broad social markers of identity, yet individuals held such rank only within socially-conscribed relationships. On this basis, weapons not only acted as a social marker for a mere proportion of the male population, their value was only applicable within this context of social relationships. Indeed, in this example, one could speculate that burial with weaponry was only allowed where individuals had fulfilled the social debt of military service. Certain evidence alluded to suggests that the structural properties of raw materials offered one aspect of broader valuation regimes through which people determined wealth measurement. The rarity, quality or diversity of certain objects made them effective media for social expression. As a form of behavioural consensus, however, this process of valuation is subject to further properties of social interaction.

One technique that has proven useful in modelling individual behavioural actions in terms of wider social processes is that of economic game theory (Von Neumann & Morgenstein 1953). Such models explicitly recognise individual behaviour within specific social environments in terms of evolutionary strategies, or choices, the effects of which are examined by comparison with one another. The common application of one such game, the iterated Prisoner's Dilemma, to the investigation of co-operative behaviour, has shown the importance of tit-for-tat strategies in the development of more co-operative social behaviour (Axelrod & Hamilton 1981; Sigmund 1993, 198). Co-operative behaviour is also
seen as underlying the self-organisation of what is constituted as valuable (Donangelo & Sneppen 2000). Donangelo & Sneppen’s model shows:

a) That value emerges through trading agents making simple decisions on the basis of individual memory of earlier encounters with other agents.

b) The emergence of money (and its periodic collapse) as the principal form of exchange is the direct result of these common trading valuations.

c) Certain goods emerge as being considered valuable by the majority of the agents without any a priori property of the product other that it being concentrated by some of the agents.

d) These high-demand goods collapse and are replaced over time unless produced and consumed at a significantly low rate.

c) Products that are easily produced never become valuable.

This game-theory model provides explanatory force to many of the issues of restricted exchange systems and exchange values recognised to underline power relationships (7.3.1). Moreover, although these conclusions are derived from the modelling of individual decision-making processes, they offer an important theoretical link to inferring artefactual patterning at a societal level.

### 7.3.4 Pareto’s Law and the social make-up of wealth

Recent econometric investigations have suggested that Pareto’s empirical law of total income distribution (derived originally from a study of a number of nineteenth-century capitalist societies) may represent a universal property of the way wealth condenses unevenly in any given society (Pareto 1897, sections 950-965; Bouchard & Mézard 2000). These modern studies and numerical simulations suggest that the distribution curve, represented by the simple analytical expression \( N = 1/\Psi^E \) (where \( \Psi \) is the income per annum, \( N \) the number of people and \( E \) a socially-contingent constant, to be found from empirical statistics) holds true in both time and space. Subsequent to Pareto’s study, scholars have found that the exponent \( E \) falls consistently between 2 and 3, thereby demonstrating that “that an increase in minimum income and a decrease of inequality in the proportions of income cannot occur in isolation nor cumulatively without total incomes growing more rapidly than the population” (Pietri-Tonelli 1994, 11). Thus, even if changes over time are random, the distribution of wealth runs in proportion to the power law, producing coefficients between 2 and 3, in which when \( E = 3 \), some 20% of the population would monopolise 55% of wealth.
In Pareto's view however, a close correlation was to be sought between economic prosperity and social heterogeneity: “If men are arranged according to their different levels of power and social influence, they will be, at least in part, the same men who will occupy the same place in the distribution structure and in that of the distribution of wealth” (Pareto 1903, I. 28, translated in Bousquet 1994, 38); a view that perhaps cannot be applied unconditionally to the context of grave assemblages (see 7.1.4 above). Nevertheless, striking similarities do exist between the percentages derived by Arnold (1980) in his study of Anglo-Saxon burial traits, and the 10-20% income distribution suggested by Pareto’s Law. Despite certain inconsistencies between cemeteries, his analysis of weapon graves showed that on average 22% of the Kentish population were buried with weapons of one form or another, with around half of those as sword-burials (Arnold 1979, 86).

The population of Dover Buckland offers a further useful example. Taking the male graves first, Evison devised a method of social subdivision based on the combinations of weapons recognised elsewhere (Evison 1987, 146-150; see 7.2.2 above). This suggested that during the earlier three cemetery phases (AD 450-625), over half of the male population was found to be buried with swords (around 24% of the total population). During the remaining phases (AD 625-750), this percentage had dropped to around 14% (c.6% of the total); a pattern interpreted by Evison as the result of the early effect of Christianity on the deposition of artefacts (ibid., 150) (Fig. 7.6). The overall impression gained by this pattern of weapon burials is that the population of DBU exhibited an unusually high percentage of martial armament during the fifth and sixth centuries, prompting Evison to suggest its interpretation as a royal military establishment (ibid., 173). Given the high level of importance placed on weapons in burials within this community, it is of interest that a small percentage of the population does nevertheless stand out in terms of the raw materials interred. Graves 93 and C are unusually endowed, as they contain iron, copper-alloy and silver objects comparable with a handful of the other sword-burials, as well as gold, ivory and glass in the case of the former and unusual sandstone and chalk pebbles in the latter. Grave C gives the impression of unusual wealth in many other ways, not least its inclusion of a ring-sword, a copper-alloy balance and fourteen Roman coin weights, and it is, therefore, of considerable interest that objects of several other materials (even ones as seemingly humble as regional stone) are inserted into the grave assemblage. That these

---

6 Arnold analysed the cemeteries of Bifrons; Sarre, Kingston; Gilton and Lyminge. It is unclear from his text however whether the derived percentages are a proportion of the total population or only the interred male graves. Härke's (1992b) study of seven Kentish cemeteries (i.e. Sarre, Broadstairs, Bekesbourne, Finglesham, Holborough, Lyminge and Polhill), totalling 937 individuals revealed only 153 weapon burials (i.e. 16.3%) suggesting that the former is probably the case.
burials are in prominent positions, respected by the other burials within their plots, merely accentuates this impression (cf. ibid., 146). By the later phases (AD 625-750), almost all male burials are restricted to objects comprising of iron and copper-alloy. The few objects of stone or ceramic are of such a limited nature, that their inclusion cannot be interpreted as part of any form of social competition.

A tentative hypothesis on the basis of these findings is that for a period during the late sixth/early seventh century, the DBU male community required additional media to signify wealth and status. During the late fifth and early sixth century, exceptional males such as those in Graves 22 or 94/b only required the social expression of sword-bearing to demonstrate élite status. By the late sixth/early seventh century by contrast, demographic imbalances required the need for additional means of social consensus by which to demonstrate wealth. As the social roles associated with sword-bearing were strictly conscribed by the community, and, during this phase, affected a large proportion of the male population, élite expression necessitated the use of further 'added value' media to signify exceptional social standing and social ambition. This may have been used to demonstrate the ability to access and consume objects made of raw materials outside the value regimes of other sword-bearing members. By the later phases of DBU (post-AD 625), sword-bearing had again become a more restricted social symbol, and the concomitant decrease in social competition decreased the need to employ such 'added value' forms of social expression. Taken together with the issues of artefact quality and diversity discussed above (7.3.2), this example suggests a dynamic relationship between social groups. Increasing ostentation in the burial practices of the sub- or lower élite triggers upper élite efforts at elaboration. This reflexive relationship between the upper élite and other classes meant that the value regimes were constantly being managed as modes of conduct in response to increasing levels of exchange. The valuation of wealth is therefore socially-mediated as a form of behaviour, influenced by concepts of gender, ethnicity and social identification, as well as economic aspects of accessibility and social legitimacy.

Similar issues of differential access to commodities are visible also in female grave assemblages. Rather than clear symbols of social legitimacy however, females are seen to have used raw material accessibility to demonstrate throughout the period (Fig. 7.7). During the AD 450-625 period, all of the graves identified by Evison as 'Rich' (ibid., 148), display an exceptional grave good composition. A proportion of these, forming c.25% of the total adult female population, are unusual in both the number of the artefacts interred
and the raw materials of which they are composed (Graves 92; 29; 1; 13; 14; 38). By the AD 625-750 phases, although the figure of exceptional individuals has dropped to around 15% of the female population, there is no significant drop in the quantity of raw materials gathered within their grave assemblages compared to those of the earlier periods. This observation reiterates the trend in wealth division identified by Evison away from deposition with brooches in the earlier phases to one without by the seventh century (ibid.). In contrast to the earlier pattern, graves such as DBU 157, 67, 134 and 129 do not appear markedly 'poorer' than their sixth-century counterparts in terms of the raw materials they are able to access, rather the objects used to demonstrate this wealth and the raw materials that were available, have changed.

Further examples of the allocative and selective processes underlining raw material consumption are offered by the application of multivariate approaches such as correspondence analysis. Such research (particularly prevalent in Danish scholarship) has superseded many of the earlier statistical models used in the analysis of grave-group compositions discussed above (7.3.1; e.g. Jørgensen 1992b; Ravn 1999; Jensen & Nielsen 1997). In such approaches, defined variables are reduced to (often two-dimensional) plots in order to observe abundance patterning within the data. Examination of the types of raw materials comprising grave-groups using this methodology emphasises the suggestion that many of the media of social signification were changing over the period. Presence of raw material variables from the DBU population clearly demonstrate temporal changes in the composition of objects placed in graves, recognisable in two discrete clusters along axis 2 (Fig. 7.8). By contrast, a scattergram produced for pre-AD600 grave-groups from six different cemeteries on Thanet, reveal a much more homogenous pattern of artefact and grave-group composition (Fig. 7.9). Repeated tests for similar spatially- and temporally-clustered groups of cemeteries substantiate these findings, arguing, on the one hand, for the application of common cultural-value regimes throughout the East Kent communities, and on the other, for differential patterns of consumption determined by differential access to allocative and authoritative resources.

7.3.5 Ants and valuables
Recent Game Theory and behavioural modelling offers an explanation of both Pareto's Law and the apparent pattern of Anglo-Saxon prosperity. By use of the 'ant model' Kirman (1993) and Ormerod (1998) have discussed the economic impact of social interactions. The entological experiment on which their findings are based demonstrated that a population of
ants, when provided with two identical choices, would group towards one choice in preference to another, occasionally switching to the other choice in a similarly uneven split. Although apparently random from the level of the individual, as the choice is always influenced by other agents, the system over an extended period of time condenses to regular uneven distributions. Agents (or ants) tend to spend more time unequally split, and this in turn lowers the propensity for individuals to change their behaviour (ibid., 8). This model has far-reaching implications. As individual behaviour is influenced by those around us, the solidity of social regimes is dependant on the forces of social conservatism. In a society where changes in behaviour are common, the split in the population between choices is more even. In societies where behaviour is more socially circumscribed alternatively, not only is the population split unevenly, it is less likely to change. This split stabilises at a ratio of 80:20 (Kirman 1993, 138 describing the experiment by Deneuboug et al. 1987).

This model offers explanatory force to the patterns defined by Pareto governing the social make-up of societies, and offers a bridging argument linking the behavioural effects of social valuations and this pattern of social inequality. Drawing on this model, a tendency of subdividing the behavioural characteristics of society (and their concomitant material culture) can be suggested. Within a relatively stable social hierarchy, c.80% will conform to a particular form of social behaviour, defined by their ‘choice’ in the ant model. As part of this group, following Pareto, c.10-20% of the total population will accumulate the greatest percentage of the total wealth, and monopolise the objects of differentiation (as defined by scarcity, exoticism or quality) and cultural position. As the valuation of objects follows the same rules of social behaviour, it is expected that material culture too, falls into the same patterns of subdivision. On this basis one can posit three general social tiers of self-organised value:

1. The presence of a product in around 80% of the population means there exists little differential access. People are socially expected to have the product, irrespective of issues of production and/or exchange. In the case of raw materials, product value will be defined on the basis of artefact type, size, diversity and quality.

2. Products utilised by 20% of the population imply relatively easy, though restricted, access. Following Donangelo & Sneppen’s (2000) model, these valuables are likely to be in high demand, and develop into global valuables. Raw materials equating with this social pattern have intrinsic value without being converted into artefacts.
3. Products utilised by less than 1% of the population constitute very rare luxury goods, restricted to the ‘inner elite’ as defined by Baines & Yoffee (1998; 2000) and subject to the conditions of high culture discussed by those authors.

7.4 ‘The Wealth of Nations’
7.4.1 GDP per capita in eastern Kent

Partially, the patterns discussed above could be argued to simply represent traditional status classifications based on the scaling of artefact types. Any recognised trends in the distribution of raw materials within burials are merely a statistical side-effect of artefacts used to demonstrate wealth and status. Temporal changes in the pattern of raw materials within graves suggest, however, that the importance of objects lay, at least in part, in the material composition of these artefacts. A comparative frequency curve of the percentage of interred communities in East Kent buried with specific raw materials illustrates the accepted material media by which people could articulate value, and by inference, accessibility to wealth (Fig. 7.10). This curve demonstrates that from the start of the Early Anglo-Saxon period, around 80% of the population in any given cemetery would have been interred with an iron object. A slow change through the seventh century only alters the demographic make-up of the iron-using population to around 60% (although it is increasingly rare in West Kent after AD 600) (Fig. 7.11a). As this trend demonstrates that iron was accessed by a large proportion of the population, it can be argued that, although iron made an inherently flexible medium for articulating value, it could not be used as a status marker in its own right. As iron only had a limited intrinsic value other than as a fashioned object, but was easily accessible by most of the population, the range of objects used to express wealth in this medium was correspondingly high. Equally, the skeumorphism of object-types made in iron demonstrate the manipulation of existent value regimes to demonstrate wealth within a cheaper medium than say, copper-alloy or silver. Certain issues related to functionality aside, the range of knife sizes within each of Evison’s types illustrates this point (1987, 113-4). Type 1 knives, from male weapon burials during the same period can weigh anywhere between 6g (Grave 137) and 46g (Grave 38) or have a length between 8 and 18cms. One is reminded of the Crocodile Dundee “That’s not a knife, ...now that’s a knife!” comment. Whilst certain variation can exist in the way that metal-workers fashioned any edged iron tool or weapon in order to save on the more expensive steel required for the cutting edge, the welding technologies applied to make these savings are much the same within specific artefact types (Tylecote & Gilmour 1986, 2-3). Indeed, following on from this observation, it is noteworthy that, as the basic
technology used to produce iron objects is similar, and presumably transferable to other metals (Hodges, H. 1989), the large number of such objects in Kent in comparison with any other material suggest an easily accessible (probably local) source.

At the other end of the scale, silver seems to have always been restricted to a less than the 20% minority of the inhumed population. It was considered a rare commodity throughout the period, often used only sparingly to decorate other objects, and is especially rare in mortuary contexts from c.AD 650 onwards. As the technology required for its manipulation in general was not dissimilar to that of other metals, this restricted use must be related to material scarcity. Indeed, much of the silver use in Early Anglo-Saxon objects, such as silver-wire inlay, gilding, as drawn-rivets or the decoration of silver objects themselves, could be argued to be overtly skilful metalworking. Despite the analogous technology to other industries, therefore, silver may have been used exclusively by specialist artisans to express their expertise. These restricted skills, requiring the knowledgeable deployment of a range of specialist tools, may in turn have lent value to the tools of metalworking themselves, as could be demonstrated by their inclusion in the Tattershall Thorpe, Li, burial (Hinton 2000). The difficulties involved in silver acquisition, combined with the specialist labour required for crafting finished objects, made silver a perfect platform for the claims of the powerful.

The trend surface of the percentage of the population deposited with silver demonstrates the common use of the medium for articulating wealth particularly on the Dover-Eastry axis of East Kent (Fig. 7.11c). Given issues of silver provenance already discussed (6.3), partial explanation for this pattern may lie in the differential access to imported commodities; and indeed, similar spatial patterns of consumption are recognised for other imported raw materials such as copper-alloy and gold (Figs. 7.11b & 7.11d). Whilst the implications of this phenomenon are discussed in greater detail in the following chapter, it is important to note the changing consumption trajectories of these different raw materials. In contrast to the deposition of copper-alloy and gold after c.675, that of silver became disproportionately low in the seventh century, even in the otherwise wealthy regions of the Dover-Eastry and East Thanet coasts. Whilst c.20% of these communities continued the active consumption of materials such as gold and copper-alloy after 675, less than 8% were deposited with silver, suggesting that this material in particular had become too valuable a

\[ In \text{ fact, a similar case of hyper-crafted objects can also be demonstrated by pattern-welded iron. Although the medium was accessible to all, the required specialist workmanship rendered such objects out of the range of normal value regimes. \]
commodity to be deposited in burials. As this period coincides with the inception of silver coinage in England, the drop in silver use throughout Kent comes as no great surprise. Beyond this interpretation, the particularly evident contrast between material consumption in traditionally wealthy regions such as Dover, Eastry or Thanet may provide some tentative evidence of the location of potential mints and/or market sites. In contrast to the so-called ‘productive sites’ of the period, which have been argued to be indicative of potential markets due to their high number of silver objects recorded there, the comparative absence of silver and high incidence of gold in deliberate funerary contexts, offers different evidence of regions of specialised consumption.

Between ubiquitous and high-status materials, copper-alloy appears to have changed in its importance over the course of the period. Before AD 600 almost half the buried population of East Kent was deposited with a copper-alloy object and the medium alone was not effectively used to demonstrate social inequalities (Fig. 7.10 & 7.11b). From c.AD 600 onwards, copper-alloy is used by far fewer people, reflecting the more restricted social use and probable access to the resource. Correspondingly, copper-alloy buckles of the sixth century are generally larger and subject to greater amounts of surface treatment than those of the seventh century. An explanation of this phenomenon, as was found also with iron objects, is to be repeated in the classic ‘added value’ domain of size and surface decoration. As social distinctions could not be demonstrated by the possession of copper-alloy alone during the earlier period, the additions of silver appliqués, chip-carving and gilding were used to demonstrate inter-group competition. Although this is also true to some extent of copper-alloy buckles of the seventh-century, material scarcity meant such emulation was restricted to both smaller in-group competition, and via smaller objects.

The combined impression of the demographic use of raw materials suggests, in line with other avenues of archaeological investigation (e.g. Shephard 1979), that the seventh century witnessed a hardening of social-group identification. Whereas during the sixth century, various media were manipulated to demonstrate intra- and inter-class diversity in a wide variety of different objects, by the seventh century, the use of copper-alloy, silver, gold, and other materials, had become the exclusive media of élite display. The curve of copper-alloy deposition is instructive in this regard. During the sixth century almost 50% of the populations of Finglesham, Mill Hill Deal, Bifrons, Broadstairs St. Peter’s, Sarre, Barfreston and Ozengell were interred with some copper-alloy. By AD 625, the percentage of the population accessing this material had halved. With the exception of Eastry Updown, the
people buried in exclusively seventh-century cemeteries such as the Beakesbournes, Kingston or Breach Downs had even less. Given the application of Pareto's Law to the identification of an elite in the patterns of consumption, this curve suggests that during this later period, copper-alloy had become a high-class quality signifier. With this in mind, the importance and relative wealth of the seventh-century communities of Dover Buckland, Eastry Updown and Broadstairs Bradstow School becomes apparent, as during these phases c.60-80% of the graves here contained copper-alloy objects. Although the significance of this pattern could be partially explained by the incomplete excavation of the latter two cemeteries, where it could be argued that only a high-status focus has been examined, the comparative importance of both the Dover and Eastry communities in particular may reflect a real socio-economic pattern.

7.4 Discussion

7.4.1 'Remains' data and the contribution to value

The discussion of the geographical socio-economic pattern of raw material use in Anglo-Saxon Kent could be regarded as falling under the remit of Härke's 'remains data'. It is argued that this theoretical bridging argument can offer a useful methodological springboard for inferring economic patterning from intentional mortuary contexts. Despite the 'intentionality' underlying the depositionary grave assemblages, certain concepts of exchange could nevertheless be seen to underlie the regional pattern of archaeological material distributions and, therefore, social dynamics. Although artefacts as objects can be construed within the conditions of social reproduction and identity discussed, temporal changes in the raw material composition of artefacts can arguably be better modelled within the spheres of consumption and accessibility. This is particularly true if we take the view that Anglo-Saxon burial is a form of multi-dimensional social expression. Given the interpretation of 'pagan burial' as a deliberate, symbolic expression of group identity, social differentiation is perhaps more critically approached at the level of community rather than the individual. Methodologically, such an approach is subject to its own shortcomings. Firstly, habitus is understood as historically and socially contingent. Concepts of community identity and symbolic expression in death are certainly regional- and potentially locale-specific. Secondly, the size of communities may effect the nature of identity expression. Nevertheless, this investigation takes account of some of the issues of community integration and reproduction in time-space. Certainly, the assumption that East Kent represents a fairly homogenous 'cultural community' is not a novel one. The archaeological traits common to this 'Jutish kingdom' are established enough to suggest at least common
forms of valuation across the geographical area. This suggestion appears to be borne out by the similar curves of raw material use through the period, discussed. Although the important multi-dimension characteristics of past valuation have been illustrated, it is argued that further information can be inferred from the patterning of raw materials in the kingdom. Despite the 'intentionality' of manipulated value regimes, this active material culture reflects 'unintentional' issues of accessibility and consumption when qualified temporally. The competitive employment of wealth symbols by the élite is enabled by drawing on an available stock of wealth items. As raw materials have been shown to be one important source of valuation, the spatio-temporal use of these raw materials is argued to reflect real issues of accessibility and comparative community wealth.

7.5.2 Conclusion

In summary, this chapter has sought to illustrate:

1. That artefacts in Anglo-Saxon Kent are to be understood within the context of mortuary deposition, formed by inter-cutting circumstances of archaeological formation, representing:
   a) the active and passive social identity of the interred both in life and death, including gender articulation, ethnicity and social status;
   b) economic concepts of accessibility and consumption of various goods and their use to express wealth (accumulation), social standing (differentiation) and cultural position (where possessions 'flag' certain cultural discourses);
   c) the props of a performance rite imbued with significance through the deliberate placement and selection of goods by the living wherein a distortion of reality can be articulated (cf. Leach 1964; Härke 1994);
   d) as a reflection of economic social structures governed by the behavioural relationships of society (e.g. the 'ant model' and 'Pareto's Law') and concomitant value articulation.

2. The operation of different value regimes as:
   a) contingent on social relationships, wherein different value regimes operate in different social contexts, reflecting the alienability and inalienability of objects and their socially-conscribed roles;
   b) sometimes defined on the basis of scarcity, originality, quality and diversity; properties that are in part defined by the raw materials themselves;
   c) politicised behavioural consensuses, aimed at the manipulation and expression of inequality.
8.1 Spatial patterns of wealth
8.1.1 Introduction

A number of contextual approaches (encountered in Chapter 2) have suggested that socio-economic development over the course of the Early to Middle Anglo-Saxon period must be understood within the framework of a particular institutional power setting. In the most clearly articulated example, that of the Early State Module, political structure is regarded as a distinct sphere with specialised roles and organisations. Beyond this model, evidence from a number of lines of enquiry discussed above has suggested, however, that the boundaries and characteristics of a system are shaped by a variety of social coalitions. Whilst centralising institutions, such as those of kingship, markets and trade, or the household, are undeniably located in spatial systems of interaction, the particular configuration of these units is dependent on how they coalesce, overlap or compete to form complex levels of socio-cultural integration (cf. Smith 1976b). One general basis for making locational claims such as these is that of perceived rationalising behaviour. Underlying a number of cases already discussed is an assumption that social institutions are the result of human decision-making made at the level of individual interactions. The negotiation of value regimes, for example, was seen to be dependent not only on cultural ritual-cosmological belief systems (which themselves reinforced a social coincidence of wants), but also on the level and distribution of resources available to different groups. As part of this dynamic, both the size of overall supply of a commodity and the social distribution of holdings, were seen as important criteria for articulating value claims, and in turn supported the sectional interests of local elites and entrepreneurs. As McIntosh (1999, 19) has succinctly stated: “although the potential for concentrating power exists wherever humans have wants, the struggle for dominion follows more than one path because the resources and forms of power also differ”. Whilst value may therefore be situationally defined and constantly renegotiated, locational models suggest that communication and accessibility underline many of the hierarchical structures of power and wealth in all early societies.

Archaeologically, concepts of rationalising behaviour, such as optimisation strategies, ‘least effort’ considerations and economic systems of retailer location and consumer behaviour are well established and continue to be important heuristic devices (cf. e.g. Trigger 1995; Shennan 2002). Despite many of the theoretical criticisms of certain functionalist interpretations of
trade (cf. 2.2.2.3), processualist models for the spatial distribution of exchange accordingly offer a useful point of departure, firstly, for the identification of artefact distribution patterning, and secondly, the examination of large-scale production and exchange systems. Although there are some necessary caveats for applying the phenomenon of exchange uncritically at the heart of wider inferences on the nature of socio-economic development, the geographical implications of exchange-system modelling outlined by authors such as Polanyi, Smith and Renfrew form an important basis for interpreting past behavioural patterns.

The object of this chapter is, therefore, to discuss some of the developments in social choice and economic welfare visible over the period AD 400-900 in Kent. As central to these changes, expanded treatment is given to the development of commodity-wealth and monetary exchange, as a means of illustrating the development of increasingly specialised forms of economic and political structure. In keeping with the objectives of this thesis, this endeavour is explored utilising two mutually-sustaining points of view. Firstly, an attempt is made to identify the spatial organisation of these socio-political hierarchies and to suggest a model for the spatial distribution of socio-economic activities. Secondly, an attempt is made to discuss the relationship between demonstrated wealth and the rights to subsistence-support (cf. Earle 1987, 69). Bazelmans' (1999), much cited, important analysis of Beowulf and the role assigned to objects and exchange-relations in providing linkages between retainers, élites and the supernatural is again of great significance in this respect. By way of contrast, the development of a monetary system in Kent over this period, suggests a quite different hierarchy of value, which amounts to the acceptance by society of "rules of play" governing their economic behaviour" (Shubik 1987, 4).

This chapter is formed by three distinct parts. Part 8.2 identifies spatial patterns of consumption in eastern Kent by applying some of the conclusions regarding the social condensation of wealth drawn in the previous chapter. In part 8.3, many of the identified features distinguishing value regimes and exchange mechanisms are re-examined with respect to the recognised development of monetary exchange over the period. Finally, in part 8.4, a number of the conclusions drawn are used to posit a model detailing a range of features comprising the transactional system of Anglo-Saxon Kent.
8.1.2 A short note on modelling: artefact and raw material distributions

The quantitative information collated in ASKED lends itself easily to various forms of spatial-regression analysis. Given many of the interpretative problems of diffusion mapping outlined by Hodder and Orton (1976, 155), it is important to note that the introduction of a sample variable, in the form of a single-grave assemblage, circumvents many of the problems of archaeological intangibles, by allowing for comparative analysis of artefact distributions on a like-by-like basis (see 6.1). Certainly issues regarding the pattern of fieldwork are unavoidable, and it could be argued that the regional approach adopted is biased towards the local sample of north-east Kent. Although issues regarding individual cases will be dealt with in greater detail below, it is argued on broad terms that, the pattern of the archaeological sample represents a meaningful dataset from which to extrapolate regional trends. Nevertheless, the derivation of trend surfaces by the IDW 12 method naturally creates surfaces of increasing precision in areas with a high density of imported point values. On this basis, surfaces for the fifth and eighth centuries are less reliable than those of the sixth and seventh centuries. Equally, trends extrapolated beyond the East Kent cemetery nucleus, particularly to the south-west of the county, become increasingly unreliable. The lack of data for the Faversham/Milton region and indeed Canterbury itself are telling, particularly as the circumstantial evidence suggests that these areas may well have formed similar focal points for imported and Kentish manufactured objects to that of the East coast region. Given the density of data in the latter area, it is important to note the effectiveness of the methodology. The close similarity of derived counts in neighbouring cemeteries indicates both the relatively homogenous Kentish depositionary processes and the reliability of the methodology in illuminating specific patterns. Barfreston (BAR) and Sibertswold (SIB) cemeteries are shown to have remarkably similar patterns of artefact deposition, and the same is consistently true of the Broadstairs Valetta House (BVH), Broadstairs Bradstow School (BBS), Broadstairs St Peter’s Tip (BSP) and OzengeU (OZE) group for example.

The distribution of constituent raw materials (either by count or weight) or provenanced artefacts throughout the cemeteries of East Kent, allows for a comparative discussion of the mobilisation and accessibility of these commodities. In Chapter 7 it was demonstrated that artefacts made from certain raw materials could be related to further issues of social inequality. Below individual, or local, ‘added value’ articulations, communities across the region were seen to utilise similar methods and artefacts in order to flag social rank. Given further issues of
Early- to Middle-Saxon exchange mechanisms, discussed in Chapter 2, these broader distribution patterns can also be interpreted with respect to models of economic redistribution and mobilisation. Whilst the application of Pareto’s Law has provided evidence of possible ‘wealthy’ communities, the interpretation of trend-surfaces of polynomial regression, both of artefacts and raw materials, can be used to identify spheres of commodity accessibility and exchange methods.

8.1.3 Geographical models of commercialisation

The interpretation of diffusion maps has a clear precedent in archaeological literature, and it is of some importance to briefly summarise some of the geographical and archaeological implications of this research.

The importance of Carol Smith’s (1976a) thesis on regional economic systems to the interpretations outlined by Hodges (1982) becomes abundantly clear when presented with the polynomial best-fit regression models of Early Anglo-Saxon artefacts in East Kent. Rather than smooth regression surfaces, the interpolated models present a number of local anomalies, not easily explainable by two-dimensional distance-decay models (e.g. Renfrew 1975, 1977). In keeping with such models, however, it is argued that repetitive areas of highest density can be related to specific behavioural patterns. Additionally, partial simplification of the pattern is possible through consideration of the communication network outlined in Chapter 4. Following on from the argument of restricted movement suggested earlier, it is hypothesised that the movement of commodities themselves, flowed through similar established geographical patterns. Further evidence would seem to support such a thesis. Even in disarticulated periodic market systems, a number of empirical studies showed regional organisation in which hierarchical central places were interrelated along modal networks (Smith 1976a, 26). Following Stine (1962), Smith argued that within predominantly agrarian economies traders needed to be mobile in order to fulfil the minimum trading threshold, or, in other words, periodicy occurs when the maximum demand range is lower than the minimum range of goods traders need to offer to survive. Periodic markets, fairs and other specialised centres by their very nature are tied, therefore, to trader mobility. Sedentary commercialised settlements, or type B *emporia* in Hodges’ formulation, could only occur when the consumer range increased enough to support permanent traders. These sites, Hodges argues (1982, 53) are by their very nature expected to occupy key nodal positions within a region; straddling
environmental zones, major routeways and frontiers in order to maximise the demand catchment-area. Straight economic models of such economic central-place hinterlands show a decrease in demand density with increasing distance from the commercial centre. Utilising the concept of trading threshold defined by Stine (1962), Plattner has outlined three key regions comprising this trading hinterland (1976). Zones defined by the combination of transport costs from a commercial centre, the population density, and the level of commercialisation can be broken into three groups of trading environments (ibid., 79-80). Close to markets, high-demand density and transport efficiency allow for continuous commercial activity. As the distance from the market increases, the zone of viable commerce is determined by a ratio between the periodic trader's minimum daily income threshold and transport costs. Finally, a zone is defined, where demand falls below the trading threshold, and transportation costs are so expensive, that even itinerant trade cannot be sustained.

At the most superficial level, this formulation offers an important addition to the model of specialised trading suggested by Hodges. Itinerant trading, in this view, runs parallel to increased commercialisation. Rather than a sedentary hierarchy of markets, itinerant peddlers operate within, and thereby create, a frontier zone of periodic trading, tied to centres of continuous specialised trade. Although periodic markets or fairs of Hodge's type A emporia can be accommodated within this second zone of itinerant trade, this system is dominated by trade in inelastic goods, for which demand is either continuous or predictable by an annual agricultural cycle.

The identification of zones of differential market accessibility, running parallel with consumer provisioning strategies, can be investigated from the basis of the distributional method discussed above (2.2.4). Given that economic interaction by this definition has a spatial variable, the comparative wealth of individual communities is expected to vary regionally. Gateway communities of the type hypothesised by Hodges, or élite residences should demonstrate markedly different patterns of consumption and access to wealth markers than contemporary productive settlements. As part of this phenomenon, there should also be some evidence of those cultural features associated with increasing specialisation, such as production, provisioning and distribution. Additionally, the model of zones of itinerant trade predicts that there should be regional areas of market accessibility associated with centres of commercialisation. Because these markets tend to be located at focal nodes of communication,
where the costs of transference are minimised, the associated zone of itinerant trade is predicted along these primary transportation arteries where connectivity with the commercial zone can be maintained.

8.2. Spatial patterns of wealth in Kent

8.2.1 Introduction
In the following section a number of spatial patterns are discussed, comparing the differential consumption of artefacts of varying provenance by geographically-situated communities. Given issues of valuation raised in the previous chapter, deposition is equated with access to goods. Within this view, only in the case of designated ‘Kentish’ artefacts, could a claim be made for equating access with areas of production. A number of caveats remain in uncritically accepting this belief however. Issues of the symbolic nature of mortuary practice already discussed aside, élites of this period are by nature characterised by itinerance, and their final place of burial may bear little relation to the social life of interred objects. It was argued above (7.3) that the comparative wealth of communities could nevertheless be regarded as evidence of contrasting consumption. This view is reinforced by trend-surfaces plotting the individual consumption of total regional wealth (Fig. 8.1). Here, a close correlation is witnessed between the consumption of total imports and locally-sourced goods per capita, both temporally and geographically. This pattern can be cited as evidence that access to and control of wealth items can be linked with the ostentatious consumption of locally-produced commodities. The economic basis of this condensation of wealth requires further explanation, best illustrated by a number of mutually-reinforcing case-studies dealing both with micro-economic examples and discrete trends. Discussion of these case-studies reveals a geographical dynamic underlying élite power. In the final section (8.4), this Early Anglo-Saxon topography of consumption is compared with the Middle Anglo-Saxon pattern of coin finds, in order to posit some interpretations regarding the changing role of exchange and the relationship with political finance and control.

8.2.2 General patterns of artefact provenance and raw material regression

8.2.2.1 The east/west divide
Despite certain inadequacies of the derived trend-surfaces with regard to the settlements of the Swale, a comparison between grave assemblages of East and West Kent in the study region provides important evidence of more general behavioural patterns (Figs. 8.2a-d). For many
phases, in most derived lines of analysis, clear differences exist in the form by which Anglo-Saxon wealth, identity and status are expressed between the regions. Given the lack of cemetery samples for much of the central region of the study area, many of the spatial trends are exaggerated, but nevertheless, are reflective of broader trends. This apparent east-west divide in material consumption offers important evidence in support of the cultural, political and ethnic partition of East and West Kent, suggested by a number of lines of enquiry (1.1.2.1). Of the cemeteries of the West, only the community of Chatham Lines (CHL), overlooking Rochester, displays any of the characteristic levels of artefacts, or general raw-material wealth, common to East Kent populations. So unusual is this community in contrast to cemeteries of the Derwent Valley, in all forms of artefacts deposition in fact, that one can reasonably infer its importance within wider socio-political and socio-economic spheres, perhaps tied to early central-place functions.

The division between East and West is most acutely recognised during the initial AD 450-525 phase (Figs. 8.1; 8.2a-d). Despite moderate wealth consumption in the CHL community during this period, the trend surfaces of percentage of total artefacts per person visibly demonstrate the regionality of consumption patterns. As this period is characterised by an extremely heterogeneous pattern of grave deposition, where wealth inequalities are most marked by high and low concentrations of ostentatious consumption, the poverty of the western communities is highly exaggerated. A similar picture is visible in the percentage of interred populations buried with artefacts made from the primary metals: iron, copper-alloy, silver and gold (Figs. 7.11a-d). In all regression models, CHL features as a wealthy community, bucking the general East-West fall-off in consumption. On the basis of this evidence, it is difficult not to draw the conclusion that the fifth-and sixth-century communities of the Rochester environs retained some form of restricted access to wealth and power, a position that could only have been reinforced during the seventh century with the foundation of the new cathedral inside the walls of Hrofecaestir in AD 604. Although the near desertion of the Roman town until the seventh century is implied from documentary sources (Tatton-Brown 1984, 14) it seems nonetheless reasonable to assume that the de facto occupants of Rochester and its immediate hinterland acted as an important focus of luxury exchange throughout the period. That this role may have been more political than economic is suggested by the distribution of Kentish artefacts amongst the interred communities. Apart from the initial AD 450-525 phase, where the CHL community displays high numbers of Kentish and Anglo-Saxon artefacts, Rochester, in
keeping with the other West Kent cemeteries in the study area, shows appreciably smaller
counts of local artefacts per population than contemporary communities elsewhere.
Hypothetically, given the historical context of relations between East and West Kent, this
differentiation of specific interred communities, could be interpreted as evidence of politicised
restrictions on access to commodities and symbols of wealth, possibly tied to organisational
hierarchies of power. Furthermore, given the lack of wealth visible in the community of
Rochester Watts Avenue (RWA) itself, c. 2km to the west, CHL may represent a higher status
group living adjacent to the Roman settlement, perhaps analogous to the Sturry/Canterbury
divide already discussed (5.2.4).

8.2.2.2 Environmental divisions?
In part 7.3.4 evidence was sited demonstrating some of the allocative and selective processes
underlying raw material consumption by communities occupying different pays or agricultural
niches. Trend-surfaces reveal a number of further East Kent examples demonstrating similar
contrasting patterns of deposition between related cemeteries. Geographically, the BIF, BKB
and HOW communities of the Nailbourne Valley are only around 2km away from those of
KGD, BAD and BSB, in the adjacent parishes and environmental zone. Taken as separate
groups, both reveal a coherent range and volume of artefacts. During the short period of
overlap, in the late sixth and early seventh century, when interment is taking place within both
areas, the Upland communities consistently reveal a dearth of comparable material to those of
the Lowland river valley; a phenomenon not wholly explainable by chronological changes in
deposition.

Similar differential access to commodities by communities is in evidence through a comparison
of the range and scale of deposition in cemeteries further to the east. Markedly greater levels of
consumption are witnessed during the sixth century by those communities occupying the
Downland margins along the Deal-Dover coast, as represented in particular by the cemeteries
of DBU and MHD. Compared to contemporary inland communities such as BAR, SIB or
even FIG, and despite similar geographical access by the latter to maritime resources via
Meateflot, the overall supply of 'Kentish' and 'Imported' artefacts (Fig. 8.1) and raw counts of
these artefacts per capita (Fig. 8.2c) is much higher in the Deal-Dover cemeteries. Although by
the seventh century, patterns of deposition at EUP and FIG parallel those at DBU, the
polarisation of wealth continues to favour communities occupying liminal positions at the
interface of contrasting pays. A graph of the average weight of raw materials per interred individual from EUP and MHD, c.4km to the southeast, demonstrates some of these differences (Fig. 8.3). Changes in the weight of silver and copper-alloy deposited over the later sixth century reveal a distinct trend continued beyond the final phase of MHD interment by the first burials of EUP. This would seem to argue for a continuity of both the transactional system and social use of these raw materials by both communities. Plots of the average weight of iron and gold interred alternatively suggest more restricted forms of consumption. Whilst it is unlikely, given the proximity of the two communities, that these commodities meant different things to the local populations, it is probable that different transactional systems underlined their mobilisation. The range of raw materials comprising cemetery assemblages offers a similar case. Correspondence analysis of the seventh-century grave inventories of the Downland cemeteries of BAR and SIB with liminal settlements such as FIG and DBU and Foothills communities of EUP and GIL, reveal a general separation in the range of raw materials consumed (Fig. 8.4)

Whilst little overlap exists between many neighbouring cross-pays communities, such evidence as there is, appears to indicate differential forms of consumption operating between communities in different environmental zones. Comparison of Fig. 8.3 with graphs produced for the average weight of primary metals interred with individuals in neighbouring communities sharing the same pays, are telling. BSP and BBS are less than 3km apart, occupying chalk spurs overlooking the coastal margins of Thanet (Fig. 8.5). The average weight of copper-alloy, iron and silver interred with burials from both cemeteries reveal a remarkably similar pattern of deposition, indicating likely similar provisioning strategies. The implications of this pattern could be taken as evidence of an important dynamic. Whilst the rite of burial, the constitution of individuals in death and the symbols of local power take a number of forms throughout the region, the ‘remains’ evidence of a community as a whole may be related to specific micro-economic phenomena of access and production. This recognition, offers important proof of divisions of labour and power in the landscape.

8.2.2.3 Randomness in flux: AD 450-525

In all of the produced trend surfaces, the period 450-525 reveals a more heterogeneous pattern of artefact deposition than is evidenced in later phases, particularly in terms of the total number of artefacts interred per capita (Fig. 8.6). Although the generated trend surfaces reveal a
general coincidence with areas of sixth and seventh century dense consumption, the raw counts of total artefacts per individual display a wider range from one cemetery to the next. Graphically, this trend is visible in the broad spectrum of colours produced for respective regression models (Fig. 8.1). During the initial phase, the individual mean consumption of imported artefacts ranges from as much as 0.99 and 0.19 at sites such as MHD and GIL respectively, to as little as 0.22 at RWA and 0.33 at LYM. By the phases of the seventh and early eighth centuries, communities reveal a far more homogenous pattern of individual consumption, all ranging between 0.0 and 0.6 imports per capita, and this pattern is paralleled by that of artefacts from other provenances.

Patterns of changing inter-cemetery deposition provide a useful counter-point to changes visible from intra-cemetery assemblages. In contrast to evidence from individual cemeteries, which have been interpreted as demonstrating increasing social stratification over the period (cf. Shephard 1979), the general pattern of deposition reveals the increasing homogenisation of community interment. Given that wealth objects are used both to define élite interests and enable the élite to define the status of others, this temporal pattern of homogenising deposition could be taken as evidence of the increasing crystallisation of social statuses at a regional level. By contrast, during the initial phase of ‘pagan’ burial, the dynamics of stratification appear to have been negotiated at a more local level, resulting in the wider range and number of artefacts used to signify wealth between communities. In this respect, the differences between the communities of CHL and RWA in the Medway estuary have already been cited.

8.2.2.4 The question of Canterbury

With no cemetery material from Canterbury or its immediate environs with which to compare the density of regional artefact consumption, clear problems exist in assessing the existence of hypothesised central-place functions or hinterland regression (though see the distribution of coins, 8.3.5 below). Nevertheless, given certain assumptions regarding the importance of communities in Canterbury and its immediate environs discussed above (5.2.4), some expectations could be forwarded regarding the influence the settlement has on the trend surfaces of respective artefacts. A number of null hypotheses could be advanced:
1) Cemeteries closer to Canterbury should be visible as **foci** for consumption, as these communities have privileged access to élite-sponsored craft specialisation and exchange at Fordwich or Canterbury itself.

2) Cemeteries closer to Canterbury should reveal evidence of limited consumption, as local communities are peripheralised by central-place mobilisation and élite exploitation.

An examination of the pattern of consumption in East Kent reveals contrasting evidence supporting both hypotheses. From AD 450-675, the individuals from the cemeteries of HOW, BKB and BIF are consistently interred with higher number of 'Anglo-Saxon', 'Curated' and 'Imported' goods than most other communities in Kent. Given the advanced hypotheses, the higher density of these traded commodities may well be seen with respect to élite exchange targeted at the royal vill of Sturry and the ecclesiastical communities of Canterbury, possibly via the **emporium** of Fordwich. Importantly however, this pattern of dense consumption is not recognised in the regression models of 'Kentish' artefacts, thereby indicating the differential mobilisation of locally-produced goods to those of foreign origin during this period. After AD 675, the consumption of all goods drops in the Canterbury environs in line with patterns of wealth throughout most of Kent. Given the continuing importance of the area in terms of contemporary coin finds, however (see below), this lack of visible funerary consumption must be seen as reflecting changes in mortuary practice.

### 8.2.3 Raw materials, Pareto's Law and the classification of communities

Pareto's Law of total income distribution, identified in Chapter 7 (7.3.4), suggested that relative community wealth could be identified through the relationship between material prosperity and social heterogeneity. As the monopoly of a commodity by the social élite defined its wider social value, a comparison can be drawn between locales where an object had an intrinsic value and others where its ubiquity rendered it an unsuitable medium for value articulation. Thus communities in which the majority of the population displayed the consumption of certain commodities (i.e. over 20%) could be directly related to material accessibility.

In part 7.4.1, a comparison of trend surfaces showing the consumption of metal commodities by percentages of local populations, identified the changing role of certain materials in value articulation. This was argued to be directly related to differential access to commodities consisting of particular raw materials. Thus, whilst, little spatial differentiation was seen to exist between communities in the acquisition and use of iron objects throughout the period,
particular cemeteries revealed above-average densities in copper-alloy, silver or gold use. Accordingly, iron as a raw material, was interpreted as a low-value commodity, accessible to most communities, with relatively equal distribution throughout the society of East Kent. Regression models produced for other material commodities during several phases, by contrast, demonstrated a number of changes in the acquisition of such objects and identified communities of unequal accessibility.

An immediate impression gained from these regression models, is the stark contrast between copper-alloy, silver and gold consumption prior to and after AD 600. Although the distribution pattern for both periods is roughly similar, with particular conspicuous consumption visible amongst the communities of the eastern and northern coasts (including a particular dense cluster in the Canterbury environs), the sharp decline after AD 600 in the deposition of these goods suggests a changing role in the mobilisation of these objects. This pattern is closely paralleled by, and indeed a partial product of, the consumption of imported artefacts over the same period.

Chris Loveluck's analysis of the distribution of iron, copper-alloy, silver and imported objects amongst interred communities 'On Driffield' provides a useful comparison to consumption in Kent (1996). In the East Yorkshire sample, it was shown that certain inland communities, such as those of the Garton-Elmswell area, were unusually rich in iron and silver artefacts, though poor in amber, rock crystal and jet beads when compared with other cemeteries in the region. This was argued to represent evidence for the easy availability of iron ore in the area and the possibly restricted role imported artefacts played in demonstrating wealth and status (ibid., 46). Similar local responses are apparent in the Kentish dataset, as seen through a comparison of the percentage of the population from each cemetery buried with objects made from iron, copper-alloy or silver. Over the entire period, a greater percentage of the total Foothill population is interred with copper-alloy or silver compared with populations of the Holmesdale or Downland pays. Pre-AD 600, burials on the Downs do reveal a greater social distribution of iron than more coastal communities, however, re-emphasising the likely differential mobilisation of this commodity to those of probable foreign provenance. Again AD 600 marks a significant change in deposition though, with a shift to increased iron consumption by a greater proportion of the Foothill populations, particularly after AD 675. Unfortunately, Loveluck made no attempt to add a temporal dimension to his analysis, thereby
making any direct comparison impossible. Nevertheless, the broad coincidence of two separate forms of commodity distribution in both regions may be significant. Whilst there is no geographical basis for supposing a direct correlation between ubiquitous consumption and the production or control of iron, as was argued in the Yorkshire example, the differential transactional orders underlying raw material mobilisation do suggest a similar balance of payments operating between coastal and inland communities in Kent. That all resources are monopolised by coastal groups after AD 600, in turn suggests the possible development of hierarchical exchange systems centred on important Foothill communities.

8.2.4 A case-study: the Isle of Thanet

The Isle of Thanet presents an important case from which to interpret other patterns within the dataset. In virtually all phases, and within every regression model, a division is recognisable in the percentage of the population able to access commodities of various materials between the communities of West (as represented by the cemeteries of Sarre - SAR, Monkton - MKN, Minster Mount Pleasant - MMP-2) and East Thanet (BSP, BBS and OZE). In contrast to the accessibility of gold, the number of people interred with copper-alloy, iron and silver throughout the period are concentrated to the east of the island. This can generally be paralleled by the density of imported, Anglo-Saxon and locally-provenanced artefacts over the same period. Despite the relative demographic stability of the population of the island, with overt consumption focused away from the routeway of the Wantsum, after AD 600 the pattern of imported goods in particular, but also to a lesser degree Kentish artefacts, swings to the west of Thanet. Given the hypothesised importance of Sarre in inter-regional trading connections, it is of great interest that the concentration of wealthy communities is not located nearer this site from an earlier date. Indeed, a comparison with the Dover Buckland community (DBU), also usually associated with early commercial activity, reveals a distinctly different pattern. Dover is visible as a community of highest density consumption per capita in almost all commodities, and during all phases, thereby fulfilling many of the criteria predicted of a zone of commercialisation. A partial explanation of the divergence between the communities could be offered by the differential excavation conditions of the two sites, and the possibility that the recorded inventory of Sarre burials represents an incomplete catalogue of artefacts. The close correlation between the consumption profile of the cemetery populations of neighbouring SAR, MKN and MMP-2, however, suggests instead that the
grave-goods listed by Brent are relatively complete. From this evidence, it could be postulated that the community of Sarre did not engage in extra-economic activity until after AD 600.

An alternative, more speculative hypothesis can be presented. Given the high density of wealth in the eastern Thanet communities during this period, there seems little doubt that a certain influx of commodities sustained social inequalities from the earliest phases of settlement. Geographically, Sarre remains the strongest candidate for a gateway to such inter-regional exchange. Located opposite the junction of the Wantsum and Stour at a point of tidal collision, the shallower, steadier waters at this point and the narrow crossing to mainland Kent made it one of the likeliest entry points to the island. In keeping, the high density of male weapon-burials interred at Sarre also suggest some form of specialised community; a common interpretation suggesting that part of the interred community represents the port garrison of the king's reeve, who is attested to in later documentary sources (Chadwick-Hawkes 1987, 391; 1970, 191-2). Accordingly, the differences between SAR and DBU may be the result of two distinct forms of emporia foundation. Whilst Dover operated as a central-place with a number of high-order functions, including a likely ecclesiastical and mercantile presence from at least the seventh century (5.2.4), Sarre may well have functioned within the specific context of specialised trading, promulgated by and profiting a non-resident élite (i.e. a Hodges Type A emporium - 2.2.2.2).

8.2.5 Discussion I: Comparative accessibility of objects between communities

Although the above comparison of trend surfaces consistently identifies specific areas of economic consumption, the picture determined by an analysis of the percentage of the total number of artefacts found in Kent divided per individual is a useful indicator in predicting exceptional communities within these zones (Fig. 8.1). As this measure is seen with respect to the total wealth of the region, it is perhaps most indicative of areas of extraordinary consumption. Correspondingly, it is only during the first AD 450-525 phase that a large number of peaks and troughs in the produced trend-surface bear witness to an excessively uneven distribution of wealth. From AD 525 onwards imported and local artefacts are seen to be distributed more evenly amongst individuals in general, and commonly fall into the same geographic zones of wealth in particular. The Deal-Dover coastal region is again seen as the focus of most individual wealth, both in local and foreign artefacts, but significantly, this computation identifies a marked divergence in the fall-off pattern of the respective hinterlands.
Prior to AD 600, areas showing the polarisation of individual wealth in Kentish artefacts correspond roughly with those rich in imported goods. Individuals in the communities of Thanet and the Dover-Deal coastline, and the routes to Canterbury along the Stour and Margary 1a are seen to have been interred with higher proportions of artefacts than their southern and western counterparts. Significantly, this general pattern has a small number of exceptions, foreshadowing the trends of the seventh century. Again, an important distinction can be drawn between the way communities of West and East Kent expressed wealth and status, with individuals in the former displaying consistently impoverished assemblages. In marked contrast to its neighbours however, the community of CHL is striking in the high number of imported artefacts interred from AD 525 onwards, particularly as this wealth is not paralleled by the inclusion of Kentish-provenanced artefacts. Perhaps of greater significance, the community of Lyminge (LYM) is recognised as a significant focus of Kentish material throughout the period, despite the dearth of imported commodities here and in neighbouring Stowting (SWT) and Folkestone Dover Hill (FDH). In fact, this pattern of uneven wealth is most pronounced during the AD 600-675 phase. Here a contrast is drawn between the coastal region of the north and eastern coasts where the significant proportion of imported goods is distributed amongst local communities, and the inland settlements of LYM, Crundale (CRD) and SWT where the high density of interred local and curated goods suggest apparent different modes of wealth expression.

When this pattern is compared with the aforementioned use of primary metals in burials, it becomes clear that the use of copper-alloy and silver in burial after AD 600 becomes primarily restricted to coastal communities. The continued high use of iron artefacts by all East Kent groups on the other hand reflects the easy availability of this commodity for the expression of wealth and status. Given the high density of locally-produced artefacts inland of coastal settlement, it is tempting to interpret this pattern as evidence of extensive seventh-century Kentish iron-working. As all East Kent communities were able to access iron objects, whilst other primary-metal commodities had a more restricted distribution, it is reasonable to assume that this pattern reflects the local availability of iron-ore sources in the Weald and concomitant specialist skilled labour. The pattern of copper-alloy objects by contrast is seen to move from relatively common use as status/wealth-markers, to more restricted modes of expression during the seventh century (cf. 7.4.1). The division between coastal and inland community forms of value articulation suggest that the source of primary-metals, other than iron, in the
seventh century was through inter-regional exchange. Although this observation is not surprising with respect to silver and gold artefacts, the implication for the derivation of copper-alloy in Anglo-Saxon Kent is important. Given issues of provenance identified through the scientific sourcing of copper-alloy (6.3) it is of some significance that the distribution of the raw material alters significantly c.AD 600. Prior to this date, the distribution of the commodity throughout East Kent suggests little by way of differential accessibility; an observation that can reasonably be tied to probable local sources of scrap metal. Reworked older Anglo-Saxon, Continental Germanic and curated Roman artefacts are not expected to vary the distributional pattern of consumption. The increasing scarcity of the raw material after AD 600, identified from artefactual evidence (7.4.1), suggests however, that these original sources of scrap metal may have become sufficiently depleted so as to remove them from earlier, more common, forms of display. That copper-alloy continues to be interred after AD 600 in some coastal communities indicates continued access to the raw material by these particular populations.

In this regard, Catherine Mortimer’s study of metal compounds suggested possible differential sources of copper-alloy for Kent and the rest of Anglo-Saxon England (1990, 375). Although her results were tentatively based on a small sub-sample of early Kentish cruciform brooches, scientific analysis of the alloys employed showed higher concentrations of zinc and lead than contemporary Anglian artefacts in particular. As these unusual alloying elements find closest parallels in Frisian contexts, Mortimer suggested that Kent may have been able to access alternative sources of copper-alloy from the Low Countries (ibid., 393-7). What is unclear is whether this pattern represents the continued supply of copper-alloy as scrap metal from Frisia, or whether this phenomenon is an artefact of the alternative migration routes of Jutish and Anglian settlers (cf Welch pers. comm. 2001). The increasingly coastal distribution of copper-alloy artefacts in the seventh century appear to support the former, rather than the latter, suggestion. Despite the striking coincidence between copper-alloy, gold and silver use after AD 600 however, the similar spatial density of iron, suggest that this pattern may not be entirely due to the importance played by inter-regional trade and may indeed be more convincingly interpreted with respect to the development of increasingly hierarchical transactional structures.

Further evidence that behavioural patterns of value assessment were in part dependent on available media of expression is offered by the distribution of ‘curated’ and ‘Anglo-Saxon’
artefacts in burials in Kent. Whilst the important link between certain foreign goods and value articulation can be recognised spatially as a zone of influence centred on the Dover and Wantsum coasts, the pattern of deposition of these objects is more complex. During the fifth and sixth centuries, curated objects appear to have been used particularly by communities either close to the centres of former Roman occupation, or far from the major coastal routes. Thus the cemeteries of DBU (Dover), CHL (Roman buildings near Rochester), GIL (the Saxon Shore fort of Richborough) and inland sites such as SWT and CRD all demonstrate exceptional densities of curated-artefact deposition. Certainly some of these communities would have been extremely aware of the Romano-British precedent given their proximity to the former administrative, economic, and population centres. As such, the importance of Roman trinkets potentially assumed greater significance as social identifiers. Significantly, during the seventh century, such links with the past appear to have lessened in importance within most of the coastal communities, although they continued to be of importance to populations inland as at SWT and CRD. As these communities were consistently impoverished in terms of imported or other Anglo-Saxon artefacts over the same period, this pattern suggests forms of local expression, wherein alternate media of value assumed greater significance. Hypothetically, it could be argued that such inland populations were less likely to be influenced by foreign contact; a suggestion which finds some credence in the deposition of 'Anglo-Saxon' artefacts over the same period. More speculatively, this pattern reflects continued links with a Romano-British past, either in terms of ancestral association (real or assumed) or actual ethnic populations.

8.2.6 Artefact provenance distributions and the question of emporia

The division of artefacts into classes of inferred provenance allows for the comparative analysis of differing modes of commodity mobilisation. Trend surfaces derived from the amount of foreign or local objects within cemeteries, and the percentage of the interred population with such goods, demonstrate the existence of wealthy coastal communities, particularly along the Wantsum and Dover coasts. Inland redistribution of imported goods, by contrast, focuses mainly along the Dover-Canterbury (Margary 1a), and Dover-Ash (Margary 100) roads, identified already as major routeways from the distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries. To the south and west of the kingdom, a noticeable fall-off in the amount of both imported and locally-provenanced material further demonstrates the polarisation of wealth along the Thames estuary-Continental axis.
Chadwick-Hawkes (1969, 191; 1982, 72, 76) has suggested that the later sixth century witnessed increasing royal control over foreign exchange contacts from the basis of inferred military components in the communities of Sarre and Dover, though Fordwich could be added to the list given further lines of evidence discussed above (5.2.4). As it is expected that both trans-shipment areas and *emporia* would allow for local communities to access more freely traded commodities for wealth valuations, it is argued that trend surfaces may indicate the geographical entry-points into the region. Regression models of imported objects of both Continental and Anglo-Saxon provenance offer some evidence supporting this suggestion. Dover and its hinterland, comprising the communities of the Deal and Eastry regions, are consistently large consumers of non-local objects throughout the period; a pattern that is also reflected in the previously discussed hinterland communities of Canterbury. In contrast, whilst the communities of Thanet visibly access similar amounts of foreign goods, the local consumption of these objects does not appear to pre-eminence the Sarre community before AD 600. A similar pattern is hinted at for mainland Kent, where regression models of ‘Imported’ and ‘Anglo-Saxon’ objects initially favour a Dover entry-point, but after AD 600 move to enclose the mouth of the Wantsum Channel, perhaps indicating Sandwich as an emergent *emporium*.

Importantly, communities recognised as important consumers of foreign valuables, do not always correlate with those accessing high numbers of locally-produced objects. Despite the fact that the total wealth *per capita* in both foreign and Kentish objects is concentrated within the coastal margins, a number of communities can be identified centres of local consumption. This pattern is most clearly pronounced in the later sixth century, when in particular the Downland cemeteries display conspicuous levels of Kentish artefacts, but is also in evidence into the seventh century with high numbers of local objects buried with the communities of LYM and SWT. Only in the final AD 675-750 phase is a clear correspondence visible between important centres of consumption in both local and foreign objects, with privileged access to both sources of wealth visible in the communities of the Sandwich and Dover hinterlands.

The recognition of these two discrete forms of commodity distribution argues for a division in forms of economic mobilisation. Prior to AD 675, non-egalitarian relationships appear to have been signified through a variety of value media. In coastal regions, the procurement and
display of foreign objects played an important role in status negotiation. Differential access to these objects by inland communities pre-eminenced the use of local objects in articulating social inequalities. The common use of 'Curated' artefacts in these same inland areas as a means of signifying value indicates both their likely local origin as well as their local importance in social valuation. As it was argued in chapter 7 that similar forms of valuation existed throughout Anglo-Saxon society, one could speculate that local Downland élites had a similar interest in acquiring objects of value as their coastal neighbours. That Kentish-wealth objects were utilised to communicate inland social ambition argues on the one hand that their mobilisation was not as restricted as comparable foreign-wealth objects. On the other hand, this differential access to objects could be taken as evidence arguing against an interpretation linking centres of specialised exchange with centres of production in this pre-AD 675 phases. Conversely, after this date, the recognised centralisation of both local and foreign-object consumption could be cited as evidence of increasingly specialised procurement and distribution of wealth. Such centralisation of transactional systems is dependant on the development of specific hierarchies of exchange. Before this observation can be elaborated further therefore, some attention must be given to the development of contemporary processes of exchange themselves, in particular the expansion of monetary exchange.

8.3 Case Study: Landscapes of commerce and the media of exchange

8.3.1 Introduction

Anglo-Saxon archaeologists and numismatists have long been aware of the distinction between gift and commodity exchange as economic phenomena. In the wake of Hodges' thesis of Anglo-Saxon commoditisation, much emphasis has been placed on the evolutionary phase of monetary expansion. While Early Anglo-Saxon society could be characterised as bound by personal obligations maintained by reciprocity, Late Anglo-Saxon society had sufficiently abstracted social labour that commodity transfer was relegated to profit economy (e.g. Hodges 1989, 198-9). Following Hart's (1983) evolutionary scheme, a pivotal point in this trajectory is the institution of markets and pure exchange values, as demonstrated by monetary exchange. Thus a contrast could be drawn between gift economies, where fixed 'equivalencies' linked objects of exchange to social values, and profit economies, where the fluctuating price of commodities is the result of market principles (cf. Gregory 1982; Bloch & Parry 1989 etc.). Given some of the issues of value discussed in the previous chapter, this alienation of basic value, commensurable as it is with social construction, needs further investigation. If one
accepts the dichotomy between monetary and non-monetary economies (or societies), Hart's economic chronology of commoditisation, describes a number of phenomena which can also be related to social ideas, ethics and frameworks. Certain evidence, hinted at in the last chapter, suggests however, that the propagation of the substantivist/formalist debate in this way, may disguise the existence of more subtle co-existing 'transactional orders' (cf. Bloch & Parry 1989). In a number of the ethnographic examples compiled by Bloch and Parry, not only does money mean different things in different exchanges, but it can often undergo transformative processes between one state and the next (ibid., 19-30). In the following section, it is argued that these states of money are in fact geographically bounded, due in part to the issues of commercialisation already discussed (8.1.3). In keeping, this part of the chapter needs to, firstly, outline the archaeological evidence for commoditisation in Kent, and the social implications this concept establishes. A focus on monetary expansion offers the most useful way to highlight these phenomena, as issues regarding money's move from "total social fact" to "merely economic fact" underline both Hodges' chronology and wider social changes. Second, while money offers the heuristic link with many of the concepts of value outlined above, its spatio-temporal distribution additionally offers a means by which to calibrate micro- and macro-economic changes evident. In the final part of this chapter, the issue of money is returned to, as a means of drawing together many of the issues of value and development discussed.

8.3.2 A brief history of money in Anglo-Saxon Kent

The pattern of supply and demand underlying the differential consumption of artefactual wealth during the fifth to seventh centuries can usefully be compared with the patterns of seventh- to eighth-century coin finds in East Kent. Associated with the interpretation of these geographical patterns, is an understanding not only of the level of monetisation and minting and how this reflects commodity exchange, but also of the development of the role of coinage from socially-mediated 'token' value (Sahlin 1972, 227) to true use-value in a commercial sense. This latter point has received some measure of debate in the existent literature and is of primary importance to an analysis of Anglo-Saxon economic change. Current views have oscillated between the substantivist anthropological school of Douglas (1967) and Sahlin (1972), that saw 'primitive' currency in terms of 'token' rationing units restricted to the acquisition of prestige goods, required for the gelling of the social order, and those of medieval numismatists and historians (e.g. Grierson and Blackburn 1986; Spufford 1988). The latter see
coins acting as an intermediary to market interchanges, certainly from the inception of the lower denomination coinage of the silver *denier* in the seventh century. Some impression of coin use can be gleaned from the form and context of coin finds. For example, although a number of residual Roman coins are known from Anglo-Saxon burials throughout the period, usually in the form of perforated or mounted pendants, the context and type of these coins suggests that they are not likely to have operated as a medium of exchange, other than as luxury objects in their own right. Arguably of greater importance within economic transactions are finds of a number of sixth and early seventh-century Byzantine, Visigothic and Gallic *tremisses*, often likewise from grave contexts. The broadening range of archaeological contexts and volume of coin finds associated with the development of regular Anglo-Saxon gold coinage from c.AD 640 in Kent and the introduction throughout the Frisian contact zone of silver coinage from c.AD 675 onwards, suggest increasing coin circulation and monetary activity over this period. The changes in coin use and availability this chronological pattern represents, is of crucial importance to understanding developments in contemporary political and economic mechanisms. The development of coinage, and particularly low-denomination silver coinage, over this period, has been argued to reflect, not only increasingly sophisticated mechanisms of inter-regional commerce, but also evidence of the widening apparatus of nascent kingship (e.g. Hodges 1982; 1989; Carver 1993). To say, however, that the foundation of a mint at Canterbury or Rochester during the seventh century marked the beginning of accelerated economic change would be to overstate the importance of coinage as a social phenomenon. In this regard, Metcalf (1967, 347) has usefully outlined the key functions associated with coined money as:

- a medium of exchange;
- a means for non-commercial payments, such as taxes, fines and gifts;
- a standard of value;
- a standard of deferred payments;
- a store of value.

### 8.3.3 Metrology and volume

Despite these multiple functions, archaeological evidence seems to suggest that coins were increasingly used as a medium for common valuations over the course of the seventh century, although, some caveats should be taken into account before accepting that coin loss reflects a coined economy. Metcalf (1965; 1967) and Grierson’s (1967) conflicting analyses of Anglo-
Saxon monetary history reveal the emphasis different numismatists have placed not only on their assessments of total coin numbers, but also on consideration of when these various functions of money themselves developed. The general chronological consensus outlined above, argues that the distribution and volume of mid-seventh-century East Kent pale-gold *thrýmsas* and contemporary continental *tríentes* cannot be envisaged readily as operating as an effective medium of exchange in anything but a restricted form (cf. Metcalf 1993a, 37). The situation for the English and continental *denarial* coinages of c.AD 670 - c.AD 760, by contrast, do suggest commercial functions. Estimates for total coin numbers between the late seventh and ninth centuries suggest that mint-output during the Middle Anglo-Saxon period was significant. Calculations have been based on the correlation of fourteenth-century die-analysis and mint-records (e.g. Stewart 1963; 1964), probability calculations of die-preservation (e.g. Lyon 1966) or combinations of both (e.g. Metcalf 1998b, 22-27). In addition, recent assessment of the large numbers of recorded single-coin finds and the recognised broad distribution of currencies, has given weight to these estimates. Whilst there seems little doubt, given the wealth of documentary references, that this coinage provided a convenient mechanism for making non-commercial payments of fines and compensations, it is less clear, to what extent it operated as a commodity with a price or as a token of wider authority.

Social historians, such as Bloch (1961) or Latouche (1961), largely side-stepping the issue of volume, suggest that coin may have been worth precise amounts as payment in exchange, advocating, what they call, the concept of a 'denarial economy'; "that is to say of an economy used to thinking in terms of large sums of money, gold and silver, pound, shillings and pence, where the only tangible native-minted coin in general use was the silver penny" (Loyn 1986, 2). Some support of this concept is offered by the metrology of early coins. Grierson's analysis of Æthelberht's law codes and Anglo-Saxon poetry, suggest that initially *secaett* were weights of gold, for which imported Merovingian *tremisses* could function as groups of equivalents (1961). Thus, although the relative value of gold to silver is speculative, *wergilds* of the ninth century could commonly be fixed in *solidi*, long after the general circulation of gold coinage had ceased. This observation has prompted some authors to propose the theoretical continuity of Roman exchange rates of gold to silver and copper of 1,000:10:1 well beyond the fifth century (e.g. Claude 1985; Steuer 1997). Their suggestion finds some support in Anglo-Saxon contexts. A comparison by weight of eighth-century gold and silver coin with the consistent relationship
given in contemporary documentary sources of thirty pence to the mancus (i.e. the Anglo-Saxon solidus) indicates that a relationship of 1:10 can be inferred (Lyon 1969, 207-09; 1976).

Extrapolating from these numismatic and historical observations, it seems the popularity of the media can be traced in great part to the commodity value of the metal content. Noble metal coin could be used in both monetary and non-monetary markets because of the already discussed importance of gold and silver as raw material commodities (7.3.2). The consistency in weight of gold coinage (Arnold 1988, 110), bracteates (Gaimster 1992) and weights and measures (Scull 1990) indicates that the value of media to contemporary users depended to a great extent on their metallic content; itself a function of weight and fineness. In keeping, touchstones, such as that found in association with a balance set at Gilton 66, were designed to check against the fineness of the metallic content. Figures derived for the theoretical weight of coin denominations for this period are subject to certain caveats however. Issues of wear and corrosion must be taken into consideration. Additionally, although correspondence between actual and theoretical weights is deemed to be close for gold and high denomination silver coins (which were individually weighed before issue), it is argued that lower denomination coins have often been struck with a group weight and can therefore vary considerably around a precise theoretical weight (Grierson 1992, 134). Despite, or perhaps in keeping with these points, the weight of the early issues - and to a certain extent, their fineness - appears to have been carefully controlled. The weight of thrymsas appears to have been regulated at around 1.30g with relatively uniform alloy content (Metcalf 1993a, 38); an observation which has been argued to represent at least partial commercial use (ibid., 40). Grierson has suggested that this weight measure - a reduction from the Byzantine solidus - may be evidence of a Germanic system of weights, based on the barleycorn (1961, 351; Lyon 1976, 176-77).

In keeping, similar analysis of scales and weight-finds from East Kent has been argued to indicate the existence of exchange in bullion. Christopher Scull's recent consideration of these objects (1990), interpreted their distribution as part of a network of commodity exchange systems linking north-west Europe with the Mediterranean on the basis of the composition of the weight assemblages. In Kent, balances and weights are known from Dover Buckland ‘C'; Sarre 26; Ozengell; Gilton 66; Ash sand-pit and an unprovenanced context, whilst an additional pair of balances has also been recorded from St. Peter’s Broadstairs, grave 76 (ibid., 184; Kent 1987, 180). Metric analysis of the interred weights showed that they corresponded
closely with contemporary Byzantine and Merovingian gold-coin standards, suggesting that they were probably used in some form of currency transaction *(ibid., 197)*. Although Scull rightly draws the conclusion that "there is no evidence to confirm that currency use need have been restricted to commercial transactions rather than social, judicial, or jurisdictional payments" *(ibid., 209)*, the comparison between the distribution of balances, weights, imported goods and Middle Anglo-Saxon coin finds establish a general pattern of specialised alienable exchange that sits well with a concept of localised foreign trade, particularly along the, already-identified, Dover-Wantsum route.

Guards against debasement and reduced weight, such as is implied by balance sets and touchstones, suggest, on the one hand, that foreign and local merchants would have been vitally concerned with the intrinsic value of coins as bullion, and on the other, that confidence in the issuing authority was weak. Addressing this phenomenon, Ricardo’s ‘Law of Value’ suggests that commodity exchange “should be removed as far as possible from the threat of political manipulation by being tied to precious metals” *(Ricardo 1817; cited in Hart 1986, 643)*. Perhaps in keeping, the trend of uniformity witnessed in the earliest coins, continues through both the pale gold ‘Pada’ issues and subsequent Preliminary sceattas of Types A3 and C *(Metcalf 1993a., 77-8; 109)*. Only with the multiplication of types and debasement of Secondary sceattas during the eighth century, does the range of coin weight and fineness increase. Rather than suggest a decline in inter-regional trade, as Hodges’ proposes *(1989, 111-17)*, in fact this pattern of debasement would only have occurred if consumer confidence in the numerical value of coin were high. Alloying of precious metals in coin was a common method throughout the Early Medieval period of adding minting and fiscal charges *(Lyon 1976, 175)*. In such circumstances legal mechanisms existed, as they did in Carolingian Frankia, of correlating the numerical price paid for bullion *(ibid.)*. Viewed in this light, debasement, somewhat paradoxically, not only argues for the acceptance of coinage as a medium of exchange rather than as a commodity in its own right, but also, for the acceptance of political authority in regulating and controlling trade.

Given these observations, it seems that metrology is not a useful method for characterising economic exchange. Although it could be argued that social confidence in weight and fineness can lead to the recognition of exchange media as measurements and symbols of worth, it is still unclear precisely when monetisation replaced other forms of exchange. It was argued above
(7.3.3) that game-theory modelling suggests that the acceptance of a medium of value in turn leads to standards of trading valuations and its emergence as a medium of exchange. As such a medium, coinage takes on ‘added value’ as a property of its monetary function. For example, the choice of silver for metal money in turn influences the value of silver by increasing demand and supply (cf. Langholm 1983, 58). The withdrawal of silver from elaborate funerary consumption during the AD 675-750 phase, in a manner not visible in the gold frequency curves of the seventh century, could indicate such a change in valuation (Fig. 8.7). This observation lends credence to the interpretation of the sceatta coinage as all-purpose money rather than as a restricted prestige or social currency (cf. Metcalf 1984, 27).

What is also unclear is to what extent this coinage replaced earlier, non-monetary exchange mechanisms in terms of geographical circulation or social distinction. Did the restricted nature of the market exchange-framework limit the use of coin in commercial or social transactions to definable zones or social classes, beyond which use operated within socially-embedded, and therefore non-monetary arrangements? Such a distinction would potentially manifest itself in the topographical patterning of coin finds. On the one hand, one could argue that differential patterns in coin would be expected between commercial centres and the hinterland zone of commercialisation (Grierson 1992, 139). If coins were acting as a medium of commercial exchange, the range of coin in terms of mint sources and types would be expected to be wider within monetary areas than regions where coin-use, and therefore standards of value, is more restricted. Within these more restricted zones, the longevity of use and area of local circulation, both geographically and socially, would also be narrower, as indeed might be the functions of coin. Alternatively, variations in volume of coin might indicate changing monetary circulation. Increased volume in both local minting and foreign coin may suggest broadening coin-use and the functions it served. In this respect, some evidence of changing circulation in terms of the proportion of local to foreign coinages might be evident. Finally, some spatial evidence may support a model of the antagonistic relationship between the merchant and political élite. In areas of carefully regulated and controlled trade, one might expect a far smaller number of foreign issues, but greater general volume of coin, whilst in areas of greater transactional freedom, the ratio may be reversed.
8.3.4 The pattern of coin finds in Kent

Taken at the most superficial level, the generally coastal distribution of areas of high coin-loss fit well with the model of important coastal trading suggested by the distribution of other imported goods and media of exchange, such as weights and balances, during the Early Anglo-Saxon period. From along the Wantsum Channel and the subsidiary Roman roads of East Kent from Dover to Canterbury and Eastry, Middle-Saxon coin-finds are known from a number of important sites. Although urban (or proto-urban) centres such as Canterbury and Rochester feature as places of relatively high coin-loss, the overall regional balance of finds is densest from modern rural sites. This pattern is in general keeping with the distribution of coin-finds elsewhere in southern England, and is reflective both of patterns of find-recovery (see 6.1.2) and a Middle-Saxon economic phenomenon characterised archaeologically by so-called ‘productive sites’.

The activity of metal-detector enthusiasts in recent decades has begun to reveal a number of these sites, interpreted as potential locations of inland markets or periodic fairs, on the basis of the large number of coins and other non-ferrous metal artefacts found (Ulmschneider and Pestell forthcoming). These have commonly been related to Richard Hodges’ type A *emporia*, primarily seasonal (or annual) fairs for obtaining luxury goods (1982). The identification of a number of these settlements, such as those near Royston (Ht) or Thetford (Nf), suggests that they may also have functioned as central-places for economic activity during this phase of intensive international trade. More critical interpretation has stressed, however, that these locales may in fact represent a range of different site-types. Follow-up archaeological excavation of the Cottam B ‘productive’ site on the Yorkshire Wolds, for example, revealed the broad range of features one would expect from other Middle Saxon rural settlements, such as the contemporary phases at nearby Wharram Percy. Additionally, it drew attention to the selective artefact sample from which many of these sites are defined. The focus on coins, pins and strap-fittings may well mask differentiation in other artefactual categories and corresponding, socio-economic characterisations (Richards 1999, 79; Brookes 2001, 124-27).

The context of single-coin finds suggests that these are more likely to represent accidental loss rather than coin-finds from grave-contexts, which are the result of deliberate deposition. The distribution of single-coin finds, it follows, is more likely to indicate areas of economic activity. As such, consideration has been given as to whether the production of regression surfaces
should disregard grave-finds and be limited to single-coin finds only. This endeavour is itself limited, however, by the quality of information regarding the context of many of the finds. The case made that the Reculver and Richborough coins may actually represent grave finds is outlined in greater detail below. Equally, it could be argued that single-coin finds found by metal detectorists and dating to the pre-AD 600 period are just as likely to have come from mortuary as domestic contexts. A number of issues are discussed below regarding the changing use of individual coins themselves. These issues, and a central concern with areas of accessibility and use, rather than an overarching interest in individual sites, has meant that all the coins listed in Tables 8.1-3 have been included in the trend surface maps produced here.

8.3.5 The distribution of hoards, gold coins, weights and scales (Figs. 8.10a-b)

Given such biases in the geographical pattern of coin finds, the distribution of silver coin from the late seventh century onwards must be qualified against both that of contemporary hoards and earlier related media of exchange. At a regional level, the distribution of coin loss may well indicate areas of coin use. The overall extent in southern England of balances and weights (Scull 1990, Fig.9) sceatta finds (Metcalf 1984, Fig.1) and ninth-century pennies (Metcalf 1998a, Fig.1) reveals a perennial pattern of monetary circulation, whose formation in the case of Kent seems to be rooted in the early-seventh century. More specifically, the correlation between early and later high-density find-spots suggests continuous development from coinage as a store of value to its acceptance as a standard of trading valuations and medium of exchange.

Some indication of when and where this process occurs with Early Medieval coinages in Kent is seen from the changing geography and context of coin-finds. Residual Roman coin, Byzantine solidi as well as later continental gold trientes and locally-minted thrymsas, are recognised with increasing frequency throughout East Kent, and it is important to briefly consider the pattern presented. Given some of the issues of secure grave-contexts used in the computations of many of the raw material regression models, the distribution of contemporary gold-coin finds potentially offers explanation for the geographical gaps of our model of population and wealth distribution. As these objects could be seen to reflect a form of extraordinary consumption, without the need for further contextualisation, their occurrence offers a means of calibrating the cemetery evidence. The high density of finds from around Canterbury and Faversham for example, offer archaeological evidence for a local élite, which although hinted at from documentary sources and negative evidence, was not apparent.
through the previously applied methodology due to the lack of secure recorded grave-contexts from those settlements. That peaks of consumption in gold coin are paralleled by consumption of other raw materials in areas where secure archaeological burial-contexts are available, such as Sarre or Dover, conversely reiterates the practicalities of the approach.

Beyond the recognition of additional local centres of consumption, the archaeological context of a minority of these seventh-century gold-coin finds cannot be clearly tied to deposition as part of mortuary practices or their use as personal effects. Although, of course, neither a mortuary context, nor perforation of coins, necessarily implies a lack of use in monetary transactions (the latter could easily be a security measure rather than a function of adornment) the interpretation of the use of such coins is arguably, more contentious. Some of these non-funerary coins are likely to have been part of hoards: the Kentish solidus found “in the foundations of St Augustine’s tower” in the 1820s was said to have been associated with a number of Roman coins (Rigold 1975, no. 54a), whilst others can effectively be labelled as single coin-finds. An East Gallic tremissis was found a kilometre from the cemetery at Cop Street, Ash (Rigold 1975, no. 27), perhaps at the location of an associated settlement; two Kentish ‘Witmen’ and a ‘Pada’ specimen are known from the ‘near Canterbury’ productive site (Rigold 1975, nos. 188-9; Metcalf 1994, 74) in addition to a Kentish ‘Two Emperor’ from Eyhorne Street, near Hollingbourne (Rigold 1975, no. 135). Then there are the finds from Reculver and Richborough, discussed in greater detail below, which may well represent genuine losses from circulation (cf. Rigold 1975, 663). The generally Kentish origin of these coins, in addition to the trend away from mounted coins after AD 590 and the actual short-lived inception of a Kentish ‘civic’ coinage in the second quarter of the seventh century, would argue for the changing role of these gold coins from a numismatic point of view.

Sceatta hoards, although broadly clustered within the same geographical region of coin-use determined by contemporary single coin-finds, tend to be located away from sites of dense individual coin-finds. Hoards identified from the study area (Table 8.5) are known particularly from the Isle of Thanet, Wantsum and Swale coasts. Although general artefacts and coins are known from a wider Kentish distribution, it is observable that these hoard deposits fall within the zone of extraordinary accessibility and exchange identified by the distribution of raw materials, weights and balances. Yet, it is clear that these distributions are not directly related either to the centres of alienable exchange identified from individual coin-finds, nor to the
wealthiest sites of raw-material consumption as suggested by the application of Pareto’s Law. More generally, hoards as deliberate deposits are better equated with coins from grave-contexts than single coin-finds. The latter are usually assumed to be likely accidental losses and therefore representative both of the coin circulating at a given time and the area of its actual use. The deposition of hoards, on the other hand, is often interpreted in terms of historical periods of flux, such as external military pressures or natural disasters. As such, it is of some interest that half of the identified hoards\(^1\) cluster on the strategically-exposed Isle of Thanet, and date to the later seventh century. This was a period of considerable warfare, involving, not only an invasion by Æthelred in 676, but a period of social anarchy stretching from that year until the final restoration of order under Wihtred in 694 (Witney 1982, 141-60).

Interestingly, the composition of the hoards is broadly comparable with that of local single finds. This suggests that they were probably put together locally or concealed by the same people acting in local-coined exchanges. The one exception to this pattern, a possible hoard from Thanet (see footnote 1 again), could be characterised as a traveller’s hoard, deposited either by a Northumbrian or an individual freshly returned from Northumbria.

**8.3.6 Geographical zones of commercialisation?**

Without clear knowledge of contemporary mints, regression models of the type utilised so effectively by numismatists (e.g. Metcalf 1998a; 2000) cannot be applied easily to the *sceatta* series distributions. IDW 12 trend-surfaces can be utilised, however, to determine general geographical trends in the dataset. The combined evidence from the distribution of single coins, hoard finds and scales and weights suggest that Kent can be divided into differing regions of specialised exchange; potentially tied to varying trading environments (Fig. 8.8). The high density of coin-finds at sites such as Richborough and Reculver are best explained in terms of the transport efficiency through the Wantsum Channel. Similarly, the importance of the Canterbury community as a focus for high-demand density is paralleled by the high peak in coin losses. To a lesser extent, this combination of close proximity to main transport routes and presumed high-demand density also explains the large number of coin-finds from the Eastry/Great Mongeham/Ripple region. Beyond these key areas, decreasing numbers of coin

---

\(^1\) A further possible hoard has been suggested to explain the 26 stray Northumbrian and other coins said to have been found 'near or in the Isle of Thanet' during the eighteenth century (Rigold and Metcalf 1984, 258-60). Gold coin finds that could represent possible hoards, such as the St. Martin’s and Faversham finds, as well as the Sarre necklace have been entered as individual finds within Table 8.1.
finds indicate less frequent use of coined-exchange; a pattern which can meaningfully be tied to Plattner’s hinterland of periodic commercial activity (1976, 80). Geographically, this zone includes the find-spots of the northern and south-eastern coastal regions, as well as the settlements of the eastern Downs and the ‘productive site’ of Hollingbourne. Extremely small numbers of coin-finds from the southern coast and Wealden districts, indicate negligible monetary activity in these regions.

Within these regions of exchange, a useful comparison can be drawn between the distribution of local and non-local coinages in the period up to AD750. Regression models produced from the sum of coin-finds in eastern Kent for this period indicate a number of complementary patterns. Although all produced distributions demonstrate the importance of Reculver in determining the shape of monetary regression models, the individual distributions of specific coinages reveal several more specific patterns. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the Canterbury environs (comprising the Roman walled city, St Augustine’s, St Martin’s and Fordwich) feature prominently as an area of high-density coin-finds of all provenances. As the ecclesiastical and secular administrative-centre of the region by this period, and the likely location of an early mint probably producing the Series C Primary sceattas and possibly other coins too, Canterbury would be expected to reveal evidence of wide monetary influences. Significantly, contemporary Primary Frisian silver coinages of Series D, E and X (Stewart 1984, 7; Metcalf 1993b) cluster in the Reculver and Eastry/Great Mongeham areas, but not at Richborough. Thus, the assumed cross-Channel impetus to monetisation appears to have flowed either via Reculver or directly to Canterbury; an interpretation reinforced by the pattern of early Kentish coins. Early gold and silver coin attributed to Kentish mints, such as the Sutherland II.v: Two Emperor and Sutherland IV.ii: Witmen gold coins, the preliminary ‘Pada’ sceatas, or the Series A2-A3 and C Primary sceattas (Rigold 1960-1, 10 & 29; Metcalf 1993a, 46), display the same geographical patterning as the Frisian imported coinages. The mutual points of contact suggest complementary balance-of-payments restricted to specific loci.

By contrast, the distribution of ‘English’ Primary sceatta types (Table 8.2; Fig. 8.9b) demonstrate a more general Wantsum distribution, with large numbers found at Richborough and Minster.

---

2 Only one gold coin (Sutherland 1948, no. 2), probably dating to the early seventh century, is so far known directly stipulating Canterbury (DOROVERNIS CIVITAS) as its mint (Hill 1975). Otherwise, it is solely on the basis of the distribution pattern of various other coin series that a Canterbury mint has been proposed (e.g. Rigold 1961).
in addition to Reculver and Canterbury. Perhaps importantly, sites recognised as significant areas of commercial activity and wealth consumption, such as Sarre and Dover, are underrepresented in terms of foreign Anglo-Saxon coinages of both the Primary and Secondary series. In keeping with the localised patterns of Frisian coin, the impression gained from this analysis is that, whilst monetary circulation centred on the 
*emporia* and central-places of the kingdom and then diffused locally, specific mercantile activities may have been carried out at different sites. Beyond these regulated centres of high commercialisation, monetary influences from outside were more significant. Although difficulties in assigning true provenances to many of these coins due to their small numbers is well known (Stewart 1984, 7) south-eastern English coins of Series A and B are nevertheless fairly well attested from Kent, and a regression model of their find-spots reinforce an impression of a less restricted flow, particularly in western districts.

8.3.7 ‘Productive Sites’ in eastern Kent

The regression patterns for all of the non-local coin types are dominated by the extraordinary finds from the ‘productive’ Minster site of Reculver at the northern terminus of the Wantsum Channel. Unfortunately, the vast majority of these coins were discovered in unrecorded circumstances during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries from a zone of coastal erosion to the north of the present Minster ruin. This part of the coast, as indicated by Reculver’s mid-tenth century charter bound (S546; Gough 1992), would seem to have been comprised of a river-cut channel sheltered by a small island to the northeast; a topographical situation well-suited as a maritime landing-place. Despite some of the uncertainties of provenance, Metcalf has argued for a general consistency in type varieties between the more securely recorded coins from Reculver and the less well defined records of finds attributed to the Minster environs (1984b, 204). In light of this numismatic observation and subsequent modern * sceatta * finds from archaeological deposits to the south of the Minster church (Rigold & Metcalf 1984, 258), it seems likely that the majority of the 57 recorded finds can indeed be sourced to the site.

The interpretation of the context of the Minster coins is more problematical. A partial explanation could lie in the use of these minsters for burial, and the common rite of including a coin within the grave by early Christian practice, as token compensation either by inheritors or guilty parties (Rigold 1961, 8; Whitelock 1979, 392; Hinton 1986, 15). The case for ecclesiastical centres doubling as *foci* for markets and fairs, particularly when sited in prominent
geographical positions, however, has been made on a number of occasions (cf. Morris 1983, 76; Hinton 1986, 15; Ulmschneider 2000, 68) and it seems likely that at least some of the coins recovered from these sites are the result of casual trading losses. This interpretation is furthermore attractive given the range of coin-types identified at sites such as Richborough and Reculver. Reculver demonstrates contacts with East Anglia, Northumbria and many other Anglo-Saxon mints, not to mention both Frisia and Paris. When compared with the relatively small numbers of local Primary sceattas identified there, this broad range of coins would argue against an interpretation emphasising some form of local supernatural debt settlement.

Broadly speaking, the ‘productive’ sites of Kent can be grouped into settlement classes comparable with those of Lincolnshire (Ulmschneider 2000). Particularly prolific sites (those with more than twenty coins) such as Reculver can be related to an important ecclesiastical presence, whilst a broader range of functions can be observed underlying ‘medium productive’ sites such Richborough, Minster-in-Thanet, ‘near Canterbury’, Eastry and Hollingbourne. In many other cases, it is often difficult to differentiate the importance of ecclesiastical or royal influence on the functions of such settlements; though in the case of Dover and Canterbury at least, it is likely that their role encompassed a number of institutional, economic and social functions.

8.3.8 Foreign contacts
The broad range of foreign coin in Kent, and the introduction of local minting in the last quarter of the seventh century imply an increasingly elaborate monetary economy. Although foreign coin in Kent indicates extensive contact with Continental centres of minting in Frankia and Frisia, the fragmented nature of much Continental production complicates the identification of specific trade routes. Gold-coin finds, in particular, demonstrate contact with Merovingian, Burgundian, Byzantine, Alamannic, Visigothic and Ostrogothic regions in the seventh century, but provide no real indication of either continued, direct, or large-scale links, although some sort of Neustrian connection appears likely (cf. Hodges 1982, 35). Alternatively, the particular dominance of Frisian Primary sceattas of Series D, E and X in Kentish contexts, can be paralleled by the distribution of Kentish coins on the Continent. The balance of payment reiterates the importance of Frisian/Austrasian Rhinemouth contact with finds of A and C specimens from Dorestad and with over twenty Kentish coins of ‘Two Emperor’, Series A and C types recovered at Domburg, even if some of these are likely to have been local
copies and all these coins make up a mere 1% of all the coins found there (Op Den Velde, De Boone & Pol 1984, 122). In addition, the two Kentish sceattas in the Dankirke (Denmark) assemblage could also be cited as evidence of Frisian contact, given the multi-cultural composition of the group (Bendixen 1974). By contrast, Kentish coins are extremely scarce in Neustrasian Frankia: a ‘Pada’ is known from Namur (Belgium), an A/C ‘mule’ was included in the Bais hoard (Brittany), there are three unprovenancable ‘Pada’s in the Morel-Fatio collection and a further one in Paris, that may or may not be sourced to there (ibid.; Metcalf 1993a, 74; Lafaurie 1981; Sutherland 1948, no.2). The overall impression is that, although there may have been more extensive contact with Neustria during the sixth and early-seventh centuries as evidenced by artefactual evidence, exchange between these regions had become sporadic during the mid-seventh century decades. By the later seventh century, Kentish mercantile relations with the Continent extended essentially to the Rhinemouth emporia, and little further. A handful of late seventh and eighth-century deniers from Neustria are known from Reculver and Ozenegell, however, bearing evidence of continued ties with Merovingian Frankia, but given the lack of reciprocal finds, such contact is likely to have been restricted or at least, carefully controlled at respective entry-points where foreign coin could be reminted as local issues.

Of equal importance, Kentish coin can be seen to have circulated widely throughout southern Britain (Fig. 8.9). The overall distribution-pattern of stray finds indicate that Kentish coin diffused through the territories of all the major Anglo-Saxon kingdoms of the late seventh and eighth centuries. Canterbury is likely to have been the premier mint in England of this period (Metcalf 1998a, 183 and Figs. 8 & 9), and the relative volume of Kentish coin output reflects this documentary assertion (cf. Metcalf 1993a, Table 1). Some chronological development in monetary expansion is visible however. Series A (and earlier issues) are rarely found in any significant number beyond the south-eastern region of Kent, London and the Essex coast (Metcalf 1988, 236), although a number of examples from Domburg, the Ipswich hinterland and sites along the upper reaches of the Nene, such as Wollaston (Nh), Wootton (Nh) and Grendon (Nh), indicate the likely waterborne network of inter-regional trade contact. By contrast, the distribution of Series C and C ‘mule’ issues take in most of Anglo-Saxon England, particularly if northern and western imitations are included, and occur extensively throughout the East Anglian kingdom (so much so in fact, that Series C has sometimes been viewed as East-Anglian coinage, e.g. Metcalf 1984). Similar distributions are visible for Secondary sceattas
of possible Kentish origin such as Series U and K, demonstrating mercantile links with the Upper Thames region, Northumbria, East Anglia and Hamwic (Metcalf 1984, FIGS. 9 & 10).

A regression model of Kentish Primary sceattas illustrates the distance these issues travelled and the general pattern of movement (Fig. 8.9). Although Kentish coins of the seventh century tend to cluster north of the Thames and have been found over 300kms to its north, an appreciable fall-off is recognised after 200kms, roughly corresponding to the Middle Saxon division of Lincolnshire discussed recently by Ulmschneider (2000, 77-78). In this respect, the relatively flat regression of Kentish coins throughout East Anglia, as far north as the South Lincolnshire productive site(s), can be contrasted with this sharp fall-off of Kentish issues and the concomitant concentration of Continental pottery and Northumbrian stycas in the former kingdom of Lindsay to the north (cf. ibid). By way of contrast, the ninth-century distributions of Canterbury issues, discussed recently by Metcalf (1998a), tend to cluster south of the Thames, and show little appreciable fall-off north of the Wash. Seventh-century Kentish issues appear therefore to have been restricted primarily to East Anglian and Mercian contacts. The relative absence of Kentish coin from Ipswich, however, and the seeming special importance afforded these coins in political frontier areas, such as South Lincolnshire, London or Royston (Ht), where local tolls are most likely to have been levied, suggest that the circulation of these issues may well have flowed directly from Kent, rather than via redistributive channels controlled by the large emporia of regional kingdoms.

8.3.9 Staple and wealth finance in Kent

In a series of works based on ethnographic and ethnohistoric evidence, D'Altroy, Brumfield and Earle usefully discuss the means by which political economic systems finance themselves (D'Altroy & Earle 1985; Brumfield & Earle 1987; Earle 1987). Central to their approach is a distinction drawn between forms of staple and wealth finance-systems in the formation of specialised economic interdependence. Staple finance is defined as an economic system based on the mobilisation of subsistence-goods from the direct producer and their distribution to support the ruling élite and their retinue. Due to the high bulk, weight and perishability of subsistence products, such systems tend to be decentralised, and are particularly suited to regionally compact societies of itinerant rulership. By contrast, élites in wealth finance-systems control the mobilisation of characteristically high value-to-weight ratio and high durability valuables as a form of currency to reward and pay subjects, and in turn this currency is used
for the purchase of subsistence goods. The separation of wealth- from subsistence-goods, the authors go on to argue, forms the basis from which both centralised political and specialised production can take place. Importantly, in the case studies examined by Earle (1987), wealth was not easily converted into subsistence-goods as it circulated in distinctly separate economic spheres, but was used as a visible symbol of access to subsistence goods. This observation offers a useful point of departure for an examination of the Kentish material.

In contrast to the density of coin and artefactual evidence in East Kent, the lack of finds near the estate centres of the Swale and Holmesdale, suggest an interpretation of differential regional access to the means of exchange, which could be interpreted within the concept of staple finance, as outlined by D'Altroy and Earle (1985). Despite the lack of clear Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery evidence from the Swale region from which to extrapolate a model of local consumption, the density of documented Anglo-Saxon estate centres in this region, and the important pattern of pan-environmental resources underlying their distribution, suggests the existence of a number of developed multiple-estates. That these areas of clearest agricultural potential correspond with a drop in single-coin finds could suggest that the local economic framework operated primarily through non-monetary means. Although the evidence for a redistributive economy - implied by D'Altroy and Earle's model - is lacking, it seems likely that the accumulation of subsistence-goods formed the primary economic mode.

By contrast, the communities of the Dover and Wantsum coast and their immediate hinterland, such as the Eastry and Northbourne/Great Mongeham area and indeed Canterbury itself, can be recognised both to access foreign commodities from the sixth century, and through peaks of coin loss in the seventh century. The coincidence of coin-finds in this area with the pattern of earlier imported-good deposition suggests that these regions probably engaged in limited price-making markets, and possibly, some limited form of wealth finance. These systems, Brumfield and Earle (1987) argue, are characterised by wealth distribution rather than staple finance.

In keeping with D'Altroy, Brumfield and Earle's thesis, the geographical patterning of coin finds in Kent suggests that both staple and wealth systems could operate within a single regional economy. Firstly, the model of highly fragmented Middle-Saxon markets and monetary-flow suggests that only communities with direct access to alienable trade could
engage in monetary exchange. Secondly, as the pattern of areas of particularly low coin loss can in some cases be equated with known important Late Anglo-Saxon estates, such as the regio and minster of Milton or the lathe of Wye discussed by Everitt and Jolliffe respectively (Everitt 1986, 302-32; Jolliffe 1933, 4-8), there exists a strong possibility that the basis of élite power rested on the control of subsistence production. The later period of the primary series and virtually the whole of that of the secondary series is marked by the relatively stable reign of Wihtred (691-725). The activities of this king known from charter and documentary evidence appear to suggest a focus on the royal vills of Hollingbourne, Faversham and Milton (Witney 1982, 162), i.e. those areas dominated by identified multi-estates.

The correlation of areas of known royal (and presumably élite retinue) activity with both structured estates and areas of few single-coin finds, raises the possibility that these areas can be identified as those where exchange through the estate-mechanism restricted active participation in price-making markets. In contrast to the monetary zone of alienable exchange identified along the eastern margin, the inland ‘productive site’ of Hollingbourne, offers the only comparable example of such negotiated exchange in the west. The location of this settlement at the important cross-roads of routeways linking the historically discrete territories of East and West Kent, the denns between the settlements of the Swale and their Wealden appurtenances and the environmental junction of the pays of Chart, Holmesdale, Downland and Weald, as well as its royal associations, all single out its suitability for localised trading. Beyond favourable topographical criterion, Hollingbourne’s importance, as is probably the case with the ‘productive sites’ of Reculver and Richborough, may well be related to the royal ecclesiastical foundations of the seventh century. Church involvement in the resettlement of Richborough and Reculver has already been mentioned, and it is possible that Hollingbourne represents an ecclesiastical foundation, without substantial Early Anglo-Saxon precedent as part of the original minsterland of Maidstone, of which it is a named dependency in the Domesday Monachorum (Everitt 1986, 332). A comparison between the regression models of Early Anglo-Saxon consumption and Middle Anglo-Saxon coinage demonstrates the importance of ‘new’ sites within the pattern of controlled exchange. Unlike communities close to the estate centres and coastal sites of the Early Anglo-Saxon period, which demonstrate both high numbers of imported-goods and Middle Anglo-Saxon coin losses, those of Richborough, Reculver and Hollingbourne are unremarkable in their consumption of wealth during the earlier period. By contrast, the almost unparalleled number of sceatta and tremissis
finds at the two coastal sites (Rigold & Metcalf 1984, 258-60) and the clear peak of coin loss at Hollingbourne may well be indicative of large-scale monetary exchange on a scale only achievable by, and under the protection of, institutions such as the Church.

8.4 Dark Age Economics: a rejoinder

8.4.1 Introduction: macro- to micro-economics

The development of monetary circulation in early-medieval Kent cannot be interpreted in isolation from economic changes visible throughout north-western Europe over this period. The uniformity in type, weight and distribution of *deniers/sceattas* throughout the North Sea economic zone and the essential break with Classical models this development marked, describe a general phenomenon crossing a number of political frontiers. Although Anglo-Saxon and Frisian *sceattas* are the most prolific issues of the seventh and early eighth centuries (Spufford 1987, 797), there is no reason to assume that the economic focus of international trade centred on these same regions (cf. Pirenne 1939; Hodges & Whitehouse 1983; above). Within this view, the concept of semi-peripheral development of world-systems outlined by Chase-Dunn and Hall (1997; 2000) provides an important insight into the processes of economic evolution. It suggests that a number of interaction networks, comprising of bulk-good exchange, prestige-good exchange, political/military exchange and information exchange networks, cross-cut socio-geographically to define a world-system (Fig. 8.11).

This highly abstracted model accommodates many of the issues considered by both Pirenne (1939) and Hodges and Whitehouse (1983) with respect to economic and urban development in north-west Europe during the early medieval period. Equally, the model provides a framework within which to review the Kentish material with respect to the exogenous relationships between both polities of unequal (i.e. hierarchical or differentiated core-periphery interaction) and equal status (i.e. peer polities), as outlined in the work of both Hodges (1982; 1989) and early medieval numismatists (e.g. Grierson & Blackburn 1986).

From a monetary point of view, the overlapping nature of the four sets of bounded networks offers a useful description of changing attitudes to coinage over the course of the seventh century. The importance of the prestige-good network to early medieval societies has already been demonstrated (2.2.2.3). In keeping, although there are a number of difficulties in bridging the gap between uses and deposition of Early Anglo-Saxon coin finds, there seems little reason
to doubt the importance ascribed these objects in daily life. As personal effects, jewellery, or grave offerings, even in more economically-marginal areas than Kent, coins operated as media of value. This was not dependent on whether they were understood to have implicit exchange value. The model of world-system relationships neatly presents this position. As prestige goods in Anglo-Saxon England, gold coins are unlikely to have operated as general-purpose money, and may even in some areas, not have been associated with means of payment at all. Within gifting systems, it is possible for the exchanged object to move to areas beyond the associated information net; here coins are valuable due to their rarity rather than any associated ideological link with the core (cf. Chase-Dunn & Hall 2000, 89).

This situation describes an important distinction to be made with Dalton’s definition of ‘primitive valuables’ (1977, 198). The thesis posed by a number of scholars is that, despite the lack of evidence for wide-spread and constant use of gold coin as cash, the monetary assessments in Early-Medieval legislation for example, bear testimony to societies which were still used to thinking in terms of a monetised economy (Bloch 1961, 65-9; Duby 1974, 62-72; Latouche 1961, 143-75; Loyn 1986, 2). In regions such as south-east England, the local replication of imperial coinages in the early seventh century suggest issues related to the emergence of embodied kingship in a medium familiar to society at large. Certainly, the cultural and political imagery of pseudo-Imperial and Frankish sovereignty had been present in the form of mounted, looped and perforated coins, as well as bracteates, for more than a century. The issuing of coins, alternatively, reflected the ability of rulers (and other magnates, including the ecclesiastical élite) to guarantee regulation and typified the expression of nascent political institutions. Some of the gold issues of the second quarter of the seventh century deliberately tried to tie local sovereignty to the imagery of romanitas: the AVDVRLD REGES issue of Eadbald of Kent provide an example (Grierson & Blackburn 1986, 161; Williams 1999). Such concerns, demonstrate the symbolic importance ascribed to coins, beyond their value either as ‘primitive currency’ or ‘primitive valuables’ in Dalton’s formulation (1977). Although Hodges’ (1982) linear application of Dalton’s (1977) divisions to Rigold’s (1975) history of Anglo-Saxon coinage (Table 8.6) may well broadly describe the movement to cash currency, Chase-Dunn and Hall’s (2000) model offers an important conceptual addition. In areas demonstrating the regular inflow of gold coin from the Continent from c.AD 550 onwards, it can be hypothesised that this contact was accompanied by cultural and political information regarding their use at the core. Even when these coins were operating as restricted primitive valuables at a local
periphery level, they were understood as media of exchange: at least ceremonially and politically, if not indeed economically.

The broad development of coinage over the course of the seventh century can therefore be interpreted with respect to the tenets of world-system political economies. Early imported coinage falls clearly within the domain of élite core-periphery interaction as outlined by Friedman and Rowlands (1977). The subsequent implementation of local issues alternatively, can be recognised as a semi-peripheral development, related to the expansion of the world-system beyond its earlier limits. Hegemons such as Frisia and Kent begin to operate as mediators between the Frankish/Mediterranean core and more peripheral regions. The introduction of regulated local media of exchange typifies the position of these regions as agents for broadening commercial activity related to the core. The low cost of maritime transport combined with the geographical position of the upwardly-mobile semi-peripheral hegemons allows for local institutional development and the accumulation of wealth: Kent and Frisia become in effect, the Genoa and Venice of their day (paraphrasing Chase-Dunn and Hall 200, 97).

Although this synopsis outlines a number of the phenomena comprising the macro-economic development of the North Sea economic zone, a number of questions remain essentially unanswered. Given that the majority of basic economic decisions during the early medieval period were enstructured by tradition, command and social obligation rather than modern views on rational decision-making, how does coined money fit into the models of value outlined in chapter 7? Similarly, although some form of mercantilism is not at odds with this view of enstructured exchange, by what agency did alienable exchange replace the political economy of social ties that characterised the pre-monetary societies of Northern Europe?

8.4.2 Issues with issues: agency and exchange

In chapter 2, an interpretation of gifting was offered outlining the embedded social obligation inherent in such exchanges (2.2.2.3). The features of this interpretation are worth noting again:-

1) gift-giving formed part of and in turn helped form social relationships between individuals, and between individuals and the ancestral/cosmological worlds;
2) the objects of exchange themselves aided the construction of both the possessor and giver as complete human beings;

3) the temporal aspects of reciprocity include routinised gifting as well as asking, taking and keeping to form an economic system.

A number of clear consequences of this interpretation must be elaborated with respect to the theory of value construction discussed in chapter 7. Here, it was shown that issues of value assignation related to the intrinsic properties of the raw-material composition, compounded with extrinsic belief (cf. Kiyotaki & Wright 1989, 928). A hierarchy of valuation is recognised, in which artefacts were seen to be valued through properties of scarcity, diversity and quality, combined with social ‘added value’ attributes of genealogy and social use. The following discussion will illustrate how these issues relate to coinage.

Hodges’ formulation of the introduction of coinage reduced its use to typifying the broader social move from gift to commodity exchange: coins in the sixth century are prestige goods, whereas coins in the eighth century are commodities with a price. How does such a change come about? Central to this question is what was regarded then as the function of money. Malinowski’s analysis of Trobriand economies emphasised the difference between kula, ceremonial prestige gift-exchange on the one hand, and gimwali, individual (often undignified) barter, on the other (1922/1984). Between these two diametrically-opposed exchanges of pure gift and trade, pure and simple, are five further gradations of varying social responsibility (ibid., 177-191). The orthodox application of these alienable and inalienable exchange methods forms the basic principle of both Dalton’s tripartite exchange-media division (1977, 198-9) and Hodges’ teleological interpretation of early money (1992; above). Primitive valuables are to be equated with kula-type exchanges, whilst barter, and later primitive money, formed the medium of gimwali-type exchange.

In chapter 2 it was suggested however that gift-exchange itself provided a dynamic social relationship, both masking, and exploiting power inequalities. The formalisation of the exchange process was part-and-parcel of a social tool, designed to create mediating obligations on the transactors. The temporal separation and the often-ceremonial nature of the exchange further emphasised it as a continuum of conflict avoidance and social responsibility (cf. Hart 1986; Samson 1991). In addition, the example of gift-exchange relationships characterising aristocratic society in Beowulf, discussed by Bazelmans (1999), suggested that some objects were
intimately related to the constitution of self. Two points of contrast can be made between such a system and that of a profit economy; the first suggests changing social conditions governing the environment of exchange, the second, changing social ideas and values themselves.

In contrast to the outline of inalienable social exchange, alienable exchange or barter, reflect social confidence in both the ability of the partner to restrict violence and establish a fair price. In the absence of established measures of weight and volume, there is neither an index of value other than *numeraire*, nor any protection against changing exchange ratios, which could be harmful to one of the transactors (Humphrey 1985, 48). As a consequence, such exchanges tend to be restricted to individual transactions between people who know one another, and can organise times and places to trade, unless wider mechanisms exist to ensure safe and informed exchange. Wider repercussions of this micro-economic division are telltale:

“One form is a temporary social framework erected in the relative absence of society; the other is an atomised interaction predicated on the presence of society...[T]he two types are different means of securing the same ends, namely circulation of commodities between independent communities. Individual barter is favoured when the general peace is such as to allow commodities to flow at their equivalent values; whereas ceremonial exchange is a temporary construct of peace based on alliance between leaders of communities at war, with political intervention in the distribution of commodities an inevitable corollary” (Hart 1986, 648).

Importantly, the widening of alienable exchange systems beyond that possible between known partners requires additional institutional and social frameworks. Individual bartering has been shown to carry prohibitively high transaction costs (Jevons 1910; Clower 1969) unless structured within specific social conditions (see for example the Lhomi barter system of Nepal discussed by Humphrey 1985). Additionally, these exchanges tend to be defined by *ad-hoc* rates, as there is no reference to alternative market opportunities; notional equilibrium rates can be defined by value in terms of weight or *numeraire*, but these can alter between goods widely produced and ones infrequently traded (*ibid*). In market exchange, alternatively, the exchange of information and impartial price-setting deriving from the interplay of a number of traders results in publicly-known prices (Ekelund & Hébert 1997, 16). In isolated exchange, such rate-setting could only come through impartial third-party arbitration (*ibid*) or socio-political conditions. In the Lhomi example cited by Humphrey, barter occurs as the primary form of exchange, only because of deep underlying beliefs in autonomous egalitarianism, whilst practising a (to Western eyes, dangerous) ‘windfall mentality’ (1985, 67).
Attitudes to exchange in early- and pre-monetary Kent are less easily discerned, though Bazelmans' (1999) interpretation of hierarchies of exchange in *Beowulf* indicate some possible further lines of enquiry. In Chapter 7, various different social relationships detailed in the poem were seen to underlie a hierarchy of valuations. Thus, for example, gifts of weapons were seen as important ceremonial exchanges between lords and their retainers, as well as partially embodying individuals as warriors and nobles. By contrast, gifts of treasure ('gold, rings, jewels and gems' and 'silverware') were seen as broader, undifferentiated-value objects used in bonds of friendship between kings, as well as general gifts throughout society. If *Beowulf* can be seen as detailing pre-Christian ideals of aristocratic exchange to an eighth-century audience, other documentary sources suggest that the importance of gifting was by no means restricted to the pagan past. In a letter to Boniface dating to c.750, Æthelbert II of Kent outlines an exchange which, although placed within a Christian context, holds closely to ideas of earlier reciprocal gifting:

"By the bearer of this letter I am sending to Your Reverence with my devoted affection a few little gifts: a silver, gold-lined drinking cup weighing three pounds and a half and two woollen cloaks. We are not sending these gifts with the purpose of expectation of receiving any earthly profit or return; but rather on bended knees begging of you what is far more necessary, that in these evil days of manifold and unexpected troubles and in this world so filled with scandals you will deign to aid us with the frequent support of your prayers." (Cited from Little 1978, 6)

This text is important in a number of ways. Not only does Æthelbert distinguish gold and silver as important forms of value, he assigns them a weight as bullion. Equally, Æthelbert details an unstable environment wherein gift and counter-gift needed explicit stipulation. Gift-exchange in this case, looks little different from commodity exchange. In ancient and medieval meditations on alienable exchanges, the ethical fairness of the transaction needed to be reinforced. Aristotle devoted much of Book V of his *Ethics* to the issue of moral conduct in exchange situations. Unlike the distribution of honours, where unequal exchange was valid, during the exchange of goods and services, all parties were stressed as equals (Aristotle 1962; Polanyi 1971; Langholm 1983, 47; Parry 1989, 84). To this end, it was deemed important that traders establish a rapport, recognising the potential mutual advantage from exchange (Ekelund & Hébert 1997, 18). Thomas Aquinas reiterated the ethical obligation of achieving a 'just price'.
“...if the price exceeds the quantity of the value of the article, or the article exceeds the price, the equality of justice will be destroyed. And therefore, to sell a thing dearer or to buy it cheaper than it is worth is, in itself, unjust and illicit...The just price of things, however, is not determined to a precise point but consists of a certain estimate. The price of an article is changed according to difference in location, time, or risk to which one is exposed in carrying it from one place to another or in causing it to be carried. Neither purchase nor sale according to this principle is unjust” (cited in Ekelund & Hébert 1997, 27; Dempsey 1935, 481)

That such ethics needed stressing, suggests that rational self-interest was common-place, as indeed the reinterpretation of gifting leads us also to believe. In this view, the ‘token’ value of gifted objects needs reassessment. Certainly, these operated as media in interpersonal relationships, but as such they carry a secondary role “for ranking political credit in an unstable environment of trade and war between communities” (Hart 1986, 649). The non-economic means for ensuring repayment, in the form of oaths or blood relationships, therefore take on both a moral and economic role. Mauss was aware of the relative distinction between commodity and gift exchange (1923). As gift exchange carries with it a notion of credit, the move to commodity exchange develops through a reduction and fixation of the period of exchange (ibid.; Bazelmans 1999, 15-6). For such reductions to take place requires specific social and cultural shifts however. Not only does it require a stable environment for ‘just prices’ to be reached, but also for the concept of credit to move from “a personal basis to the objective value of the contents of a man’s pockets” (Hart 1986, 649). In this sense, money is both the product of changing contemporary social attitudes and environmental stability, but also the motor replacing socially-important exchange. Aristotelian ethical belief in coined money permitting the development of ‘unnecessary’ exchange can be compared on this basis to the highly moralistic content of Beowulf. In detailing explicit exchange relationships between the living and the supernatural as providing the socio-political framework of Anglo-Saxon aristocracy (cf. Bazelmans 1999), Beowulf can be seen in this view as an ethical tale detailing idealised past societal relationships rather than contemporary reality. Thus Beowulf is the Ethics of the eighth (or tenth) century; intended as a guide to moral conduct, but also a protest against social change.

Little (1978) suggests that this social change was primarily caused by Christianisation. Only through the introduction of Christian concepts of otherworldliness, could essentially-modern value configurations replace valuations based on an individual in society. The early Church initially appears to have redirected gift exchange, however, rather than halt its social role.
Instead of a network of relationships between living (and ancestral) individuals, gifts to sanctuaries or clerics were promoted in exchange for future spiritual benefits (ibid., 6). Time appears to be a central issue of conflict. The explicitly temporal arrangements defining gift-exchange relations could be interpreted in direct conflict with Christian ideology. Criticisms levelled against merchants throughout the Medieval period, for example, argued that “he sold something which he could not possess, for his profit implied a mortgage on time, which was supposed to belong to God alone” (Parry 1989, 82; Le Goff 1980, 29). All temporal arrangements were henceforth to be made with God, and only God.

8.4.3 The geography of transactional orders

The model of socio-economic and environmental safe-guards provides an important addition to the zones of commercialisation outlined by Plattner (1976; 8.1.3 above). Given that conditions of necessary arbitration underlie the widening of isolated alienable exchange, the spatial context of such exchanges is restricted to areas defined by stable social circumstance. In short, commodity exchange is dependent firstly, on the existence of regulated forms of authority and secondly, a belief in the value of fairness. Economic agents exchanging at price-fixing markets, alternatively, are not subject to the same level of insecurity, as numerous buyers and sellers affix fair prices through negotiation. Plattner’s zones of market hinterland commercialisation are, therefore, not merely dependent on the physical distance traders would travel, but perhaps more significantly, on the distance that price-information travels. Additionally, one can argue that, as commodity transactions are dependent on regulatory social conditions, the spatial context of such exchanges impart information regarding micro-economic environments. Such a model provides a framework for gift-exchange running parallel to commodity transactions, rather than requiring evolutionary replacement. Marketing instances are theoretically possible whenever many buyers and sellers come together. A marketing system of wider commercialisation and atomised alienable exchange alternatively, is dependent on these specific social conditions.

Given this view of exchange, the importance of coinage lies not so much in its commodity value in alienable exchange, but in its value as a contractual store of credit. In a society of regulated authority, it becomes better in a sense to hold money than goods. By contrast, in areas of social flux, credit security is maintained through personal bonds. Nevertheless, even here, coin has an intrinsic value as a property of its raw-material constituents, and its role as a
signifier of ‘treasure’, authority, wealth, status and demand obligation. In this view, the context of coin-finds is more important in ascribing their role, than the coins themselves.

The geographical distribution of coins in Kent was argued above to reflect different regions of staple and wealth finance. Given this interpretation of gift and commodity exchange, it could be further argued that these areas also reflect hierarchies of social organisation. Earlier in this chapter, differences recognised between West and East Kent were argued to have been partially the result of different ethnic and historical circumstance (8.2.2.1). Equally, distance from the core political area of eastern Kent is likely to have made the western lathes of Kent a more dangerous environment, particularly during the long period of social disruption of the late seventh century. In this situation, infrastructural security is likely to have been fitful, as indeed could be postulated also for those ‘colonial’ regions of the south where settlement development was not as advanced. Theoretically, such uncertain conditions are likely to have increased the importance of social bonding - as marked by food-rent and gifting - in promoting individual security. By contrast, the eastern coastal zone, recognised in chapter 5 as the area of initial core settlement, had both a developed structural settlement system and was geographically buffered from rival hegemons by Wealden and western districts, offering relative high levels of social security by the seventh century. Trend surfaces indicate that in this area, wealth finance in the form of foreign objects from the sixth century provided a historical context for the development of preferences and wants, forming the basis of developing forms of monetary exchange. The ‘moneyness’ of metallic commodities, in other words, was established by the social distribution of fifth- and sixth-century holdings, the overall size of supply, and the extrinsic power of these commodities in knitting society together. Once introduced, money’s role as a strategic decoupling device, allows individuals to freely exchange, make side payments and distinguish economic actors (cf. Shubik 1987, 10-11). Preconditions for the location of such market exchanges are, however, as we have seen, mutually-negotiated focal nodes, firstly, where the communication and cost demands are at a premium, and secondly, where transactions can be conducted safely. Whilst the development of marketing is therefore related to institutional organisation - in so far as it provides the conditions for exchange - it cannot be conceived as an active articulation of local power strategies, as presented in Hodges’ model. Rather, continued coastal trade with strangers, as well as at specific inland sites, enabled individuals to assess risk-bearing factors, provided common experience and allowed for the negotiation of times and places for exchange.
If this describes the primary dynamic for market-type exchange, the elaborated model of wealth finance suggests that commodity exchange provided an important arena for political manipulation. In this respect, many of the identified phenomena can usefully be compared with the political models of economic specialisation and exchange identified by Brumfield and Earle (1987; Earle 1987). Their research has demonstrated that specialisation in many cases is the result of the development of élite mechanisms of control over society through political, economic and symbolic means, rather than an adaptive response to environmental and economic threats. In the Inka and Hawaiian examples elaborated by Earle (1987), wealth objects acted as, and were manipulated by élites, as visible symbols demonstrating the system of rights to position and title for land underlying staple-subsistence wealth. In contrast to limited specialised production and exchange, seen as useful in linking together local communities, the development of complex specialisation was the result of increased social stratification and the development of religious institutions as landowners. Specialised wealth production in this model, was deliberately and strategically controlled by élites, in the Hawaiian example, utilising rare raw materials - feathers - to further accentuate the restricted control of these symbolic objects: “the items of wealth served as means of payment, as symbols of legitimate power, and as evidence of sanctity” (ibid., 75).

Given the demonstrated importance of inter-regional commodities in articulating social inequalities in Anglo-Saxon society, it is of no surprise that the connection between *emporia* and kingship has often been drawn (2.2.2). Rather than dominating all aspects of trade and production, this model of ideological legitimisation and the economic tools by which it was materialised, suggest that the élite were more interested in siphoning wealth and wealth-symbols to legitimise their position as landowners and the dominant social order. Cited evidence bears witness to a variety of mechanisms the élite employed to maintain wealth and legitimise their position. Instead of the overtly predatory form of kingship - implied in the Hodgean model - Kentish royal interests encouraged the economy by combating disorder, social violence and localism, through weak infrastructural penetration and taxation (Brookes 1998, 48-54). Later laws explicitly stipulate where and how market-trade was to be carried out, not merely, it follows from this argument, in order to control trade, but also to encourage it by providing the necessary conditions for peaceable transaction between strangers. All could profit in the Late Anglo-Saxon period: “the mint and the borough [were] the major institutions through which the king could benefit the trader, and could himself benefit from the trader's
activity" (Loyn 1961, 129). Thus we find that in Æthelstan's 'Grateley Laws': “no goods worth more than twenty pence are to be bought outside a town, but must be bought there in the witness of the town-reeve or of another trustworthy man, or in the witness of the reeves at a public meeting” whilst a code of Edgar “makes provision for purchases made at distance to be declared to the purchaser's neighbours” (quoted in Lyon 1969, 213). Given the game-theory issues discussed, such laws simply amounted to good business.

A more important source of revenue for the king and other magnates was money. In the models proposed here (7.3.3), it was argued that media of exchange are a natural development of rational individual optimisation. Money gives traders the strategic freedom they would not have in direct barter transactions. Shubik puts the dilemma simply: “in a no-money, non-credit world, an individual cannot commit himself to buy until he knows what he will be able to sell” (1987, 10). In the game-theory models alluded to, optimisation can explain how, without centralised decision or agreements, individuals settle on the same good as the medium of exchange (e.g. Jones 1976; Donangelo & Sneppen 2000). In Early Medieval Europe, intrinsic properties of precious metals such as durability, portability, fungibility, as well as the distribution of holdings, the overall supply, and historical traditions of 'moneyness' going back to the Roman period all converged on gold and silver, firstly as commodities and then as coin, as acceptable media of exchange. The important issue for the élite was how to devise strategies linking this wealth with ideological concepts of hierarchical order and how to use it to legitimise their social and political roles (cf. Baines & Yoffee 1998; 2000). In the pre-monetary phase, an elaborate socio-cosmological set of relationships structured the role of individuals in society, crystallised by the mobilisation of precious metals and artefact-symbols. After the adoption of coined money, geographical constraints were put in place both to aid continued supply, and to restrict the geographical flow of wealth through society. In addition, law codes stipulating wergilds and fines in coin, the increasing use of symbols of political authority on coins, and the control of mints, were all élite strategies formalising specific exchanges and the social role of the élite, with the restricted distribution of commodities an inevitable corollary. Finally, with the control of wealth, kings and magnates could use the Church and continental contacts to provide further iconographic symbols of legitimisation granting the right to key resources, subsistence support and labour.
8.4.4 Competition and socio-economic development in Kent AD 400-900

The recognition of two transactional orders operating within bounded areas and contexts, provide important evidence of social and economic specialisation in operation from the earliest periods of monetary circulation. Significantly, this dual-economic system also provides important clues regarding the way that social power was hierarchically structured and maintained. In Chapter 2, a number of the strategies adopted by élites in limiting access to luxury goods, restricting the production of specific wealth items and controlling their use, were discussed with respect to Hodges' (1982) theory of state formation. It was further argued that although many of the issues regarding these strategies are important, the amassment of wealth cannot be understood as an end in itself, but as a symptomatic means by which individuals expressed and maintained order (cf. Baines & Yoffee 1998; 2000; van Buren & Richards 2000; Earle 1987; Costin & Earle 1989; etc.). Wealth objects, which include primitive valuables used in display, exchange and ritual, as so usefully illustrated by Beowulf, formed the principle means by which rulers defined their own status and the status of others (Brumfield & Earle 1987, 4).

As was discussed in part 2.2.2.4, the economic foundation of élite - and especially royal - power, was not the circulation of wealth symbols, however, but the fœrm, i.e. food-render collected at royal vills. Wealth, in this view, was merely the mechanism by which rulers legitimised their right, and the right of their Gefolgschaft, to subsistence support. “Because of this use value,” Brumfield and Earle’s model goes on to elaborate (ibid), “wealth acquires an exchange value and can be used as a means of payment for services rendered the state. When wealth and subsistence goods are freely exchanged, wealth comes to serve as a true currency”. Spatial analyses of the deposition of wealth objects in this chapter have demonstrated some of the processes by which wealth and subsistence systems operated within spatially-bounded areas. What appear to have been the important criteria for political development were how rulers maintained control of the mobilisation of these respective commodities, both before and after the development of currency exchange.

The interplay of these two transactional orders was similarly shown to form the basis of Saunders’ narrative of social formation over the Early Medieval period (1991; 1995; 2002). The evolutionary steps of this model are worth restating (paraphrasing ibid):

1. Whilst the economic basis of kingship rested on the fœrm, royal position was legitimised within a social order through extra-economic relationships of gifting and military overlordship.
2. With the conglomeration of peer-polities over the course of the Anglo-Saxon period, kings became increasingly reliant on local followers to help collect and supervise the administration of the tributary system.

3. Increasing size and complexity of respective hegemons led to increasingly antagonistic relationships between kings and magnates as the latter had to bear the double burden of military and economic service.

4. Royal strategies for curbing social unrest involved the alienation of land on a permanent basis in return for stringent military services.

5. Rent-taking lords replaced tribute-taking kings as the central economic force. Whilst this process broadly describes the historical transition from tributary to feudal social relations, a number of issues encountered in this thesis illustrate the mechanisms by which this transition occurred at a regional level. Of central importance, as demonstrated in Chapters 3 and 5, was the development of a system of inter-settlement organisation, usually referred to as the 'multiple-estate' (e.g. Jones 1961; 1979; etc.) based on the self-sufficient economic principle of parcelisation. In terms of spatial organisation, the unit presented by Jolliffe in particular (3.3.2) was one of a number of a "spatially scattered hierarchy of functionally differentiated settlements...centred upon a focal place which often housed the territorial [non-producing] aristocracy" (Gregson 1985, 342). Extrapolating from this model, evidence in Kent was examined in Chapters 3-5 which demonstrated:

a) The existence of a highly developed service network linking together economically-differentiated settlements, datable, on the basis of associated archaeological complexes to the seventh century at the latest.

b) The strategic ecotonal location of demonstrable Anglo-Saxon settlements as well as archaeological evidence from excavated settlements indicating inter-pays subsistence support.

c) The existence, by the tenth century at the latest, of overarching jurisdictional institutions, grouping together townships, vills, hamlets and other settlement units from a variety of pays.

d) A model of settlement colonisation moving from an archaeologically-definable association with Romano-British settlement in core areas, along major routeways into more marginal landscapes.

Of all this evidence, d) provides perhaps the most important clue as to the dynamic of settlement organisation and economic evolution. Seen from the point of view of the multiple-
estate model, the process of colonisation away from core settlement in the Foothill pays followed a definable economic rationale. The key factor was the spatial organisation of resources themselves, as can be demonstrated by a simple game-theory model (cf. Boone 1992; Owens & Hayden 1997; Shennan 2002, 228-30). If the settlement of eastern Kent is accepted as an influx of migrating populations, the diverse location of economic resources - in the form of pays - leads to competition between individuals over particular resource patches. As a product of this competition, a hierarchy develops where additional individual 'latecomers' increase the intensity of competition for specific resources, or are pushed on to less profitable resource patches. An individual's share of resources, accordingly, is dependent on the quality of the resource patch he is able to obtain. This development follows the principles of a "density-dependent phenomenon, in the sense that latecomers to the local population have to accept resource patches of lower quality if it is worthwhile for dominant individuals or groups to defend their higher-quality resources. If they are not able successfully to defend their higher-quality resource then the competing group will take it over, but structurally the position will remain the same" (Shennan 2002, 229).

In this model, land-holding in more marginal zones was tied to Mother settlements in core areas as a function of economic push and pulls. Whilst primary settlement in the Foothill pays supports the idea that this area was the most important agricultural resource, later settlement colonisation of the Downland, Chart and Weald, conversely argues that these landscapes were not as productive or desirable. Environmental conditions, particularly during the climatic nadir of the sixth century, meant that de novo land-holdings in these more marginal zones are likely to have been inadequate, if not indeed seasonally exploited. The trend surfaces of wealth condensation and correspondence analysis of the range of interred commodities reviewed at the beginning of this chapter, support the idea that dominant groups centred on those eastern Foothill areas were established also as areas of primary settlement (Fig. 8.12).

The patch resource model outlined by Boone (1992) has further implications regarding the group structure populations adopt as a formation strategy. Optimisation models defined on the basis of group sharing, showed that systems of social reciprocity cannot grow indefinitely in size if some resource patches are consistently better than others (ibid., 307). Initially, asymmetric relations develop between groups characterised by greater net flow in one direction. As the group increases in size, the problem develops whether subordinates can do
better either solitarily or by becoming members of other groups. For dominant groups on the other hand, the optimum group size as a whole is always larger than is in the interests of subordinates. Consequently, a number of strategies can be adopted to allow for greater co-operation in larger groups, including: the punishment of defectors; increased hierarchical group structure, including the development of privileged groups charged with maintaining some public good unilaterally; and social exclusion (Boyd & Richerson 1988; cited in ibid., 305-15).

These models regarding the spatial hierarchy of power relations have a number of important repercussions for the study of the kingdom of East Kent. Not only does the patch-resource model provide a framework for the temporal development of spatial economic relations, it provides important evidence for a dynamic relationship binding lowland and upland groups together. In the case of Kent, the spatial distribution of resources meant that related groups occupied contrasting environmental - and probably agricultural - niches. In the sketched scenario, not only is it likely that marginal communities were in part dependent on additional subsistence support from lowland neighbours, viewed as an inter-related system, economic specialisation within resource patches was an overall more productive strategy than any other form of agricultural organisation. For the dominant group, increased group size can only be facilitated through sharing resources, but the follow-on-effect, predicted by Ricardo's Law of Comparative Advantage, is that specialisation leads to increased overall production.

From the point of view of Kentish kings, increased population and the associated more widely diversified resource economy meant greater personal wealth, but also greater contest competition between dominant and subordinate groups. Boone (1992) argues that competition is determined by the value of the resource: if the resource is valuable, fight for it; if the cost of defending it is greater than the value, a more mixed, fight and acquiesce strategy is adopted (ibid., 318). Shepherd's analysis of Kentish barrow cemeteries (1979a) can be viewed in this light. He argued that the seventh century might have witnessed increasingly antagonistic relationships between Downland groups and other - institutional - authority. Cemeteries of Group 4 barrows and, the possibly contemporary, development of gavelkind, were interpreted as group strategies aimed at maintaining historical rights to local resources (ibid., 8.3-8.7). In Chapter 4, the spatial location of these cemeteries was shown to be structured by those primary network routes linking pays together, i.e. along the physical manifestation of centralised power. The overtly aggressive symbolism of such ostentatious burial, tied as it is to landed
resources, suggests that this period may have witnessed increased competition for holdings and power. Population increases, suggested by total numbers of excavated burials (Table 6.2), and the processes of *pays* colonisation identified so clearly by Everitt (1987), offer evidence of increasing resource exploitation. Subordinate Downland élites would have profited from this expansion of local resource holdings through the same process of patch-resource conflict witnessed at the macro-scale (Fig. 8.13). Strategic positions on routeways, in the Holmesdale, or at spring-heads took on greater value as latecomer colonisation of the Chart, Downland and Weald progressed. These subordinate groups would have come under increasing pressure during the seventh century from the ruling (Foothill) élite to continue the asymmetrical flow of goods rather than fragment into smaller, more rational economic units. The political success of individual leaders rested in limiting the access to the sources of power by competing individuals. Accordingly, over the late sixth and seventh centuries, a wide number of strategies were adopted by Kentish rulers, aimed firstly, at controlling the flow of media of power via the staple and wealth finance division, and secondly, developing both the cultural ideology and socio-political framework for ‘ultrasociality’. This included a concept of regional unity, based initially on an ethnic myth of ‘Jutishness’ (Sørensen 1999) and then Christianity; the centralisation of political and economic power at key sites (e.g. royal vills and towns); as well as widening the benefits subordinate interest groups could expect to receive for continued cooperation (e.g. traded wealth or landed holdings) (Fig. 8.14).

Whilst Kent’s semi-peripheral position provided many of the wealth opportunities for controlling power, therefore, the material base of economic wealth was rooted in the geography of local resources. The corridors of socio-territorial organisation, encapsulated in the later lathes, were a product of internal colonisation, potentially stimulated by increasing population density (perhaps of Anglo-Saxon settlers?) in the coastal margins. Although an imperfect record, Table 6.2 records an increase in the eastern Kent population of 171% from the 150 years before AD 600 to the 150 after, of which the Downland *pays* saw an expansion of nearly 242%. Political power lay in controlling the mobilisation of commodities across these contrasting landscapes: initially through the territorial expansion of the household, in the shape of the multiple-estate, and a control of wealth circulation. Following Saunders’ thesis, a further hypothetical model presents itself regarding the changing strategies adopted by kings over the period. Changes from the control of wealth finance to the control of wealth transactions have already been mentioned. Parallel developments in the control of staple are hinted at by
Saunders. As territorial holdings were slowly enfeoffed to local magnates, estates no longer maintained self-sufficiency as large units, but began to be held together by more rigorous extraction of servile obligations. The development of the lathe could be seen as a further attempt to hold together the contrasting economic basis of staple wealth, by binding together cross-\textit{pays} communities through jurisdictional, rather than personal, bonds.

8.5 Conclusions

In this chapter, Kent's status as the first Anglo-Saxon kingdom has been explored utilising a concept of ecologically-determined human decision-making. The proposed evolutionary model of settlement development, characterised by contrasting \textit{pays} and the geographical pattern of colonisation and land-holding, provides a likely socio-economic backdrop against which rational optimising behaviour can be gauged. In this case, the timing, location and ecological circumstance of eastern Kent, all contributed to the formation of a complex social and economic hierarchy of inter-dependence (cf. Boone 1992, 336). A number of concepts have been forwarded drawing particularly on the cultural evolutionist theories found in the works of Brumfield, Earle and Boone. Of central importance to this interpretation is the concept of the spatial division of staple and wealth finance systems: the former, the agrarian basis of economic power, as illustrated by the concept of the multiple-estate; the latter, strategically-mobilised valuables, used to legitimise rights to the staple. Given the emphasis in previous chapters on defining the structure of subsistence systems in Anglo-Saxon Kent, this chapter has sought to elaborate parallel developments in wealth finance. An important characterisation was shown to be that of the two transactional orders of coined money. Although a global value of coin was demonstrated to be dependent on the intrinsic value of the metallic content, as established in the pre-monetary phase, under specific social conditions, coin could develop to true currency. A number of factors have been shown to influence these conditions, both in determining rational decision-making on the part of transactors, and in the manipulation of favourable social and institutional conditions by the élite. The elaboration of this dual economic system, and an examination of its spatial organisation, finally, have formed the basis of a forwarded model of social and economic growth over the period AD 400-900.
9.1 Issues with exchange

9.1.1 Transactional orders and the modern/non-modern dialectic

One of Medieval history's more provocative practitioners wrote some years ago that "it is an illusion that archaeology can tell you what happened, it cannot; by its nature it cannot do more than provide an imperfect echo of what happened" (Campbell 1982, 37). Notwithstanding this damning proposition, it is archaeological and not historical approaches that are best suited to facilitate the investigation of the interrelationships amongst spatial, economic, and environmental factors in the emergence of socio-political power and nation states (cf. Austin 1990). The division is primarily academic however. Neither camp would argue that the changes in economic strategies and political power over the course of the Early Medieval Period, visible in both the archaeological and historical record, are easily interpreted. Of particular interest is the understanding of how societies of the period functioned economically, and how changes in wealth, power, exchange and identity interrelated over the course of the first millennium. Economics stand at the centre of much of this Early Medieval theorising, as perhaps most usefully characterised in the works of Richard Hodges (1982; 1988a; 1988b; 1989; etc.), but such views have not been unchallenged. Indeed, current trends in archaeological theory away from earlier systemic works reflect older critiques of economic thinking for their perceived disregard of deeper social aspects of life. As early as 1847, Thomas Carlyle warned that:

"Never, on this Earth, was the relation of man to man long carried on by Cash-payment alone. If, at any time, a philosophy of Laissez-faire, Competition and Supply-and-demand, start up as the exponent of human relations, expect that it will end soon" (Carlyle 1847, 235).

In keeping with this criticism, examinations of past exchange systems, so central to this work, have wrestled with the interpretative opposition of gift and commodity, on the assumption that the former represents a form of 'traditional' relationship, that is moral, altruistic and incomprehensible to modern readers, in a way that the impersonal, amoral and calculating latter, is not (2.2.2.3). Gregory's (1982) definition of this opposition provides a useful reminder: "the first is based on an exchange of inalienable objects between interdependent transactors; the second an exchange of alienable objects between independent transactors" (italics as quoted in Bloch & Parry 1989, 8). Utilising this premise, archaeologists and anthropologists alike have drawn historical distinctions between capitalist societies (i.e. those dominated by commodity exchange) and non-capitalist societies (i.e. gifting). Indeed, from an Early Medieval
point of view, this same opposition is centrally placed in the archaeological works of Richard Hodges (e.g. especially 1988b) and in numismatic debates on the role of early money (e.g. Grierson 1961 versus Metcalf 1965). In contrast to these views, recent anthropological re-evaluations of exchange based on ethnographic evidence, as well as game-theory concepts of valuation discussed over the course of this thesis, have both challenged preconceived divisions between capitalist and non-capitalist societies, and elaborated the diversity of mechanisms subsumed by these classifications (cf. Bazelmans 1999, 17).

In the preceding chapters I have formulated a model of the way a variety of exchange mechanisms co-existed in Early Medieval England. The important recognition, revealed by the mobilisation of raw materials, finished artefacts and money in Anglo-Saxon Kent, has been one of the different uses of objects and media in different spheres of exchange and of the temporal and spatial issues describing these forms of exchange. 'Things' in many of the examples cited, could often move back and forth from gift to commodity exchanges, because of the multi-layered nature of value. What was often more important were the conditions and nature of exchange; an interpretation lying at the heart of the concept of 'transactional orders', as developed by Bloch and Parry (1989). In the case of Anglo-Saxon Kent discussed here, special emphasis has been given to two specific forms of transaction: one, concerned with the reproduction of long-term social and cosmic order; the other, “a ‘sphere’ of short-term transactions concerned with the arena of individual competition” (ibid, 24). In the forwarded model, these two exchange systems form, not two discrete transaction systems, but reinforcing spheres sustaining a single ideological Gestalt (cf. Sallnow 1989). Flows of gold, silver and other 'luxury' imports of 'treasure' formed part of the physical manifestation of legitimising order. This same ideologically-constructed order guaranteed rights over the transactional spheres of food and staple circulation and the generation of further wealth finance. According to this system, state power, socio-cosmic relationships and subsistence production are locked together and symbolised by the controlled exchange of valuables, either through the ritualised exchanges comprising social relations, or control over the mercantile transactions (or warfare) underlining the generation of further wealth objects.

9.1.2 Optimisation in a spatial context
Importantly for the archaeological study of distribution patterns, both of these transaction orders are recognised to have a spatial context. Game-theory issues regarding the important
properties of money as a strategic decoupling device, as well as rationalising mercantile
behaviour, have been both shown to influence, and be influenced by, local institutional
arrangements. By contrast, issues regarding the condensation of wealth objects through society
have helped identify the demographic location of socio-cosmic hierarchies and discuss the
nature of these social orders. Finally, evidence that these transaction orders were rooted in the
geography of Anglo-Saxon Kent has offered a means by which to discuss the dynamic of state
formation at this regional scale.

Beyond the important dynamics of intra-regional interconnectedness discussed here, it is clear
from this study that the archaeologically-demonstrable landscapes of consumption belie a
number of more deceptive landscapes of agricultural production. Discussion of the ecological
basis to material wealth has necessarily focused attention on the spatial remit of past action.
Settlement development, the service network and placement of archaeological complexes, have
all been shown to frame an inferred economy, integral to the evolution of political power and
kingship. Thus, although archaeologically the past focus has been on those coastal centres of
conspicious consumption, a regional perspective, in this case, has suggested that the economic
reasons for this pattern were determined by a complex settlement hierarchy of staple and
wealth production. Whilst wealth finance, therefore, reveals itself in a number of
archaeologically-discernible ways, the case for staple production has rested on the use of
middle-range linking arguments. The heuristic device utilised for this exploration of
archaeological intangibles, has been that of rationalised decision-making, as characterised in
evolutionary game theory. In a number of cited cases, optimising and rational economic
behaviour have offered the best explanation for the distribution and form of archaeological
complexes.

This focus on the dynamics of individual action at the heart of group formation offer an
important application of what has been called the distributional approach; i.e. the comparison of
individuals within a system. A number of methodologies applied throughout this thesis have
suggested the way that archaeologically-identifiable individuals and communities can be
understood with respect to self-interest explanations. Conversely, this same rationale has
offered a means by which to view past corporate behaviour. Inter-cemetery examinations of
remains data, in the form of Pareto's Law, trend-surfaces or correspondence analysis, have
demonstrated the usefulness of macro-scale studies, when they are understood as higher-level
phenomena constituted from lower-level events and processes (cf. Winterhalder & Smith 1992). Issues of valuation, for example, were shown to relate to individual choices, made on the basis of real and inferred intrinsic and extrinsic properties, as well as higher-level principles of accessibility and distribution. Similarly, variation within cemetery assemblages, were argued to be the product of a number of social dynamics, operating at the individual, communal and regional level.

As part of the investigation of these higher-order phenomena of regional socio-economic development, it was argued that an analysis of ‘remains’ data offered a way of balancing ‘intentional’ social processes (i.e. thought) against ‘unintentional’ issues of economic accessibility and distribution (i.e. action) (cf. Härke 1994). Application of this methodology to the Kentish data has provided some evidence of the differential regional mobilisation of raw materials underlining the interpretations offered of a number of dynamics: convergent modes of wealth and staple finance; the development of specialised exchange; and the extension and centralisation of political control. Although many of the conclusions drawn about the social processes comprising the development of this early state must be seen with respect to significant research undertaken, particularly in New World anthropology, the applied methodology has a number of epistemological strengths given the nature of excavated data. Beyond the interpretative impasse recognised of some post-processual approaches to burial data, this focus on the functional data of unintentional ‘remains’ allows for cross-community comparisons on a like-by-like basis. Thus, although all archaeological data from burial contexts can rightly be interpreted as the symbolic patterning of ‘intentional’ inclusions, the focus on the weight, range and number of raw materials interred has been argued over the course of this work to reflect important ‘unintentional’ sources of economic information. Comparison with Loveluck’s analysis of Anglo-Saxon ‘On Driffield’ sites (8.2.3) supports the idea that an investigation of the economic basis to political power has much to profit from such approaches. Perhaps more significantly, this methodology provides an important practical application from which to compare social behaviour at a regional and, potentially, inter-regional scale.

9.1.3 Internal versus external forces

In chapter 2, it was argued that this investigation of the spatial patterning of society and economy in Early- to Middle Saxon Kent (AD 450-900) grew out of a concern with current
models of Early-Medieval socio-economic development. An important product of the form of approach advocated in the preceding thesis is the formulation of a more robust model of internal factors leading to the development of states to set against Hodges' important thesis of external forces. Through the two parts of this work, two concepts of economic systems have been developed, in keeping with many of the issues raised by anthropologists and historians (2.2.2.3-2.2.2.6). The first provided evidence of the ecological basis of material wealth and the second a revaluation of the exchange of wealth objects themselves. Consideration of both issues from the perspective of a detailed regional study has provided a more complex conceptualisation of Anglo-Saxon society and the multiplicity of inter-related causal factors underlying change and transformation, often overlooked by reductionalist single common characterisation or causal process.

Whilst some of the ways in which élite sources of ideological and military power run alongside economic factors have been discussed, many of the conclusions drawn here have suggested the further important influence that population increases may have played in the development of social hierarchies in access, rights and ownership of land. Both Everitt’s (1986) model of pay colonisation and the ‘patch resource model’ proposed in section 8.4.4 assume demographic changes as contributing dynamics. Whilst archaeological evidence supporting population increases is admittedly slender, nevertheless this phenomenon offers the best explanation for many of the changes visible in Anglo-Saxon Kent. Although it is certainly beyond the scope of this thesis to forward a model of Germanic stream-migration underpinning such a dynamic, population growth as a result of an historic Völkerwanderung may yet prove to become re-established as an important causal mechanism in the development of English peer polities. Beyond the model of territorial colonisation and land-use outlined in this thesis, increasing archaeological evidence from the Frisian homelands (e.g. Heidinga 1997), theories regarding socio-cultural links defined by language, religion, mythology and custom (e.g. Sørensen 1999), and genetic studies of population DNA (e.g. Weale et al. 2002) all appear to substantiate the important role migration played in the evolution of Anglo-Saxon hegemons. Rather than propagate insular theories of immobilism, migration, in the light of these lines of evidence, should perhaps take a central role in future analyses of the resource-holding potential, equilibrium group size and contest competitions comprising peer polity interactions (cf. Boone 1992).
Somewhat paradoxically, this appreciation of external factors has come about through an evaluation of internal developments, and in turn informs the interpretation of internal conflict and the evolution of complex agrarian-production systems. If migration and population growth can be accepted, the model of intensively-settled coastal areas and appurtenant colonisation of interior pays accounts for part of the dynamic of socio-political development. This stands in some contrast to the Hodgen model of Anglo-Saxon social hierarchisation, which saw the modes of inter-regional exchange as primary influences in determining indigenous change. Whilst the importance of gift-tribute systems to Anglo-Saxon society has been addressed from a number of perspectives in this work, its analysis suggests that the prestige-good system merely realised transformations and relations in society. As wealth finance, their acquisition, control and redistribution acted to articulate legitimacy, competition and order. Rather than an overemphasis on long-distance exchange, it is dynamics of landholding and the changing nature of exchange systems that have been recognised as important contributing factors to the formation of kingdoms. By contrast, extra-economic modes of production, such as politico-military apparatus and the exchange of luxury goods, have been interpreted as complementary, though discrete economic spheres, tied to the political right to mobilise subsistence goods.

This change in emphasis has further repercussions for the interpretation of the role of emporia in socio-economic development. Rather than the active articulation of local power strategies, the evidence considered throughout this thesis has suggested that emporia formed as a result of the mutually-sustaining effects of mercantile behaviour, the establishment of marketing conditions, and infrastructural control over the exchange of prestige goods. As mutually-negotiated and controlled focal nodes, emporia in Kent developed in response to directional trade stimuli, but also helped foster local economic zones of monetary exchange. The establishment of media of exchange, intrinsic to transaction between strangers and predictable by game-theory modelling, widened the sphere of exchange to allow anyone with money to access mercantile activity. Fall-off patterns of single-coin finds suggest that these zones of monetisation corresponded to areas which matched Plattner’s model of commercialisation (1976). Thus, although emporia were settlements controlled and dependent on a secular or ecclesiastical élite to provide and guarantee the conditions for peaceful exchange and the subsistence basis for specialised production and exchange, while the influence of money, and money’s ability to decouple transactions, distinguish transactors and make side payments,
widened the principle of marketing beyond the confines of the market. The royal response to such incipient commercialism appears to have been increased infrastructural penetration in the form of controlled minting and legal restrictions on markets and taxation. These changing strategies merely hastened the increased use of money, and, in combination with the pervasion of Christian concepts of otherworldliness, aided the deconstruction of socially-important exchange. The role of gifts in maintaining social relations and legitimising tributary social relationships needed to be reinforced in verse. Failing that, loyalty was bought with land, thereby facilitating the growth of feudal relations.

If the wealth-finance strategies adopted by the élite form the most easily archaeologically-recognisable aspects of the Anglo-Saxon political economy, this economic power is argued to have financed far less archaeologically-visible activities aimed at sustaining access to agricultural surpluses. The concept of pays and the divergent models of settlement history associated with these landscapes, elaborated throughout this thesis, suggest that a final form of value underlay the relationships of political power: that is to say, the value of land. Whilst it seems likely that the pattern of settlement colonisation owed much to pre-existent conditions, the patch resource model emphasis on, what were after all the best agricultural lands, suggest that the likely pastoral economy of the Downland and Chart pays (and certainly the Marsh and Weald) formed 'secondary' resources in both senses of the word. This recognition notwithstanding, it is arguably the pastoral and not the agricultural economy, that is most attuned to surplus production. This proposition is perhaps demonstrable archaeological by the animal provisioning of Hamnic (Bourdillon 1980; 1988) or the features suggestive of intensive stock-rearing at Riby Crossroads (Li) or Pennylands (Bu) (Blinkhorn 1999). Thus it is of some interest, that it is from these areas that most evidence for Germanic 'folkways' have been forthcoming, as seen in: attitudes to death and mortuary customs; rules of rank; onomastic customs, including the re-naming of the landscape; attitudes toward authority, power wealth; and so on (cf. Fischer 1989). These are the same 'folkways' that are interpreted as a form of settlement 'colonisation'. Stretching into supposition it is not difficult to imagine that it was in the relationship with these (more heavily contested?) regions that the roots of much social conflict arose. Given that settlement was not into a pristine environment, it was in these more marginal regions that resource allocation became a more critical issue. Yet it was these same pastoralists who first recognised the potential of market exchange as a way of accessing the channels of wealth, and the same pastoralist, who, 500 years later, had their ideas of liberty and independence codified in the gavelkind. It follows from this that if the reason for the
ideological, military and wealth power strategies adopted by the élite, examined through this thesis, was in order to maintain the allegiance of these specialised producers, it was these same landed relationships which determined the development of Kent as a hierarchically-organised polity.

9.2 Future work
As recently as 1989 an eminent Anglo-Saxonist bemoaned the discipline’s reluctance to produce any general model of state formation for this crucial period (Brooks 1989, 55). Whilst a number of important contributions to the debate have now been forwarded (e.g. Hodges 1982; Bassett 1989; Saunders 1995; Scull 1999), little emphasis has been placed on the timing, conditions, location, or ecological circumstances surrounding the formation of specific hegemons. The example offered here of Anglo-Saxon Kent, suggests a number of potential future directions. The importance control over the mobilisation of both wealth and staple finances played in buttressing élite and royal power demonstrated in this work indicate the likely significance of specific ecological and geographical conditions in the formation of regional polities. Whilst similar conditions are likely to have existed elsewhere in Anglo-Saxon England, notably in the contrasting landscapes of Suffolk and the Upper Thames region, dynamics, other than the patch resource model used here, are likely to have been important in regions where resources were not geographically circumscribed. Here, as is perhaps relevant for the study of the kingdoms of Wessex or Mercia, continued expansion would have lessened the importance of within-group competition for resources. In these regions, kingship as an office is likely to have retained closer affiliation with that of the Germanic *Heerkönig* (i.e. the leader of an extended retinue of warriors) than that in seventh-century Kent, where leaders appear to have begun utilising a variety of strategies to legitimise their position. In this respect, it might be of considerable interest to investigate possibilities regarding the potential diffusion of authoritative and allocative strategies and/or the adoption of different modes of power configuration in different circumstances.

In this respect, Anglo-Saxon archaeology has an important role to play in developing models on the nature and structure of state formation. The wealth of archaeological and - by comparison with prehistoric periods - documentary evidence, allows interpretations of this particular period to investigate more fully the natural environment, historical circumstances and social relationships of power, politics, ideology and wealth, than many other arenas of archaeological endeavour. As part of this wider tradition of investigating why, where and when
complex societies develop, the potentials for multi-disciplinary research should place the study of Early Medieval Europe at the forefront of theoretical debates. Beyond comparisons with other established examples in Mesoamerica, Peru or Bronze Age Europe (cf. the many examples compiled in Haas 2001), models of state formation, migration and the organisation of the political economy for this period can usefully be contrasted with the economic strategies and ‘folkways’ of the historically-attested Danish incursions of the tenth century or the aftermath of the Norman Conquest itself.

At a more practical level, a number of methodologies have been applied in this work in an attempt to elucidate intra-regional patterning and economic behaviour from the most common of Early Anglo-Saxon archaeological data. By using people as the basic units of analysis, an attempt has been made to extrapolate broader economic and social themes as aggregates of social organisation at a micro and macro level. As part of this objective, the derivation of ‘remains’ information from burial data, as already stated, may yet provide a means of investigating many of the regional and inter-regional patterns of consumption underlining socio-political development. The identification of different communities and individuals, separated by their consumption patterns and identifiable in space/time, may provide further evidence of the way in which wealth and access was restricted both spatially and temporally. At the very least, ASKED has demonstrated the importance of a unified and standardised burial data format. It has allowed for the examination of the frequency or quantity of commodities with respect to units of economic consumption, such as individuals, households or communities. Further, the structure of the database has provided the methodological flexibility to link past agents with their environment. Future research would profit greatly from widening the scope of such computer-manipulated applications, both in defining the territoriality of past polities and investigating their spatial, economic and social structure. Whilst some of the possible criteria for such studies have been suggested in this work, the ASKED, or a national equivalent, would provide the basis for an integrated study of Anglo-Saxon polities at a micro- and macro-scale for years to come.
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Fig. 1.1 Two contrasting views of the relationship between agents and the environment as outlined by Ingold (1992).
The ASKED data structure showing the site gazetteer detail and level of data input.
Fig. 1.3 The southern North Sea region in the Early Middle Ages AD 500-900
Fig. 1.4  Regression curves for Huggett's Group I artefacts (redrawn from Huggett 1988)
Fig. 1.5  Regression curves for Huggett's Group II artefacts (redrawn from Huggett 1988)
Fig. 1.6 Regression curves for Huggett's 'Borderline' Group I artefacts (redrawn from Huggett 1988)
Whether artefact-types or certain diagnostic technical or stylistic elements of artefacts (such as punch-marks, gold-foil impressions, or motif elements) could be linked to specific workshops (e.g. Inker 2000)

Whether different technical properties of artefacts can be used to discriminate amongst artefact making traditions (e.g. Arrhenius 1982, Mortimer 1990; 1999; Brown-sword & Hines 1993)

Whether cultures can be defined by stylistic or typological criteria, i.e. broadly described art-historical approaches (e.g. Salin 1904; Bakka 1958; Haseloff 1981)

Whether different technical properties of artefacts can be used to discriminate among artefact making traditions (e.g. Arrhenius 1982, Mortimer 1990; 1999; Brown-sword & Hines 1993)

Whether modes of production might affect decorative variability (e.g. Dickinson 1982; Leigh 1980)

Fig. 2.1 The components of a constellation of knowledge of artefact manufacture, as defined by Sinclair (2000), showing the types of issues addressed by artefact studies and their relationship with past technical knowledge.
### Gift exchange vs. Commodity exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gift exchange</strong></th>
<th><strong>Commodity exchange</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- is non-capitalist/non-modern/non-Western</td>
<td>- is capitalist/modern/Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is based on clans, segmented society</td>
<td>- is based on class, state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are social <em>persona</em>, mutually dependent</td>
<td>- are independent parties, strangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are not necessarily of equal status</td>
<td>- are of equal status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- has in addition to economic aspects social, political and religious ones as well</td>
<td>- takes place in an independent economic domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- reciprocity anchored in collective representation</td>
<td>- is contractual (legal anchoring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- is obligatory and obligating</td>
<td>- is non-obligatory and non-obligating, voluntary basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- brings about a qualitative relationship between persons (i.e. distinctions in rank)</td>
<td>- brings about a quantitative relationship between objects (an equivalence in value)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gift and counter gift not balanced</td>
<td>- exchange is balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- social relationship formed</td>
<td>- relationship terminated after transaction (is a point in space and time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- emphasis on consumption</td>
<td>- emphasis on production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are a means</td>
<td>- are an end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are inalienable</td>
<td>- are alienable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are ordered according to rank</td>
<td>- have exchange value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are personified</td>
<td>- are commodified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 2.2** The conceptual dichotomy between gift and commodity exchanges (from Bazelmans 1999, 15)
Fig. 2.3  The relationship between exchange and displacement (redrawn from Needham 1993, 161).

Fig. 2.4  The typology of gateway communities as presented by Hodges. Type A: a disembarkation or trading-place, may give rise to either type A1: multiple/competitive gateway communities, or type B: a primate centre concerned with production as well as distribution (redrawn from Hodges 1988b, 45).
Within and between Group relationships demonstrated by combined design and object distributions

Very strong associations exemplified by 'C' Groups

Strong associations exemplified by the 3 Groups 1, 2 and 3.

Apparent associations recognized between Groups.

Fig.2.5 A comparison of Shepherd's Style I within and between group relationships and the hegemons of the Tribal Hidage (Shepherd 1998, 51; Davies and Vierck 1974, 235; Yorke 1990, 12).
Fig. 2.6 Siegfried enjoys a quiet moment with Balmung amid the just-calcified Nieberlungen (left) and suffers from the bad luck attached to the hoard (right).

Fig. 2.7  Bazelmans' ritual cosmological model of the relationship between lord and warrior-follower in *Beowulf* (1999, 169).
Fig. 3.1 The Kentish pays as defined by Alan Everitt (1979)
Fig. 3.2 The Lathes of Kent c. AD 1086
Fig. 3.3  Source material for economic landscape reconstruction, combining modern maps with information on past settlement and environment (Adapted from Berglund 1997).

Fig. 3.4  The effect of rising sea levels and wave attrition on the Isle of Thanet through 8000 years (Devoy 1979).
Fig. 3.5
Geomorphological studies of the evolution of Romney Marsh. On the right, the proposed locations of barrier systems within Rye bay suggested by Dix, Long and Cooke (1998) on the basis of offshore barrier systems identified by seismic survey. Below, a composite reconstruction model of the changing course of the River Rother based on back-barrier sediments, the location of archaeological find-spots, and the location of Medieval dyke walls, sluices and channels (Green 1988).
Fig. 3.6 The drift geology of north-east Kent showing the extent of Holocene alluviation
Fig. 3.7 Detail of Christopher Saxton’s *Map of the Four Southern Counties* dating to 1575, showing the northern extension of the Shellness spit in relation to Stonar. (Reproduced in Ravenhill 1992, 32).

Fig. 3.8 Detail of William Borough’s coastal chart of south-east England from 1596, showing the relationship between Shellness and Sandown Castle. (Reproduced in Robinson 1962).
Fig. 3.9 Coastal changes around the Sandwich Bay region showing the rate of growth of the Shellness Spit based on hydrographic and ordnance surveys (after So 1963, pl. 65).

Fig. 3.10 Map showing the location of various medieval and later sea-defence walls in the Chislet valleys. (after Bowler 1983, 36).
Fig. 3.11 Map showing the location of some of the sites mentioned in the text and the reconstructed topography of Anglo-Saxon Kent c. AD 800.
Fig. 3.12
Percentage pollen diagram from the Ebbsfleet excavations (Taken from Scaife 1995).
Fig. 3.13 Modern woodland and select woodland place-names showing the former scale of the Blean north of Canterbury.

Fig. 3.14 The distribution of Anglo-Saxon archaeological complexes and place-name evidence in relation to drift geology, showing the lack of data from London Clay drift geologies.
Fig. 3.15 The hundreds of Kent
Fig. 4.1  Map of East Kent showing the distribution of Early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and isolated burials. Also shown are the principal routes of communication and the randomly produced points used in the Kolgomov-Smirnov test.
Fig. 4.2  Graph of the distances between the cemeteries of north-east Kent and either Roman roads, rivers or coast.

Fig. 4.3  Graph showing the percentage of cemeteries in East Kent and their distance from the routes of communication
Fig. 4.4  Graph demonstrating the fall-off curve of cemeteries in relation to the distance from the routes of communication.

Fig. 4.5  Graph of the distance between cemeteries and random points from the routes of communication. Also shown, is the significance of the two distributions using Kolgomov-Smirnov testing.
The eastern extent of the least-cost path generated between Eastry, Bishopsbourne and their Wealden denuis, projected on an aspect map of the region created from 10m O.S. digital contours.
Fig. 4.7  
Digital elevation map of north-central Kent showing the location of the produced optimum paths between Faversham, Teynham, Milton Regis and their Wealden appurtenances. Also shown are Payne's (1893) hypothesised 'ancient' routes, 13th-century droveways and possible Anglo-Saxon routes, determined from the location of archaeologically-identified 5th-to-8th-century mortuary complexes.
Fig. 4.8 Map of East Kent showing the distribution of place-names containing the OE element ora (as identified by Cole 1990).
Fig. 4.9 Distribution of early place-name elements in north-east Kent to geology by phase.
Fig. 4.10  The distance of places, containing the place-name elements -hām, -ing² and -ingas (blue lines), from the routes of communication. Compared are the distribution of randomly generated places (pink lines) and the significance of the pattern using Kolgomov-Smirnov testing (grey lines).
The seventh-century Anglo-Saxon barrows on Kingston Down as recorded in Faussett’s Inventorium Sepulchrale showing the prominent position and high visibility of the features even in the eighteenth century (reproduced from Chadwick-Hawkes 1990).
6th-century cemetery without barrows
6th-century cemetery ?barrow
ora place-name element
7th-century cemetery without barrows
7th-century cemetery ?barrows
Anglo-Saxon barrow cemetery
?Isolated burial
Bronze Age barrow

Fig. 4.12 View-sheds produced for a hypothetical sea-route through the Wantsum Channel.
Fig. 4.13 Map of South-East Kent showing the visibility of the landscape from seven points on the Pilgrim's Way and Roman road near Wye.
Fig. 4.14 Map of East Kent showing the location of the Anglo-Saxon estate centres identified by Everitt (1986) in relation to the routes of communication.
Fig. 5.1 Archaeological evidence for Early to Middle Anglo-Saxon settlement shown with respect to pays, other sites and finds
Fig. 5.2 Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries and the Drift Geology of North-East Kent AD450-550
Fig. 5.3  Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries and the Drift Geology of North-East Kent AD550-650
Fig. 5.4 Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries and the Drift Geology of North-East Kent AD650-750
Fig. 5.5  Distribution of Anglo-Saxon finds in eastern Kent with respect to known woodland.
Key to sites:

Fig. 5.6 Map of south-east Thanet showing: a) the location of known Early- to Middle Anglo-Saxon archaeological complexes with respect to the Early Medieval topography and b) a model of settlement interdependence (parcelisation) suggested for the location of Anglo-Saxon complexes centred on Higgin's Bottom valley.
Fig. 5.7  The general Saxon topography of north-east Canterbury, showing the distribution of the five main Early Medieval units: the Archbishop’s manor of St. Martin (later Caldecote) and ‘Wic’; the manor of Northgate or Colton; the town and port of Fordwich; and the intra-mural settlement of Canterbury (after Rady 1987, Fig. 2, inset).

Fig. 5.8  Map of Dover showing the probable site of the Anglo-Saxon harbour in relation to the Roman Saxon Shore fort, the possible burh, cemeteries and find-spots (after Parfitt 2001, Fig. A2.1; Evison 1987, Fig. 36).
Fig. 5.9 The waterways and pays of eastern Kent.
Fig. 5.10 The distribution of cemeteries (blue dots) in East Kent and their relation to a) waterways and b) watershed boundaries. Expected frequencies are shown by shading.
Fig. 5.11a  The distance of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries to waterways in East Kent (pink) compared with the expected frequency (black) and difference.

Fig. 5.11b  The distance of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries to watershed boundaries in East Kent (pink) compared with the expected frequency (black) and difference.
The distribution of estate-centres in East Kent and their relation to a) waterways and b) watershed boundaries. Expected frequencies are shown by shading.
Fig. 5.13a  The distance of probable Anglo-Saxon settlements to waterways in East Kent (pink) compared with the expected frequency (black) and difference.

Fig. 5.13b  The distance of probable Anglo-Saxon settlements to watershed boundaries in East Kent (pink) compared with the expected frequency (black) and difference.
Fig. 5.14 A topographical sketch of Anglo-Saxon Eastry showing the location of major finds (after Chadwick-Hawkes 1979, Fig. 4.7; Parfitt 1999, Fig.1).
Fig. 5.15 Thiessen polygons created around Everitt's 'primary centres' showing the cross-pays structure of resource exploitation.
Fig. 5.16 The spatial correlation of estate-centres and Roman archaeological complexes in the central Holmesdale.
Fig. 5.17 A comparison between the distribution of 'early' place-name elements and Roman archaeological complexes.
Fig. 5.18  Distribution of Early Minsters and Churches in relation to Hundreds and Woodland
Fig. 6.1 The distribution of the minimum number of burials in eastern Kent with respect to *pays.*
A comparison between the distribution of primary 'early' place-name elements and Early Anglo-Saxon burial sites
Fig. 6.3  A comparison between the distribution of secondary 'early' place-name elements and Early Anglo-Saxon burial sites
The ASKED data structure showing the site gazetteer detail and level of data input (above) and the grave by grave entries for the Kentish cemeteries and individual artefact entries within graves (below).
Fig. 6.5  Graphs showing the measured weights of Type 6 shield-bosses in East Kent, in numerical order of weight (above) and chronological order (below) with the mean weight of bosses in blue.
Fig. 6.6 Sword weights from various East Kent contexts, also showing those swords within 15% of the mean weight (between black lines).

Fig. 6.7 The weight of Swanton type C2 spearheads in chronological order (the median weight in blue).
Fig. 6.8  The average weight of gold interred with burials in East Kent
Fig. 6.9  Graph showing the average weight of buckles from Dover Buckland by date phase and raw material constituent (see Table 6.6)

Fig. 6.10  Graph showing the average weight of all buckles within the East Kent sample that have been weighed and assigned a close date phase (see Table 6.7).
Fig. 7.1 Comparative models of Germanic invasion, above c.AD500 http://www.britannia.com/history/500.html and below, detail of Operation ‘Sealion’ AD1940 (Imperial War Museum exhibition catalogue).
Table and diagram illustrating attempts at correlating material culture from male grave assemblages with social status in German scholarship (after Samson 1987, Fig. 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noble</th>
<th>Free</th>
<th>Half-free</th>
<th>Unfree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealthy Peasant Proprietors</td>
<td>Poorer Peasant Proprietors</td>
<td>Landless Peasant Proprietors</td>
<td>Serf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Veeck** 1926: Sw S Sp Ax Sb also S alone
- **Stoll** 1939: Sw S Sp Sb
- **Laur-Belart** 1948: Sw S Sp Sb
- **Böhner** 1958: Sw
- **Grimm** 1953: S
- **Schmidt** 1961: S? A Axe
- **Fremersdorf** 1955: Sw
- **Werner** 1953: Sw S Sp Sb - S
- **Dannheim** 1962: Sw or S + second weapon
- **Neuffer-Müller** 1966: Sw or S + second weapon
- **Stein** 1967: Sw/S Sp Sb
- **Christlein** 1966: Sw + S
- **Christlein** 1978: Sw + S
- **Schach-Dörges** 1970: Sw S Sp Ax Sb
- **Müller** 1976: Swl + weapon
- **Martin** 1976: Sw S Sp Sb
- **Schmidt** 1976: Sw S Sp Sb
- **Schach-Dörges** 1978: Sw + S
- **Koch** 1977: Sw S Sp Sb

**Key**
- Swl = Exceptional Sword
- Sw = Sword
- Sp = Spear
- Sb = Shield boss
- S = Seax
- A = arrow(s)
- Axe = Axe or Fransisca

Fig. 7.2: Attempts at correlating material culture from male grave assemblages with social status in German scholarship (after Samson 1987, Fig. 1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Group</th>
<th>Archaeological Characteristics</th>
<th>General Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Graves</td>
<td>Female Graves</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>no grave goods</td>
<td>markedly poor, poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>axe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bow and arrows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>sword</td>
<td>averagely wealthy, wealthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>axe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decorated belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>buckles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>glass containers, 6th C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>sword</td>
<td>above averagely wealthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>axe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>spear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decorated belt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>buckles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>snaffle and horse-harness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bronze containers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bronze fittings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wooden buckets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>glass containers, 7th C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 7.3** Correlation of specific artefact types with wealth/status groups, as derived from contemporary German and Anglo-Saxon scholarship (after Samson 1987, Fig. 2).
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**Fig. 7.4** A model of the changing relative value of different resources by amount. Resource j is more valuable than i in similar small amounts (R) but can be more valuable in larger quantities (R'). Resource x on the other hand, is always more valuable (after Minnegal 1997, Fig.2).
Fig. 7.5 Pan-Germanic systems of value. Beyond issues of cultural expression and stylistic development, 'wealth' items uniformly draw on similar media for articulating value. Assemblages such as the St. Martin's hoard (Canterbury), containing a Merovingian soidus, Kentish 'medalet' and an Itallian tremissis, demonstrate on the one hand, how objects from diverse provenances could be valued in a local context, whilst cross-cultural stylistic influences in material culture are readily apparent throughout Germanic Europe, as shown, for example, on a range of gold and gilt-silver buckles.
Fig. 7.6 The range of different raw materials interred with males at Dover Buckland (in blue), and a count of the number of artefacts comprising the grave complex (in orange).
Fig. 7.7 The range of different raw materials interred with females at Dover Buckland.
Fig. 7.8  The raw material composition of grave-groups from DBU plotted against CA axes 1 and 2.

Fig. 7.9  The raw material composition of post-AD 600 grave-groups from six cemeteries on Thanet.
Comparative raw material frequency curves, showing the percentage of cemetery populations interred with iron (left) and copper-alloy (right). Despite little discernible patterning in the deposition of iron over the period, a clear drop in the use of copper-alloy during the seventh century is apparent, with the exceptions of the communities of EUP, BVH/BBS, DBU and the three burials from MTF.
Fig. 7.11a
Percentage of the population interred with iron.
Fig. 7.11b
Percentage of the population interred with copper-alloy.
Fig. 7.11c
Percentage of the population interred with silver.
Fig. 7.11d
Percentage of the population interred with gold.
Fig. 8.1
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Fig. 8.2b
Counts of 'Curated' artefacts per individual
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Counts of Kentish artefacts per individual
Counts of Imported artefacts per individual

Fig. 8.2c
Graphs showing the comparative weight of raw materials per individual in the cemeteries of MHD (blue) and EUP (pink). Whilst clear temporal trends are visible in the deposition of silver and copper-alloy, the weight of iron and gold per individual shows signs of differential access c. AD 600.
CA graphs demonstrating clustered consumption of raw materials by communities specified by pays. Above, the assemblages from the Downland cemeteries of BAR and SIB appear slightly different in composition to those of liminal settlements such as FIG and DBU and the Foothill community of EUP. Below, the Foothill cemeteries of EUP and GIL display a distinctive pattern in the range of raw material deposition to other groups.
Fig. 8.5: Graphs showing the comparative weight of raw materials per individual in the cemeteries of BBS (blue) and BSP (pink). Similar temporal trends are visible in the deposition of silver, copper-alloy, iron and seventh-century gold.
Fig. 8.6 Graph showing the average number of 'Imported' artefacts interred with each individual in the cemeteries of Kent.
Fig. 8.7 Comparative graph of the average weight of gold (pink) and silver (blue) interred with individuals from the cemeteries of MHD, DBU, BBS, BSP, EUP, MKN and BIF.
Fig. 8.8: Monetary zones of commercialisation
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Fig. 8.9: Regression model of the distribution of Kentish coins (gold and Primary sceattas) in England
Fig. 8.10a:
Trend surfaces interpolated from coin finds, showing above, Kentish thrymsas of types Sutherland II.v: Two Emperors and Sutherland IV.ii: Witanmen; Preliminary 'Pada'; Kentish Primary sceattas of types C 'mule', A2-A3 and C, and below, Secondary sceattas of types F-W.
Fig. 8.10b:
Trend surfaces interpolated from coin finds, showing above, Primary Frisian sceattas of types D and E, and below, Primary English sceattas of types A1, B, C/R, E and Vernus Group 2.
Fig. 8.11 The graphical relationship between world-systems boundaries as defined by Chase-Dunn and Hall (1997; 2000).
Fig. 8.12  Phase I: Primary settlement in the best agricultural land. Economic parcelisation requires liminal dependent settlements linked to a primary centre through kinship bonds.
Fig. 8.13 Phase II: Secondary settlement infilling of the Foothills from the Primary centre and liminal settlement. Primary colonisation of more marginal areas particularly along routeways. New liminal elite make territorial claims and break with established kinship links with primary centres by \textit{inter alia} adopting visible mortuary structures. This is countered by a) new ideology, b) increased strengthening of individuals through generations of wealth finance inluding imports c) intesification of surplus production.
Phase III: Tertiary settlement infilling. Lots of dispersed marginal settlements linked to more nucleated (?) liminals. Individually, these units are either still linked to primary centres or have been ceded to ecclesiastical and secular lords. Lessening importance for kings of control over wealth finance, as the new power is in the negotiated rights to bookland. Equally, monetisation allows people to access allocative resources directly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Archaeological evidence for Romano-British occupation within 500m</th>
<th>Excavated Archaeological Evidence</th>
<th>EAS burials within 500m</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acol</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>ACL: Post-holes; midden; pottery</td>
<td>CSP; CSP-2 500m W</td>
<td>630900</td>
<td>167400</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Breach Downs</td>
<td>Iron Age and Roman find scatters</td>
<td>BRD-FS1; BRD-FS2; BRD-SET1; Sceatta finds and scattered Anglo-Saxon material west of church</td>
<td>BRD 500m SE</td>
<td>620300</td>
<td>149500</td>
<td>8th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Broadstairs Dumpton Gap</td>
<td>Iron Age and Roman settlement, inhumations and cremations</td>
<td>BGD: Settlement visible in cropmarks</td>
<td>BVH; BBS 500m N</td>
<td>639300</td>
<td>166400</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury (Marlowe Car Park, George's St., 36-37 Stour St.)</td>
<td>Major Roman town and associated cemeteries</td>
<td>CAT-SET2-3, CAT-SET05, CAT-SET7-8, CAT-SET11, CAT-SET13, CAT-FS4-5, CAT-FS7-13, CAT-FS15-17, CAT-FS20-21; Multiple SFBs; post-holes and occupation layers</td>
<td>CAT-2, CAT-3</td>
<td>615000</td>
<td>157900</td>
<td>5th-6th century onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury II St Augustine's</td>
<td>Roman occupation site and associated cemetery</td>
<td>CAT-SET14-16, CAT-SET1; CAT-FS18-19; Anglo-Saxon deposits, pits</td>
<td>CAT-IB3, CAT-1</td>
<td>615400</td>
<td>157800</td>
<td>7th century onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury III St. Martin</td>
<td>Roman cremation cemetery</td>
<td>CAT-SET18; Rubbish pits, metalled track</td>
<td>CAT-IB1</td>
<td>615900</td>
<td>157700</td>
<td>Mid-8th century onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Whitfield, Dover</td>
<td>Single Roman burial 250m NE</td>
<td>CWD: 2 timber halls and 4 SFBs</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>631300</td>
<td>145800</td>
<td>Late 6th-7th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Cliffe-at-Hoo</td>
<td>Roman occupation horizons and find scatters (500m NW)</td>
<td>CAH: Several pits, animal bones; A-S girdle hanger</td>
<td>no (CAH-1 is 1500m SE)</td>
<td>572190</td>
<td>175480</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover (Market St.; Queen St. &amp; Royal Victoria Hospital)</td>
<td>Major Roman town and associated cemeteries</td>
<td>DVR-SET02-6, DVR-SET08, DVR-FS03-6, DVR-FS08; Various sites, SFBs, timber halls, timber church inside Roman fort</td>
<td>DVR-2</td>
<td>631800</td>
<td>141500</td>
<td>6th century onwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Faversham</td>
<td>Roman settlement and associated cemetery</td>
<td>FAV-FS-2-3; FAV-SET1; Possible SFB</td>
<td>FCY; FAV (800m SW)</td>
<td>601800</td>
<td>161500</td>
<td>EAS-MAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkestone Cherry Garden Hill</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>FLK-SET7: Refuse pits</td>
<td>FLK-IB2</td>
<td>620800</td>
<td>137900</td>
<td>8th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkestone, Cheriton Hill</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>FLK-SET6: Refuse pits</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>619910</td>
<td>138190</td>
<td>Late 8th-9th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manston, Tesco</td>
<td>Small Roman building 500m S</td>
<td>MTC: 5 SFBs, ditches and occupation debris</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>636170</td>
<td>186500</td>
<td>Late 6th-8th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Nethercourt Estate, Manston</td>
<td>A number of Roman buildings stretching from to 300m N200m E</td>
<td>MTC-2: Possible AS post-holes, AS-Med finds</td>
<td>OZE 300m S</td>
<td>635730</td>
<td>165650</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington Biggin's Wood</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>NWOT-SET2: SFB, occupation layers</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>619530</td>
<td>137910</td>
<td>6th-8th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington Dolland's Moor</td>
<td>Adjacent Roman farmstead</td>
<td>NWOT-SET1: 2 SFBs; associated features, domestic refuse</td>
<td>NWOT-2 250m SE</td>
<td>617800</td>
<td>137400</td>
<td>EAS-MAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Preston</td>
<td>1st-4th C. Roman occupation site</td>
<td>PRE-SET7: 4thC pit sealed by an unburnt clay hearth</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>625030</td>
<td>160750</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.1 continued: Excavated Early- to Middle Anglo-Saxon settlements in East Kent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Archaeological evidence for Romano-British occupation within 500m</th>
<th>Excavated Archaeological Evidence</th>
<th>EAS burials within 500m</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saltwood settlement</td>
<td>Adjacent Roman occupation features</td>
<td>SLT-SET1: SFB</td>
<td>SLT1-3</td>
<td>615450</td>
<td>136950</td>
<td>8th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandtun</td>
<td>Opposite Roman fort</td>
<td>SAN: Occupation layers, pottery, animal and fish bones</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>612140</td>
<td>133880</td>
<td>7th-11th century seasonally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarre</td>
<td>Roman find scatters</td>
<td>SAR-SET1: SFB, MAS find scatters</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>626300</td>
<td>165050</td>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrubsoles Hill, Sheppey</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>SHS: Possible SFB, pits, gullies, post-holes and finds</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>596825</td>
<td>171637</td>
<td>5th-7th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swale</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>SWA: Post-holes, Ipswich ware, AS finds</td>
<td>MTS-1</td>
<td>595000</td>
<td>173000</td>
<td>7th-9th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Woodinesborough</td>
<td>Isolated Roman finds</td>
<td>WNB: Doubtful AS earthwork</td>
<td>none (WNB-2 1200m NE)</td>
<td>630000</td>
<td>156000</td>
<td>8th century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2: Correlation of data-sources for estate centres in East Kent (Roman site information summarised from the Kent SMR and listed references; Anglo-Saxon site referencing relates to Appendix A; Everitt 1986; Tatton-Brown 1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible settlements</th>
<th>Everitt 'Primary Centre'</th>
<th>DM Minster or pre-800 ecclesiastical foundation</th>
<th>Archaeological evidence for Romano-British occupation within 500m</th>
<th>Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery within 800m</th>
<th>Additional EAS-MAS findspots within 500m</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appledore Minster</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>?y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>595750</td>
<td>129300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Possible Roman burials</td>
<td>AYF</td>
<td>AYF-FS1; AYF-FS2</td>
<td>572900</td>
<td>159000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boughton Aluph Minster</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>?y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>BGA-IB1; BGA-IB2</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>603300</td>
<td>148130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boughton-under-Blean Minster</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>?y</td>
<td>Doubtful: Isolated burial (possibly Anglo-Saxon)</td>
<td>BGB-IB1</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>604750</td>
<td>158600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury I</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Major Roman town and associated cemeteries</td>
<td>CAT-2; CAT-3</td>
<td>See Table 5.1</td>
<td>615000</td>
<td>157900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury II St Augustine's</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Roman occupation site and associated cemetery</td>
<td>CAT-IB3; CAT-1</td>
<td>See Table 5.1</td>
<td>615400</td>
<td>157600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury III St. Martin</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Roman cremation cemetery</td>
<td>CAT-IB1</td>
<td>See Table 5.1</td>
<td>615900</td>
<td>157700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charing</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Roman finds scatter (possible cemetery)</td>
<td>no (WSW 1200m SW)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>595410</td>
<td>149400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilham</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Small 2nd century Roman cremation cemetery</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>CHI</td>
<td>606900</td>
<td>153600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffe-at-Hoo</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Large industrial and occupation site with associated cemetery</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>573000</td>
<td>176000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Major Roman town and associated cemeteries</td>
<td>DVR-2</td>
<td>See Table 5.1</td>
<td>631800</td>
<td>141500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastry</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Possible Roman cremation burials</td>
<td>EBT; EEH; EBT-2</td>
<td>EST-FS2; EST-SET1</td>
<td>631170</td>
<td>154640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham?</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>?y</td>
<td>Roman settlement and associated cemetery</td>
<td>FCY; FAV (800m SW)</td>
<td>See Table 5.1</td>
<td>601800</td>
<td>161500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkestone</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Scattered Roman finds (possible cemetery)</td>
<td>FLK-IB1</td>
<td>FLK-SET2</td>
<td>623100</td>
<td>135800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordwich</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>?y</td>
<td>Roman cultivation horizon (possible local villa)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Brookes forthcoming b</td>
<td>618100</td>
<td>159830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godmersham</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Scattered Roman finds (possible cemetery)</td>
<td>no (CRD 1000m S)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>606200</td>
<td>150400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrietsham?</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Scattered Roman coin-finds (doubtful)</td>
<td>HAR-IB3</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>587500</td>
<td>153000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2: continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible settlements</th>
<th>Everitt 'Primary Centre'</th>
<th>DM Minster or pre-800 ecclesiastical foundation</th>
<th>Archaeological evidence for Romano-British occupation within 500m</th>
<th>Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery within 800m</th>
<th>Additional EAS-MAS finds spots within 500m</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>no (HOL is 2000m W)</td>
<td>HOL-FS1/HOL-FS-2</td>
<td>584300</td>
<td>155100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoo St. Werburgh</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Roman occupation site and associated cemetery</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>HOO-SET2</td>
<td>578300</td>
<td>171800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenham?</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>?y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>LEN-IB1</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>589900</td>
<td>152150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydd</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>604200</td>
<td>120200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyminge</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Roman bath-house and inhumation indicating probable occupation site</td>
<td>LYM</td>
<td>LYM-FS1-2</td>
<td>616100</td>
<td>140850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymnse</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>?y</td>
<td>Late 3rd century fort</td>
<td>LYP</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>611950</td>
<td>134700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Roman villa, further Roman buildings and associated cemetery</td>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>576300</td>
<td>156200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Regis?</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Large Romano-British cemetery, possibly indicating sizable local settlement</td>
<td>MRE, MRE-2, MRE-3, SWA-IB2</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>590300</td>
<td>164600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster-in-Sheppey</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>MTS-1</td>
<td>MTS-2</td>
<td>595500</td>
<td>173000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster-in-Thanet</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Roman villa near town centre, as well as Roman industrial and occupation site and cemetery on the ridge</td>
<td>MCY near medieval town centre, further Anglo-Saxon cemeteries at MMP, MMP-2, MMP-3, MST-3 on ridge 1200m to the N</td>
<td>MTS-FS2</td>
<td>631080</td>
<td>164250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkton?</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Group of Roman pits and features (possible industrial site)</td>
<td>MKN</td>
<td>MKN-FS1, MCF</td>
<td>628000</td>
<td>165200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington?</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>?y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>566200</td>
<td>165400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbourne</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>?y</td>
<td>Iron Age and Roman settlement with associated burials</td>
<td>DBH</td>
<td>GMH-FS1</td>
<td>634100</td>
<td>151100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainham</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>581700</td>
<td>165900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Roman Saxon Shore fort and vicus</td>
<td>REC-IB-1, REC-IB2</td>
<td>REC-SET1, REC-FS1</td>
<td>622800</td>
<td>169300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richborough</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Roman Saxon Shore fort and vicus</td>
<td>RIC-IB1, RIC-IB2</td>
<td>RIC-FS1-2</td>
<td>632450</td>
<td>160180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Major Roman town and associated cemeteries</td>
<td>RWA, RSC-2</td>
<td>RSC</td>
<td>574000</td>
<td>168000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruckinge</td>
<td>?y</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>602490</td>
<td>133500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarre?</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>Brookes forthcoming</td>
<td>625700</td>
<td>165000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stowling</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Roman pottery scatters</td>
<td>STW</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>612500</td>
<td>141800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2: continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible settlements</th>
<th>Everitt 'Primary Centre'</th>
<th>DM Minster or pre-800 ecclesiastical foundation</th>
<th>Archaeological evidence for Romano-British occupation within 500m</th>
<th>Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery within 800m</th>
<th>Additional EAS-MAS findspots within 500m</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sturry</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Iron Age settlement, and possible Roman harbour installations</td>
<td>no (SFH is 1100m W)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>617600</td>
<td>160200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teynham?</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Small Roman settlement and associated activity areas</td>
<td>TEY</td>
<td>TEY-SET1-3</td>
<td>596500</td>
<td>163500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwell</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>no (WSW 1100m SW)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>599100</td>
<td>147500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickhambreaux</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>ICK-FS3</td>
<td>622000</td>
<td>158750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingham</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Roman building, possibly part of a villa</td>
<td>WGH; WGH-2</td>
<td>WGH-FS1</td>
<td>624150</td>
<td>157395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wye</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>WYE-IB1; WYE-IB2</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>606500</td>
<td>146500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible Additional sites

| Boughton Monchelsea  | no                        | ?y                                            | yes                                                           | no                                   |             | 577800 | 152150 |
| Stone                | no                        | ?y                                            | yes                                                           | no                                   | STO         | 599160 | 161320 |
| Hythe                | no                        | no                                            | None                                                          | no                                   | no          | 616000 | 134000 |
| Old Romney           | no                        | no                                            | None                                                          | no                                   | no          | 603500 | 125300 |
| Sandwich             | no                        | ?y                                            | None                                                          | no                                   | no          | 633000 | 158000 |
| Seasalter            | no                        | no                                            | None                                                          | no                                   | no          | 608000 | 164000 |
Table 5.3: Simplification of Table 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible settlements</th>
<th>Everitt 'Primary Centre'</th>
<th>DM Minster or pre-800 ecclesiastical foundation</th>
<th>Archaeological evidence for Romano-British occupation within 500m</th>
<th>Early Anglo-Saxon cemetery within 800m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury I</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury II St Augustine's</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury III St. Martin</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastry</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkestone</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyminge</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyminge</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Regis?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster-in-Thanet</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkton?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbourne</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stowting</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teynham?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingham</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richborough</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charing</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffe-at-Hoo</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godmersham</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoo St. Werburgh</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturry</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordwich</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>?yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenham?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster-in-Sheppey</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarre?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wye</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartletsham?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boughton Aluph Minster</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>?yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boughton-under-Blean Minster</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>?yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainham</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwell</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickhambreaux</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appledore Minster</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>?yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruckinge</td>
<td>?yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: 6.1
Distribution of burial sites in eastern Kent with respect to pays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>ha</th>
<th>% ha</th>
<th>burial sites</th>
<th>% sites</th>
<th>minimum no. of graves</th>
<th>% graves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Kent</td>
<td>306086.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4904</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downs</td>
<td>91609.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>2785</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothills</td>
<td>64251.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmesdale</td>
<td>11485.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh</td>
<td>26620.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weald</td>
<td>71596.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart</td>
<td>21509.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: 6.2
Distribution of burial sites in eastern Kent with respect to pays by period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Sites pre-600</th>
<th>% sites</th>
<th>Graves pre-600</th>
<th>% graves</th>
<th>Sites post-AD 600</th>
<th>% sites</th>
<th>Graves post-AD 600</th>
<th>% graves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Kent</td>
<td>75.59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1810.35</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3093.65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downs</td>
<td>32.62</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>800.26</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>49.38</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>1983.74</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothills</td>
<td>31.35</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>894.78</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>43.65</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>1097.22</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmesdale</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>99.50</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weald</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3  A list of the minimum number of excavated Anglo-Saxon graves from all burial sites in the eastern Kent study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Burials excavated in antiquity</th>
<th>Burials excavated post-1925</th>
<th>No. in numeric sample</th>
<th>No. in weight sample</th>
<th>Number certainty?</th>
<th>Minimum totals including excavated &amp; unexcavated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acol I Primrose Hill</td>
<td>ACL-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash, Cop St</td>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td>AFD-IB1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashford II Willesborough</td>
<td>AFD-IB2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash I Milfield</td>
<td>ASH</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>AYF</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beakesbourne I Adisham Down</td>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>48/45 graves</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barfreston (Ribertswold)</td>
<td>BAR</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>181</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadstairs Bradstow School</td>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>19/15 graves</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadstairs</td>
<td>BBS-2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2/small cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boughton Aluph</td>
<td>BGA</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bifrons Patrixbourne</td>
<td>BIF</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>114-116</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beakesbourne II Aerodrome</td>
<td>BKB</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brabourne Iden Corner</td>
<td>BRB</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>?1+</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach Downs</td>
<td>BRD</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>80/113+</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breach Downs?</td>
<td>BRD-IB1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>NA/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barham II, Upper Diggens</td>
<td>BRH-2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barham III Wick Wood</td>
<td>BRH-3</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>NA/2+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barham Broom Park</td>
<td>BRH-4</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooksend</td>
<td>BRO</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadstairs 1910</td>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopsbourne</td>
<td>BSB</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>15/many</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopsbourne, Bourne Place</td>
<td>BSB-2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>NA/11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopsbourne</td>
<td>BSB-3</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopsbourne</td>
<td>BSB-IB2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadstairs St. Peter’s Tip</td>
<td>BSP</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>425/388 graves</td>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burstead Wood, Bishopsbourne</td>
<td>BWB</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffe-at-Hoo II</td>
<td>CAH-1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury IV Old Westgate Farm</td>
<td>CAT-4</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>?4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Burials excavated in antiquity</td>
<td>Burials excavated post-1925</td>
<td>No. in numeric sample</td>
<td>No. In weight sample</td>
<td>Number certainty?</td>
<td>Minimum totals including excavated &amp; unexcavated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury II, St. Martin's churchyard</td>
<td>CAT-IB1</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury V Stour Street</td>
<td>CAT-IB2</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury III St Pancras'</td>
<td>CAT-IB3</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham Downs</td>
<td>CHD</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>73/100?</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk Hill nr. Ramsage</td>
<td>CHH-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham Lines</td>
<td>CHL</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charing I Bishop's Palace</td>
<td>CHR</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court-le-Street, Aldington</td>
<td>CLS</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2+/many</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claylans Wood, Shorne II (Cobham)</td>
<td>CLW</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury Martyr's Field</td>
<td>CMF</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman's Pit, Norton</td>
<td>CPN</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2+/skeletons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crudale</td>
<td>CRD</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3+/many</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crudale Downs</td>
<td>CRD-2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2+/burials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crispes Road</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>NA/many</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombe Woodnesborough</td>
<td>CWN</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuxton</td>
<td>CXT</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal Beacon Hill (Northbourne)</td>
<td>DBH</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>NA/200+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover II Buckland</td>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover Buckland, Castle View</td>
<td>DBU-2</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover II Priory Hill</td>
<td>DPH</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover Temple Ewell</td>
<td>DTE</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover Temple Ewell Watersend</td>
<td>DTE-2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover, High Meadow</td>
<td>DVR-IB1</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastry I Butsole</td>
<td>EBT</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>6+/several</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccles</td>
<td>ECC</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastry 2 Eastry House</td>
<td>EEH</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastry IV Eastry Mill</td>
<td>EEM</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elham, Mill Down</td>
<td>EMD</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastry 3 Updown</td>
<td>EUP</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>NA/34+</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Burials excavated in antiquity</td>
<td>Burials excavated post-1925</td>
<td>No. in numeric sample</td>
<td>No. In weight sample</td>
<td>Number certainty?</td>
<td>Minimum totals including excavated &amp; unexcavated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eythorne</td>
<td>EYT</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham, King's Field</td>
<td>FAV</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>5+/many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham I Churchyard</td>
<td>FCY</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkestone Ill Dover Hill</td>
<td>FDH</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finglesham Northbourne</td>
<td>FGL</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkestone Folly Rd</td>
<td>FLK-4</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkestone, Martello Dairy Farm</td>
<td>FLK-FS01</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkestone I The Bayle</td>
<td>FLK-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkestone II Cherry Garden Hill</td>
<td>FLK-IB2</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillingham, Central Hotel</td>
<td>GCH</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillingham, Woodlands-Grange Rd.</td>
<td>GGH-IB2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilton</td>
<td>GIL</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>130+</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mongeham</td>
<td>GMH</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godmersham</td>
<td>GOD</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guston</td>
<td>GUS</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrietsham I, Churchyard</td>
<td>HAR</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrietsham II, Court Farm Lodge</td>
<td>HAR-IB2</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrietsham Pilgrim's Way (Deodora House)</td>
<td>HAR-IB3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborough</td>
<td>HBR</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborough II Lad's Farm</td>
<td>HBR-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higham, Shorne I Hoo Junction</td>
<td>HGM</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>10+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoath Millbank</td>
<td>HOA</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoath, Broomfield</td>
<td>HOA-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne Whiteheath</td>
<td>HOL</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howletts, Littlebourne</td>
<td>HOW</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>36+</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Down</td>
<td>KGD</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>321+</td>
<td></td>
<td>321</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Down II</td>
<td>KGD-2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>NA/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Down</td>
<td>KGD-3</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>NA/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Down</td>
<td>KGD-4</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>NA/9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Burials excavated in antiquity</td>
<td>Burials excavated post-1925</td>
<td>No. in numeric sample</td>
<td>No. In weight sample</td>
<td>Number certainty?</td>
<td>Minimum totals including excavated &amp; unexcavated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Down</td>
<td>KGD-5</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>NA/3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Down</td>
<td>KGD-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Chart, Stamber’s Field</td>
<td>LCT</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>LEE</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenham I</td>
<td>LEN</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lenham II</td>
<td>LEN-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Halstow</td>
<td>LHS</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidsing, Boxley</td>
<td>LID</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littlebourne II</td>
<td>LTB-IB1</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyminge</td>
<td>LYM</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydden</td>
<td>LYN-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lympne, Bellevue</td>
<td>LYP</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maidstone Wheeler St.</td>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster-in-Thanet Churchyard</td>
<td>MCY</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Hill Deal I</td>
<td>MHD</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Hill Deal II Waterworks Hill</td>
<td>MHD-2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1/several</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Hill Deal</td>
<td>MHD-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margate Half Mile Ride</td>
<td>MHH</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>33+</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnis Bay</td>
<td>MIB</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkton Primrose Hill</td>
<td>MKN</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>MMP</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>MMP-2</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Regis (Sittingbourne) Huggin’s Field</td>
<td>MRE</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>12+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Regis (Sittingbourne) II Rondeau Estate</td>
<td>MRE-2</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Regis III Brickfields</td>
<td>MRE-3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>7+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Regis I Cook's Lane</td>
<td>MRE-4</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>?1+</td>
<td>?1+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margate II Gas Alley</td>
<td>MRG</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>4+/many</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersham</td>
<td>MRS</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>3+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster Laundry, Telegraph Hill</td>
<td>MST-3</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Burials excavated in antiquity</td>
<td>Burials excavated post-1925</td>
<td>No. in numeric sample</td>
<td>No. in weight sample</td>
<td>Number certainty?</td>
<td>Minimum totals including excavated &amp; unexcavated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster-in-Thanet</td>
<td>MST-IB2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster Thorne Farm</td>
<td>MTF</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nethercourt Farm</td>
<td>NCF</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700 4+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nethercourt Farm Estate West</td>
<td>NCF-2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonington</td>
<td>NON</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northdown</td>
<td>NTD</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>NWT</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozengell</td>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>13/100</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsgate II, Station</td>
<td>RAM-IB1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsgate III</td>
<td>RAM-IB2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsgate St Lawrence</td>
<td>RAM-IB3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver II Foreshore (possible cemetery finds)</td>
<td>REC-IB2</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>?1+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwould</td>
<td>RGW</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwould II Freedown</td>
<td>RGW-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwould, Mill Service Station</td>
<td>RGW-IB2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwould III with Kingsdown</td>
<td>RGW-IB3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>RIC-IB1</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Castle (possible cemetery finds)</td>
<td>RIC-IB2</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>?1+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripple Mill Service Station</td>
<td>RPP-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsgate I St Augustine's College</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester I Star Hill</td>
<td>RSH</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Short Bros. Works</td>
<td>RST-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>RST-IB5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester II Watts Avenue</td>
<td>RWA</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarre</td>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>274+</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich</td>
<td>SAW</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strood Temple Farm</td>
<td>SDA</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strood III Coach and Horses</td>
<td>SDC</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stodmarsh</td>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Site ID</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Burials excavated in antiquity</td>
<td>Burials excavated post-1925</td>
<td>No. in numeric sample</td>
<td>No. In weight sample</td>
<td>Number certainty?</td>
<td>Minimum totals including excavated &amp; unexcavated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelford Farm Hackettton</td>
<td>SFH</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sholden II Upper Deal</td>
<td>SHD-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibertswold Barfriston</td>
<td>SIB</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>725 229</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittingbourne I Chalkwell</td>
<td>SIT</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittingbourne III Murston</td>
<td>SIT-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saltwood</td>
<td>SLT</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>c.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Margaret's-Cliffe IV Tennis Court</td>
<td>SMB</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Margaret's-Cliffe II</td>
<td>SMC</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700 22/30+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Margaret's-Cliffe I</td>
<td>SMC-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Margaret's-Cliffe III Salisbury Rd.</td>
<td>SMC-IB2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton II East Studdal</td>
<td>SUT</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>NA/3+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton I Downs</td>
<td>SUT-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stowing</td>
<td>SWT</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600 84+</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stowting Common</td>
<td>SWT-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throwley (Belmont Park)</td>
<td>TBP</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teynham II</td>
<td>TEY</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>650  2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teynham I</td>
<td>TEY-IB1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600  1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurnham I Thurnham Friars</td>
<td>THU</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>650 2+/number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upchurch</td>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>700 3+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickhambreaux II Grove Ferry</td>
<td>WGF</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>?2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingham</td>
<td>WGH</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingham II</td>
<td>WGH-2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickhambreaux</td>
<td>WHB</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>650 2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickhambreaux III Church</td>
<td>WHB-2</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitfield I Old Park</td>
<td>WHF</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700 2+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodnesborough II</td>
<td>WNB-2</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>?1+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbere</td>
<td>WSB</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700 60-70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwell</td>
<td>WSW</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wye</td>
<td>WYE</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>700 5/c.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Burials excavated in antiquity</th>
<th>Burials excavated post-1925</th>
<th>No. in numeric sample</th>
<th>No. In weight sample</th>
<th>Number certainty?</th>
<th>Minimum totals including excavated &amp; unexcavated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wye Olantigh Mount</td>
<td>WYE-IB3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3244</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td></td>
<td>4904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable Mid to Late Anglo-Saxon Burials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover (LA-S) Durham Hill</td>
<td>DVR-2</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover (LA-S) Castle Hill</td>
<td>DVR-1</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury I St. Augustine's Abbey</td>
<td>CAT-1</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>?19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury III Cathedral</td>
<td>CAT-3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>?1EAS/many LAS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burials of Uncertain Anglo-Saxon Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravesend I Denton Court</td>
<td>GVE-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2+/large cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravesend II Brown Rd</td>
<td>GVE-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrixbourne Church</td>
<td>PAT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegwell Bay Cliffsend Farm</td>
<td>PEG-IB1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonington</td>
<td>NON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripple Mill Service Station</td>
<td>RPP-IB1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wye</td>
<td>WYE-IB4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalk Hill nr. Ramsagte</td>
<td>CHH-IB1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwould III with Kingsdown</td>
<td>RGW-IB3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Hill Deal III Redbull Ave</td>
<td>MHD-IB2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishopsbourne/Kingston</td>
<td>BSB-IB1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsgate III</td>
<td>RAM-IB2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitfield</td>
<td>WHF-IB1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claylane Wood, Shorne II (Cobham)</td>
<td>CLW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nethercourt Farm Estate West</td>
<td>NCF-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holborough II Lad's Farm</td>
<td>HBR-IB1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsgate St Lawrence</td>
<td>RAM-IB3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boughton-under-Blean</td>
<td>BGB-IB1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>?1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Burials excavated in antiquity</th>
<th>Burials excavated post-1925</th>
<th>No. in numeric sample</th>
<th>No. In weight sample</th>
<th>Number certainty?</th>
<th>Minimum totals including excavated &amp; unexcavated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newington Dolland’s Moor</td>
<td>NVT-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes to Table 6.3:

* Number Certainty relates to the accuracy of the recorded numbers of excavated burials. As such, although the modern excavations at Ozengell accurately record 231 individuals, and a further 13 can be accounted for from Rolfe’s investigations of 1845-50, the record of c.100 graves destroyed by the nineteenth-century railway cutting makes the derived figure of 244 a minimum value. This can be compared with the several isolated burials at Ringwould. For example, RGW relates to two individuals excavated c.1852 on the Dover-Deal road. The inclusion of 2 iron spearheads, a single-edged ‘coutel’ (presumably a scramasax), the iron ferrule of a spear, a belt ornament of gilt metal (set with red imitation gems), and a bronze buckle make these burials likely Early Anglo-Saxon interments (Meaney 1964). As these graves are individually recorded, albeit in cursory fashion, the number of individuals is certain. This can be compared with:

δ The date range relates to the level of confidence in ascribing individual burials to the Early Anglo-Saxon period. Thus, while it seems certain that at least part of the unrecorded c.100 graves destroyed by the railway cutting at Ozengell belonged to this period in light of later discoveries, the dating of the isolated burial from Ringwould, Freedown is less certain. RGW-IB1 represents a crouched burial discovered to the east of 2 Bronze Age barrows in 1945, which was tentatively dated to the Pagan Saxon period by Professor Cave on the basis of skull morphology (Kent SMR records). A fine sixth-century composite brooch, provenanced to an Anglo-Saxon grave found near Ringwould Village, on display in Deal Castle Museum, may well be linked with this or a nearby burial. The circumstantial evidence surrounding the discovery therefore warrant its inclusion as a possible Anglo-Saxon inhumation secondary, but the dating of the burial remains very uncertain.
Table 6.4 An outline of applied artefact typologies and their relative dating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Combinations of min. 4 brooches including Kentish brooch types other than disc brooches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Combinations of Kentish disc brooches.combined with other type(s) of brooch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Combination of a Single Kentish disc brooch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Continental brooch-types of Boehm's late phase II and early phase III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Continental brooch-types of SD Phase 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Continental buckles with early club-shaped tongue &amp; shield on tongue buckles up to 2.9cm in width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Continental Shield on tongue buckles over 2.9cm in width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Late types of continental buckle with club-shaped tongue c.300-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Continental reticulated mosaic and milieux beads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Continental rust-red barrel-shaped beads with either yellow or white dots and crossing trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Kentish square-headed brooch Type Aberg 131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Kentish square-headed brooch with drop-shaped garnets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Kentish square-headed brooch Type Aberg 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Kentish disc brooches of Avent class 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Kentish disc brooches of Avent class 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Kentish disc brooches of Avent class 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Kentish Skimmer type B1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brugmann 1999</td>
<td>Kentish Skimmer, type B1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avant 1975</td>
<td>Kentish disc brooches of Avent class 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avant 1975</td>
<td>Kentish disc brooches of Avent class 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avant 1975</td>
<td>Kentish disc brooches of Avent class 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avant 1975</td>
<td>Kentish disc brooches of Avent class 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avant 1975</td>
<td>Kentish disc brooches of Avent class 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avant 1975</td>
<td>Kentish plated disc brooches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avant 1975</td>
<td>Composite brooches of Avent class 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avant 1975</td>
<td>Composite brooches of Avent class 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avant 1975</td>
<td>Composite brooches of Avent class 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avant 1975</td>
<td>Composite brooches of Avent class 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton 1973</td>
<td>Spearheads of Swanton types C2, D1, E2 and F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton 1973</td>
<td>Spearheads of Swanton types H3 and L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton 1973</td>
<td>Spearheads of Swanton types D3 and E4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton 1973</td>
<td>Spearheads of Swanton types C3, D2, E3 and G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanton 1973</td>
<td>Spearheads of Swanton types C4 and C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson &amp; Haark 1973</td>
<td>Group 1.2 and 1.1 shield bosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson &amp; Haark 1973</td>
<td>Group 2 shield bosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson &amp; Haark 1973</td>
<td>Group 3 shield bosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson &amp; Haerk</td>
<td>Group 6 shield bosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickinson &amp; Haerk</td>
<td>Group 7 shield bosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain 2000</td>
<td>Group 3 shield bosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evison 1987</td>
<td>Knife of Evison Type 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evison 1987</td>
<td>Knife of Evison Type 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evison 1987</td>
<td>Knife of Evison Type 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evison 1987</td>
<td>Knife of Evison Type 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evison 1987</td>
<td>Knife of Evison Type 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evison 1987</td>
<td>Knife of Evison Type 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evison 1987</td>
<td>Amber bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Melon bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Spotted/trailed bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Small monochrome bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Amethyst bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Type g annular brooch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Ribbed palm cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Claw beaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Siniform pendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Domed/condical beaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Triangular buckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Shoebuckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Coptic vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Squal jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Bag beaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Style II bracteate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Tripod-rim bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Roman coin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Necklace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Pottery vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Thresholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Type f annular brooch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Finger ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Single pin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Serrated-edged buckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Double-sided comb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Firesteel/pseneomount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Spiral disc bead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4 continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Wire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Chælaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Bracelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Weaving batten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Wooden vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Bead-in-wire pendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Cabochon pendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Lace-tag/strap-end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Iron-bound bucket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Casket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Double-bell metal bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Seax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Cowrie shell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Playing pieces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Shears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Horse harness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Wire ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Beaver tooth pendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Almond-shaped metal bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Spatulate tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Hanging bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Safety-pin brooch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Padlock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Iron bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Hump-backed comb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Bulla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Plain palm cup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Double-tongued buckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Biconical silver/gold bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Thrymsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Twist-inlay bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Workbox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Linked pins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Openwork buckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Filigree disc pendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Spoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Scelta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Sword</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Heckie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Simple buckle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.4 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Pointed iron tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Whetstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Spiral-headed pin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geake 1994</td>
<td>Hooked tag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing timeline and data]

- **Source**: Geake 1994
- **Object**
  - Pointed iron tool
  - Whetstone
  - Spiral-headed pin
  - Hooked tag

- **Graph Details**
  - The graph represents data over a timeline from 470 to 740.
  - Specific sections are highlighted to show the distribution or frequency of the objects over time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Grave No.</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Ae</th>
<th>silver</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>475-525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450-525</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kentish/Frankish</td>
<td>525-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525-600</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish/Frankish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frankish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575-625</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>625-650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish/Frankish</td>
<td>625-650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>625-650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>12.34</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>625-650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>625-650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish/Frankish</td>
<td>625-650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>650-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish/Frankish</td>
<td>650-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625-675</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>675-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>675-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>675-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>675-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>675-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>675-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>675-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>675-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>675-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>675-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>700-750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>700-750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avg</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6 Weight of DBU buckles by raw material
Table 6.7 Weight of all buckles by raw material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Grave No.</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Ae</th>
<th>silver</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>475-525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>500-525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>500-550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGL</td>
<td>D3/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redist</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redist</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475-550</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>500-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.333</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>500-600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>500-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>500-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-600</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>500-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>500-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish/Frankish</td>
<td>525-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGL</td>
<td>H3/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525-575</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525-625</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBU</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redist</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>525-575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redist</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>525-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redist</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kentish</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>575-625</td>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.7 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Grave No.</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Ae</th>
<th>silver</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>575-675</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| BBS     | 77       | 1  | 28 | 600-625 |
| SAR     | 1860/    | 1  | 3  | 625-650 |
| DBU     | 39       | 1  | 20 | 625-650 |
| DBU     | 39       | 1  | 13 | 625-650 |
| DBU     | 131      | 1  | 10 | 625-650 |
| DBU     | 135      | 1  | 12.34 | 0.65 | 625-650 |
| DBU     | 18       | 1  | 13 | 0.2  | 625-650 |
| DBU     | 42       | 1  | 6  | Kentish/Frankish | 625-650 |
| FGL     | 95       | 2  | 6  | 625-650 |
| FGL     | AA4(14)  | 1  | 10 | Local   | 625-650 |
| FGL     | 33       | 1  | 6  | Local   | 625-675 |
| FGL     | 33       | 1  | 5  | 625-675 |
| OZE     | 173      | 1  | 10 | 625-675 |
| OZE     | 173      | 1  | 1  | 625-675 |
| OZE     | 18       | 1  | 1  | 625-675 |
| OZE     | 79       | 2  | 26 | 625-675 |
| OZE     | 80       | 1  | 11 | 625-675 |
| OZE     | 95       | 1  | 9  | 0.3  | 625-675 |
| DBU     | 36       | 1  | 13 | 650-675 |
| DBU     | 8        | 1  | 38 | 2     | Kentish/Frankish | 650-675 |
| redist. |          | 61 | 11| 575-675 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>600-675</th>
<th>quantity</th>
<th>24.5</th>
<th>9.5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| FGL     | 124      | 1  | 2  | Local | 650-700 |
| DBU     | 108      | 1  | 4  | Local | 675-700 |
| DBU     | 113      | 1  | 4  | Anglo-Saxon | 675-700 |
| DBU     | 144      | 1  | 2  | Anglo-Saxon | 675-700 |
| DBU     | 144      | 1  | 10 | Local | 675-700 |
| DBU     | 148      | 1  | 4  | Local | 675-700 |
| DBU     | 149      | 1  | 11 | Local | 675-700 |
| DBU     | 149      | 1  | 2  | 0.1  | Local | 675-700 |
| DBU     | 158      | 1  | 1.6 | 7.5  | 675-700 |
| DBU     | 158      | 1  | 0.5 | Local | 675-700 |
| DBU     | 159      | 1  | 2  | Local | 675-700 |
| FGL     | 144      | 1  | 30 | Local | 675-725 |
| FGL     | 180      | 1  | 4  | Local | 675-725 |
| OZE     | 47       | 1  | 7  | Import/Byzantine | 675-725 |
| OZE     | 47       | 1  | 2  | 675-725 |
| DBU     | 145      | 1  | 7  | Local | 700-750 |
| DBU     | 85       | 1  | 8  | Anglo-Saxon | 700-750 |

<p>| 675-750 | quantity | 9   | 8  | 0 |
| average | 5.11     | 7.6 | 0 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Gr.</th>
<th>Qty.</th>
<th>Fe</th>
<th>Ae</th>
<th>silver</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>575-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSP</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>600-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGL</td>
<td>125/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>600-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGL</td>
<td>125/b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>600-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGL</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>600-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGL</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>600-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGL</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>600-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGL</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>600-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGL</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>600-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>600-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>600-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>625-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>625-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>625-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>500-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>500-700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OZE</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>525-725</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note to Table 6.7**
Although all buckle weights are given, total phase values noted in yellow fields are redistributed amongst other (more convenient) phase groupings presented in orange. The orange totals define the graph (Fig. 6.10). Included also at the bottom of the table are the weights of those buckles recorded that cannot be assigned to a meaningful date phase.
Note for tables 8.1-8.3: The coins listed include only those with a known location, settlement or parish. Coins attributable to 'East Kent' or 'Thanet' have not been included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference (EMC number unless otherwise stated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adisham</td>
<td>Thrymsa</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Metcalf 1993, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Rodez</td>
<td>Belfort</td>
<td>1994 0111, Rigold 1975 no.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Maastricht</td>
<td>Belfort</td>
<td>1996 006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barham</td>
<td>Thrymsa</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Metcalf 1993, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birchington</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Merovingian</td>
<td>Quentin</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birchington</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Merovingian</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BVH 55</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Merovingian</td>
<td>Trizay</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.96a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Burgundian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Solidus</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.54a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>S. Gaul/Spain</td>
<td>Justinian</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Justin II</td>
<td>Syllage 1029.0005, Rigold 1975 no.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Alemannic</td>
<td>Alemannic</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Solidus</td>
<td>Merovingian</td>
<td>Leudullus'</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Solidus</td>
<td>Merovingian</td>
<td>Leonarius'</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Merovingian</td>
<td>St. Bertrand-de-Comminges</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Solidus</td>
<td>Unk</td>
<td>Agen</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Marseille</td>
<td>Dorestad</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Thrymsa</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Padua</td>
<td>Metcalf 1993, 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Merovingian</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>Thrymsa</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Sutherland III.ii: London-derived (48-56)</td>
<td>1993 9024 (Ref: Sutherland 50a: T&amp;S no.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>Thrymsa</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Sutherland III.ii: London-derived (48-56)</td>
<td>1948 00501 (Ref: Sutherland 50a); Rigold 1975 no.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastry</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Byzantium</td>
<td>Justinian</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Marseille</td>
<td>Merovingian pseudo-Imperial tremissis of Justinian</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Uzes</td>
<td>Merovingian pseudo-Imperial tremissis of Justinian</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Aries</td>
<td>Merovingian pseudo-Imperial tremissis of Justinian</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Marseille</td>
<td>Merovingian pseudo-Imperial tremissis of Justinian</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Merovingian</td>
<td>unk, Agen</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Merovingian</td>
<td>Campbon</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Reference (EMC number unless otherwise stated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Merovingian</td>
<td>Elegius</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Frisia</td>
<td>Dronisp</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Merovingian</td>
<td>uncertain mint</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>Thrymsa Kent</td>
<td>Sutherland II.i: Roman</td>
<td>? Carausus (23-5)</td>
<td>1948.0024; Rigold 1975 no.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGL 7</td>
<td>Solidus Marseille</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Pada'</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkstone</td>
<td>Tremissis Lieusaint</td>
<td>Loco Sancto / Dacoaldus</td>
<td>Belfort 6226-7</td>
<td>1913.0003 (Ref. Carlyon-Britton sale, part of lot 137); Rigold 1975 no 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkstone</td>
<td>Tremissis Lieusaint</td>
<td>Loco Sancto / Dacoaldus</td>
<td>Belfort 6226-7</td>
<td>1913.0002 (Ref. Carlyon-Britton sale, lot 135); Rigold 1975 no 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIL 41</td>
<td>Tremissis S. Gaul/Spain</td>
<td>Thrymsa Kent</td>
<td>Sutherland II.v: Two Emperors (31-44)</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mongeham</td>
<td>UNK Kent</td>
<td>Sutherland II.v: Two Emperors (31-44)</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mongeham</td>
<td>Tremissis Quentovic</td>
<td>Sutherland II.v: Justin'</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higham</td>
<td>Tremissis Frisia</td>
<td>Belfort 672</td>
<td>Sutherland II.v: Two Emperors (31-44)</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>Tremissis Frisia</td>
<td>Belfort 672</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>Thrymsa Kent</td>
<td>Sutherland II.v: Two Emperors (31-44)</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>Thrymsa Kent</td>
<td>Sutherland II.v: Two Emperors (31-44)</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoo</td>
<td>Tremissis S. Gaul/Spain</td>
<td>Belfort 1536-9 (cf)</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 36a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Sheppey</td>
<td>UNK Early England</td>
<td>Sutherland VI.i: Regal</td>
<td>Ean... (79-81)</td>
<td>1948.00793 (Ref. Sutherland 79c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littlebourne</td>
<td>Tremissis Merovingian</td>
<td>Nitry</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymene</td>
<td>Tremissis Merovingian</td>
<td>uncertain mint</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymene</td>
<td>Tremissis Merovingian</td>
<td>uncertain mint</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymene</td>
<td>Thrymsa Kent</td>
<td>Sutherland II.v: Two Emperors (31-44)</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster, on Sheppey</td>
<td>Tremissis Quentovic</td>
<td>Sutherland II.v: Two Emperors (31-44)</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbourne</td>
<td>Tremissis S. Gaul/Spain</td>
<td>Justin'</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozenegell</td>
<td>Solidus Byzantium</td>
<td>Justinian I</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Tremissis UNK</td>
<td>Belfort 5697 var</td>
<td>1986.8425 (Ref. MEC I. 625); Rigold 1975 no 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Thrymsa Kent</td>
<td>Belfort 2934 var</td>
<td>1986.8437 (Ref. MEC I. 437); Rigold 1975 no 104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Tremissis Marcolly-en-Gault</td>
<td>Belfort 6302</td>
<td>1986.8465 (Ref. MEC I. 465); Rigold 1975 no 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richborough</td>
<td>Solidus Byzantium</td>
<td>Justin I or II</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richborough</td>
<td>Tremissis Byzantium</td>
<td>Leo I</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandwich</td>
<td>Tremissis Rodez</td>
<td>Belfort 3890-8 (Rodez mint, moneyer Vendemius)</td>
<td>1995.0064 (Ref. CR 1995: 64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarre</td>
<td>Solidus Marseille</td>
<td>Merovingian pseudo-Imperial tremissis of Justinian</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarre</td>
<td>Solidus Arles</td>
<td>Merovingian pseudo-Imperial tremissis of Justinian</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarre</td>
<td>Solidus Marseille</td>
<td>Merovingian pseudo-Imperial tremissis of Justinian</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarre</td>
<td>Thrymsa Kent</td>
<td>Pada'</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarre</td>
<td>Thrymsa Kent</td>
<td>Pada'</td>
<td>Rigold 1960-1, 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference (EMC number unless otherwise stated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarre</td>
<td>Thrymsa</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Pada</td>
<td>Rigold 1960-1, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI B 172</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Marsal</td>
<td>Beifort 2409 (Marsal tremissis by Totus)</td>
<td>1982.9018 (Ref: SCBI 29 - Merseyside: 18); Rigold 1975 no 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI B 172</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Verdun</td>
<td>Beifort 4765 (Verdun tremissis)</td>
<td>1982.9017 (Ref: SCBI 29 - Merseyside: 17); Rigold 1975 no 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittingbourne</td>
<td>Solidus</td>
<td>S. Gaul/Spain</td>
<td>Libius Severus</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittingbourne</td>
<td>Thrymsa</td>
<td>S. Gaul/Spain</td>
<td>Sutherland IV.ii: Wlmen (closely copied) (58-71)</td>
<td>1973.6309, Rigold 1975 no 120a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strood</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Merovingian</td>
<td>Uncertain mint</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strood</td>
<td>Thrymsa</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Carausius'</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturty</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Alemannic</td>
<td>Alemannic'</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton-by-Dover</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Alemannic</td>
<td>Alemannic'</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton-by-Dover</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Merovingian</td>
<td>Beifort 666</td>
<td>1998.0084 (Ref: Rudd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hythe</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Quenovic</td>
<td>Quenovic tremissis: Dagulfs (Lafaurie II, 2-6)</td>
<td>1970.2127 (Ref: Bonser 2127/63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitstable</td>
<td>Tremissis</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>Merovingian Pseudo-imperial tremissis of Justinian</td>
<td>1974.0002 (Ref: BNJ 1974, pp. 74-5; Rigold 1975: 31); Rigold 1975 no 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodnesborough</td>
<td>Solidus</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Julius Nepos</td>
<td>Rigold 1975 no 24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.2: Primary sceatta finds from eastern Kent AD 675-750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference (EMC number unless otherwise stated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldington</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1996.0094 (Ref: CR 1996: 94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1985.0003 (Ref: B&amp;B 1985: 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barham</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1993.9194 (Ref: Metcalfe, T&amp;S, pl. 11, no 194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bekesbourne</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1992.7471 (Ref: SCBI 42 - Southeastern: 471)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birchington</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1989.0064 (Ref: CR 1989: 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bredgar</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1998.0007 (Ref: Bonser 232/88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, near</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1977.0024 (Ref: Rigold and Metcalfe 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, near</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>Pa III</td>
<td>2001.0563 (Ref: Bonser notes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, Porcupine</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Metcalfe 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, Rose Lane</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Metcalfe 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, St Dunstan's House</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Metcalfe 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, St Margaret's Street</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Metcalfe 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliffsend</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1993.0161 (Ref: CR 1993: 161)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Reference (EMC number unless otherwise stated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobham Park</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2001.0562 (Ref. Bonser notes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobham Park</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>Pa III</td>
<td>1017.0064 (Ref. SCBI 17 - Midland: 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1960.0006 (Ref. Rigold BNJ 1960 p. 51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folkestone, near</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1994.0143 (Ref. CR 1994: 143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>Blb</td>
<td>1986.8640 (Ref. SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 231; MEC I. 640)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartlip</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1986.8653 (Ref. SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 246; MEC I. 653)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herne</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>Pa Ila</td>
<td>1988.6016 (Ref. BMC 74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoath</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1986.8660 (Ref. SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 983; MEC I. 660)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1986.8646 (Ref. SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 241; MEC I. 646)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>C 'mule'</td>
<td>1993.9160 (Ref. Metcalf, T&amp;S, pl. 9, no 160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>D/E</td>
<td>1986.8652 (Ref. SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 239; MEC I. 652)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston Down</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1999.0040 (Ref. West Hythe 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Mongeham</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1960.0002 (Ref. Rigold BNJ 1960 p. 51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster-in-Thanet</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1993.9150 (Ref. Metcalf, T&amp;S, pl. 8, no 150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Romney</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2001.0553 (Ref. Bonser notes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsgate</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>Bla</td>
<td>1993.0139 (Ref. CR 1993: 139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>1977.0060 (Ref. Rigold A4, 2; Metcalf 1984. no 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Blia (A)</td>
<td>1986.8694 (Ref. SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 253; MEC I. 694; Metcalf 1984. no 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Blia (A)</td>
<td>1988.6010 (Ref. Rigold Blia, 5; Metcalf 1984. no 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Blia-c (A)</td>
<td>1960.0008 (Ref. Rigold BNJ 1960 Blia, 5; Metcalf 1984. no 49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Reference (EMC number unless otherwise stated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>C/R</td>
<td>1986.8686 (Ref. SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 233; MEC I. 686; Metcalf 1984. no.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1996.0067 (Ref. CR 1996: 67; Metcalf 1984. no.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1988.6004 (Ref. BMC Mercia, Ethelred, 4; Metcalf 1984. no.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richborough</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Nicholas at Wade</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>BX</td>
<td>1995.0078 (Ref. CR 1995: 78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Nicholas at Wade</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1996.0070 (Ref. CR 1996: 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Court Farm, nr Deal</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1985.0028 (Ref. B&amp;B 1985: 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornham</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1993.0175 (Ref. CR 1993: 175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hythe</td>
<td>Early Continental</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1986.8681 (Ref. SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 226; MEC I. 681)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitfield, nr Dover</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>BZ</td>
<td>1996.0064 (Ref. CR 1996: 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Reference (EMC number unless otherwise stated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, Beer Cart Lane</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Metcalf 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, Brickfield</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, Castle Street</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Metcalf 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, St Dunstan's Church</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Metcalf 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, St Pancras Church</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>Metcalf 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury, Sluor Street</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Metcalf 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastry</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td></td>
<td>1995.0100 (Ref. CR 1995: 100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mongeham</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>Saraoaido Group (Type 3b and 11)</td>
<td>1993.0183 (Ref. CR 1993: 183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster, on Sheppey</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1977.0050 (Ref. Rigold and Metcalf 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minster, on Sheppey</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>Type 30b/8 'mule' (Wodan head obverse)</td>
<td>1977.0049 (Ref. NC 1 (1838-9), p 48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozenegell</td>
<td>Merovingian Francia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Merovingian denier; Childeric II, Tours (not in Belfort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>1986.8695 (Ref. SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 252; MEC 1. 695; Metcalf 1984. no.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1986.8697 (Ref. SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 254; MEC 1. 697; Metcalf 1984. no.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1986.8698 (Ref. SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 255; MEC 1. 698; Metcalf 1984. no.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1988.6006 (Ref. BNJ 1988, p 127 no. 6; Metcalf 1984. no.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Reference (EMC number unless otherwise stated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1986.8702 (Ref: SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 256; MEC I. 702; Metcalf 1984. no.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1986.8703 (Ref: SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 257; MEC I. 703; Metcalf 1984. no.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Merovingian Francia</td>
<td>Merovingian denier</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Merovingian Francia</td>
<td>Merovingian denier</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Merovingian Francia</td>
<td>Merovingian denier</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1986.8704 (Ref: SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 263; MEC I. 704; Metcalf 1984. no.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1986.8705 (Ref: SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 264; MEC I. 705; Metcalf 1984. no.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1988.6002 (Ref: BMC 175; BJN 1974, pl 1 no. 9, Metcalf 1984. no.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1986.87061 (Ref: MEC I. 706A; Metcalf 1984. no.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1988.6005 (Ref: SCBI 2 - Glasgow: 118; Metcalf 1984. no.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Metcalf 1984. no.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>Rosettes on Obverse Group (Type 46?)</td>
<td>1988.6015 (Ref: BJN 1968, p 127, no. 15; Metcalf 1984. no.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>Type 51 (V?)</td>
<td>1988.6017 (Ref: BJN 1968, p 127, no. 17; Metcalf 1984. no.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>1986.8718 (Ref: SCBI 1 - Fitzwilliam: 252; MEC I. 718; Metcalf 1984. no.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richborough</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1977.0064 (Ref: Metcalf 1974, 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richborough</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1977.0066 (Ref: Rigold and Metcalf 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richborough</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1977.0065 (Ref: Rigold and Metcalf 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richborough</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1993.9453 (Ref: Metcalf, T&amp;S, no 453)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richborough</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>Trigueras Group</td>
<td>1988.6011 (Ref: BMC 196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Nicholas at Wade</td>
<td>Wessex</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1993.9291 (Ref: Metcalf, T&amp;S, pl. 17, no 291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone-next-Faversham</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>1977.0075 (Ref: Rigold and Metcalf 1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hythe</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1999.0041 (Ref: West Hythe 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Reference (EMC number unless otherwise stated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hythe</td>
<td>Early England</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1999.0042 (Ref: West Hythe 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodnesborough</td>
<td>Northumbria</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1996.0126 (Ref: CR 1996: 126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMC</td>
<td>Coin type/Ruler</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999.0194 (Ref: Photo from John Newman)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993.0909 (Ref: Metcalf, T&amp;S, pl. 5, no 94)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993.9129 (Ref: Metcalf, T&amp;S, pl. 7, no 129)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996.0072 (Ref: CR 1996: 72)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990.5009 (Ref: MASB notes: Bedford, Bonser 563)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993.9132 (Ref: Metcalf, T&amp;S, pl. 7, no 132)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996.0074 (Ref: CR 1996: 74)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990.0171 (Ref: CR 1990: 171)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999.0127 (Ref: Rudd 2 August 1999)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (shilling)</td>
<td>600-675</td>
<td>Sutherland IV iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987.0047 (Ref: CR 1987: 47)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1017.0063 (Ref: SCBI 17 - Midland: 93)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998.0038 (Ref: Rudd cat 34 no 20)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (shilling)</td>
<td>600-675</td>
<td>Sutherland IV iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996.0071 (Ref: CR 1996: 71)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000.0044 (Ref: Email from Gabor Thomas)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977.0109 (Ref: Rigold and Metcalf 1977)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000.0234 (Ref: Blackburn 1993 (Lindsey), p. 87)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999.0072 (Ref: Newman 24May99)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMC</td>
<td>Coin type/Ruler</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000.0046 (Ref: Brought in)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000.0047 (Ref: Brought in)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991.5026 (Ref: MASB notes (SF 4))</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960.0011 (Ref: Rigold BNJ 1960 p. 52)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001.0048 (Ref: Photographs sent in by Mr Brian Read)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977.0038 (Ref: Rigold and Metcalf 1977)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001.0053 (Ref: Scan sent by Mr Kevin Blackburn)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999.0023 (Ref: CR 1999: 54)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991.0020 (Ref: Stott 7)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977.0045 (Ref: Rigold and Metcalf 1977, Stott 9)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948.0062 (Ref: Sutherland 62a; Stott 1)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (shilling)</td>
<td>600-675</td>
<td>Sutherland IV.ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993.0080 (Ref: Metcalf, T&amp;S, pl. 4, no 80)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (shilling)</td>
<td>600-675</td>
<td>Sutherland II.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998.0052 (Ref: Rudd cat 34 no 22)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998.0054 (Ref: Rudd cat 34 no 25)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993.9133 (Ref: Metcalf, T&amp;S, pl. 7, no 133)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995.0109 (Ref: Rudd for Vecchi)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986.0004 (Ref: B&amp;B 1986: 4)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8.4 Continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMC</td>
<td>Coin type/Ruler</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989.5167 (Ref: MASB: Royston, 67)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994.5100 (Ref: MASB: Royston, 100)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994.5113 (Ref: MASB: Royston, 113)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995.0066 (Ref: CR 1995: 66)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (shilling)</td>
<td>600-675</td>
<td>Sutherland II.v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000.0512 (Ref: South Lincs (2000), O12)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000.0521 (Ref: South Lincs (2000), O21)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999.0205 (Ref: South Lincs (1999), 5)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000.0509 (Ref: South Lincs (2000), O9)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000.0510 (Ref: South Lincs (2000), O10)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000.0534 (Ref: South Lincs (2000), O34)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986.0205 (Ref: Bispham 1986, E5)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948.0023 (Ref: Sutherland 23a)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (shilling)</td>
<td>600-675</td>
<td>Sutherland II.i : Roman: ? Carausius (23-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986.0130 (Ref: B&amp;B 1986: 130)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985.0424 (Ref: Metcalf BNJ 1986 p. 10)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998.0055 (Ref: Rudd cat 34 no 26)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMC</td>
<td>Coin type/Ruler</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993.9128 (Ref: Metcalf, T&amp;S, pl. 7, no 128)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993.9120 (Ref: Metcalf, T&amp;S, pl. 6, no 120)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977.0107 (Ref: Rigold and Metcalf 1977)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986.0134 (Ref: B&amp;B 1986: 134)</td>
<td>Ruler: anon. (early penny)</td>
<td>675-750</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Hoard I) Broadstairs Valetta House - 8 coins (3x Series A, 5x Series B)
(Hoard II) Milton Regis - 20 coins (8x Series A, 12x Series B)
(Hoard III) Barham, Breach Down - 5 coins (2x Series A, 3x Series B)
(Hoard IV) Ozengell - 3 coins (all Series B)
(Hoard VII) Birchington - 5 coins (1x Epillus, 1x Series B, 1x Series C, 2x Series R3)
(Hoard X) Finglesham - 8 coins (6x Series B, 2x Series A)

Table 8.5 Kentish hoards of silver coin AD 650-750 (collated from Rigold 1961; 1966)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Coin-type</th>
<th>Metal</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6th century</td>
<td>bracteates</td>
<td>gold</td>
<td>primitive valuables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.550-c.600</td>
<td>continental tremisses</td>
<td>gold</td>
<td>primitive valuables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.600-c.625</td>
<td>continental (civic issue) tremisses</td>
<td>gold</td>
<td>primitive valuables/currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.625-c.675</td>
<td>continental (civic issues) tremisses &amp; English imitations</td>
<td>gold</td>
<td>primitive currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.670-c.685</td>
<td>intermediate sceattas</td>
<td>pale gold/silver</td>
<td>restricted small denomination currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.680-c.710</td>
<td>primary sceattas</td>
<td>silver</td>
<td>restricted small denomination currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.700-c.725</td>
<td>intermediate sceattas</td>
<td>silver</td>
<td>small denomination currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.725-c.750-65</td>
<td>secondary sceattas</td>
<td>silver</td>
<td>extended currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.765 on?</td>
<td>Carolingian pennies &amp; Kentish and Offan reform pennies</td>
<td>silver</td>
<td>restricted currency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.786-796</td>
<td>Secondary Offan pennies</td>
<td>silver</td>
<td>? incipient early cash</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.6 The chronological development of Anglo-Saxon monetary circulation as defined by Hodges (1982), with amendments incorporating the framework outlined by Metcalf (1988).
The following section contains a summary of the ASKED site records. Most data contained in the database has been omitted from this appendix in order to enable simple reference between this gazetteer, the main text and other figures and tables contained in this volume. References are cited using the Harvard system for both books and periodicals. Expanded reference information is provided in the main bibliography in Volume 1. The sites are arranged in alphabetical order of site-code (usually an abbreviation of site location and site-type). There is no attempt at consistency in the names of sites used. I have selected the name by which the site is commonly known. The format and further conventions of this gazetteer are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ashford</th>
<th>AFD-IB1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 601000</td>
<td>Date From: 600 To: 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 142000</td>
<td>Site-type: Isolated Burial?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum of 2 graves, found pre-1856, though only one recorded. Clawbeaker, weapons and a bell beaker from the second burial. Sited in the 19thC.

Selection of Bibliographic Sources: TR 04 SW 13, Evison 1982, 50

Although full bibliographic sources are detailed in ASKED, only two significant sources are noted in this report. The primary source mentioned is generally that of the Kent SMR (e.g. TR 04 SW 13, corresponding to O.S. grid-sheets), but occasional reference is also made of the Trust for Thanet SMR (e.g. TTA site 250) or the Corpus of Early Medieval Coins (e.g. EMC 1963.0021).

Summary of ASKED site entry, detailing the major archaeological features, dates of excavation and primary finds. Also noted are inaccuracies, some references and other supporting evidence. Entries prefixed by "SMR" broadly replicate Kent Sites and Monuments records. Meaney's (1964) comments are generally quoted in full.
### Acol

**Eastings:** 630900  
**Date From:** 500  
**Site-type:** Settlement

SMR: Possible settlement site, visible from aerial photography. TR 309674. Located to the nearest fifty metres. Medieval settlement discovered in 1982. TTA Site no. 111. The remains of an Anglo-Saxon settlement were found during the cutting of footing trenches for a house. The remains included SFBs, PHs, Midden pits and Grass-tempered ware scatters. RB pottery and find scatters indicate a probable nearby villa. Finds not recorded in detail and kept by land-owner.

**Selection of References:** TR 36 NW 76  
Perkins et al 1987

### Acol Hill

**Eastings:** 630700  
**Date From:** 500  
**Site-type:** Cemetery

Possible AS burials visible as CMs. Observed in 1975. A fair distance north of ACL and therefore regarded as a separate site.

**Selection of References:** TTA site 250  
Perkins et al 1987  
Richardson 2000, site 1

### Ash, Cop St

**Eastings:** 629000  
**Date From:** 500  
**Site-type:** Cemetery

AS cemetery excavated pre-1849. Nearly 20 EAS graves with flagstone covers. Multiple finds. Site location not exact.

**Selection of References:** TR 25 NE 2  
Richardson 2000, site 7  
Haseloff 1981

### Ashford

**Eastings:** 601000  
**Date From:** 600  
**Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

Minimum of 2 graves, found pre-1856, though only one recorded. Clawbeaker, weapons and a bell beaker from the second burial. Sited in 19thC.

**Selection of References:** TR 04 SW 13  
Evson 1982, 50  
Richardson 2000

### Ashford II Willesborough

**Eastings:** 602000  
**Date From:** 500  
**Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

Isolated Burial? C6th buckle with shield on back, 6 amber and 4 glass beads, a bronze ring and bronze fragments were found at Willesborough in 1844 in unknown circumstances and passed into the Bateman Collection.

**Selection of References:** TR 04 SW 19

### Alkham

**Eastings:** 627800  
**Date From:** 0  
**Site-type:** Find-Spot

SMR: EM buckle, brooch, pendant and belt rivet found near Chilton Farm, Alkham

**Selection of References:** TR 24 SE 67
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>Site-type</th>
<th>Selection of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldington</td>
<td>606000</td>
<td>715 To: 750</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>EMC 1996.0094, BNJ 1996, no.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appledore Minster</td>
<td>595750</td>
<td>700 To: 900</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon Church</td>
<td>Tatton-Brown 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash I Millfield</td>
<td>629340</td>
<td>500 To: 600</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td>TR 25 NE 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>629000</td>
<td>600 To: 675</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>EMC 1994.0111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash</td>
<td>629000</td>
<td>600 To: 675</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>EMC 1996.0060, BNJ 1996, no.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>572390</td>
<td>600 To: 700</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>TQ 75 NW 30, Swanton 1973, 185, Richardson 2000, site 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locality Only. Metal detector find of Series E Continental penny

According to Tatton-Brown 1988 "The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the 11th century" this is a possible 'old' Minster church, probably of the 7th/8th century.

Isolated Burial from watching brief: decorated sword pommel, a cruciform brooch and a ditch and pit (TR 25 NE 50) containing pottery of a similar date may suggest contemporary occupation of the site.

AS cemetery. Isolated burial found 1922, WT pot. Further material in 1926, including several spearheads. 2 more spearheads found in 1931 and a Ae buckle in 1956.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>SMR</th>
<th>Selection of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aylesford II Rochester Rd.</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>Ae buckle with a fixed plate with hooked end, similar to that found in Gilton 88 (Faussett 1956, pl x.4) found in garden of &quot;Norbury&quot; Rochester Rd, Aylesford</td>
<td>TQ 75 NW 20 Grove 1955, 208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesford III Bushey Wood</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>Ae brooch find, located c. 280m S of the Eccles cemetery on lower part of a gentle S-W facing slope</td>
<td>Richardson 2000, site 13 Kelly 1987, 354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesford</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Locality Only. Series E continental sceat find</td>
<td>EMC 1985.0003 BNJ 1985, no.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beakesbourne I Adisham Down</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>AS Type 4 barrow cemetery. Faussett opened 45 graves in 1773, primarily in barrows.</td>
<td>TR 25 SW 1 Richardson 2000, site 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barreston (Sibertswold)</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>AS Type 4 barrow cemetery. 1772-3: Faussett opened 181 graves in and about 162 AS tumuli in 2 groups on Sibertswold Down. Multiple finds.</td>
<td>Smith 1856 Richardson 2000, site 232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Broadstairs Bradstow School

Easting: 639450 Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 167090 Site-type: Cemetery

Possibly a type 5 barrow cemetery, with a penannular ditch grave. Treated separately from Valetta House site to overcome problems of grave numbering. Total of 98 graves exc (Webster) including a nucleated group of warrior burials. Ae bowl, Frankish gold tremissis, claw beaker. Structural features in some graves. TTA site 199

Selection of References: TR 36 NE 12
Richardson 2000, site 40

Broadstairs Bleak House

Easting: 639950 Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 167580 Site-type: Cemetery

According to both the Kent SMR and the TTA SMR AS burials from a small inhumation cemetery were excavated by C. Hogarth in a rescue excavation at this point in the 1960s. No further information regarding either the context or the finds is known

Selection of References: TR 36 NE 186
TTA site 261

Broadstairs Dumpton Gap

Easting: 639300 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 166400 Site-type: Settlement

An extensive settlement visible in CMs and showing evidence of occupation from the Iron Age to Early Medieval period

Selection of References: TTA site 137

Boughton Aluph

Easting: 603720 Date From: 550 To: 700
Northing: 148780 Site-type: Cemetery

Poss AS Type 1 cemetery site. 1719-20: 2 x AS male burials found. Sword, conical shield boss, penannular brooch and other finds. 1902-4: Anglo-Saxon burial at Tarbutt's chalk quarry opposite Whitehall where the Wye-Challock Road crosses the Pilgrim Road. The Skeleton was accompanied by a sword, iron spearhead, ten Roman coins, etc. Adjacent to long 200m linear feature visible as a cropmark running WNW-ESE (TR 04 NW 32)

Selection of References: TR 04 NW 4
Richardson 2000, site 31

Boughton Aluph Minster

Easting: 603300 Date From: 700 To: 900
Northing: 148130 Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church

According to Tatton-Brown 1988 "The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the 11th century" this is a possible 'old' Minster church, probably of the 7th/8th century.

Selection of References: Tatton-Brown 1988a

Boughton-under-Blean

Easting: 604700 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 158600 Site-type: Isolated Burial?

Is this AS? Not located. This could be from Parsonage Farm (6047 1595) or as Hawkes suggests (60470 15860) or indeed from any of the other 3 Boughtons. 1716: In a hedge by the roadside near the Parsonage Barn a male skeleton was dug up, with an iron sword and a coin of Antoninus Pius.

Selection of References: Meaney 1964
Richardson 2000, site 32
### Boughton-under-Blean Minster

**Easting:** 604750  **Date From:** 700  **To:** 900  
**Northing:** 158600  **Site-type:** Anglo-Saxon Church

According to Tatton-Brown 1988 "The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the 11th century" this is a possible 'old' Minster church, probably of the 7th/8th century.

**Selection of References:** Tatton-Brown 1988a

### Bifrons Patrixbourne

**Easting:** 619020  **Date From:** 450  **To:** 625  
**Northing:** 154570  **Site-type:** Cemetery

AS cemetery. 1866: 18 or 20 graves. 1867 (Faussett): 91 graves, 96 burials - various finds. Situated c.3 miles south of Canterbury near the juncture of the River Nailbourne and the Roman road between Canterbury and Dover.

**Selection of References:** Chadwick-Hawkes 2000? Richardson 2000, site 202

### Birchington

**Easting:** 630000  **Date From:** 700  **To:** 715  
**Northing:** 169000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

4 sceatta finds listed in Hill & Metcalf (eds.) 1984 "Sceattas in England and on the Continent" pp. 247

**Selection of References:** Hill & Metcalf 1984, 247 Richardson 2000, site 23

### Beakesbourne II Aerodrome

**Easting:** 619990  **Date From:** 475  **To:** 600  
**Northing:** 155490  **Site-type:** Cemetery

AS cemetery. 1914: burial and finds. 1936: burial found at Homestead with brooch and beads find. 1955-8: Excavation of 38 burials (Jenkins), some in mounds. Strong Frankish element.

**Selection of References:** TR 15 NE 1 Richardson 2000, site 21

### Bekesbourne III

**Easting:** 620150  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 156200  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

AS spearhead find. 6 inches below the surface and aquired by RMC. In fact slightly closer to Howletts than Bekesbourne II cemeteries, close to the Well Chapel remains in the Nailbourne Valley. Could be suggestive of a settlement location for either the Howletts or Beakesbourne II communities. It is likely that Bekesbourne Lane represents another 'den' route.

**Selection of References:** TR 25 NW 5 Richardson 2000, site 146 Chadwick 1958

### Bekesbourne

**Easting:** 619000  **Date From:** 715  **To:** 750  
**Northing:** 155000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Series E sceatta metal detector find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1998.0136
### Boughton Monchelsea

**BOM-SET1**

**Easting:** 577800  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 152150  **Site-type:** Settlement

1842: located the site of a supposed Ro walled cemetery with towers. 1996: only revealed two poss Ro ditches and a single pit with sherds of early AS pot in the fill, though reassessment of the results of the 1998 excavation did identify the cemetery.

**Selection of References:** TQ 75 SE 89

### Bonnington

**BON-FS1**

**Easting:** 605800  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 133700  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

SMR: AS pot find: "EM pottery found by fieldwalking."

**Selection of References:** TR 03 SE 35  Reeves 1995

### Boxley

**BOX-FS1**

**Easting:** 578000  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 159000  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

AS pot (Myres 1977, corpus number 3824, f. 69) and spears found from Boxley Hills.

**Selection of References:** Evison 1956, 112  Richardson 2000, site 34

### Boxley

**BOX-FS2**

**Easting:** 577000  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 158000  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

Small Anglo-Saxon bowl, now in Maidstone Museum. Myres 1977, 92

**Selection of References:** TQ 75 NE 111  Myres 1977, 92

### Boxley

**BOX-FS3**

**Easting:** 577000  **Date From:** 525  **To:** 575  
**Northing:** 159000  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

Locality only: Ae worn an incomplete square-headed brooch Hines attributes to Leigh's style III AC 108, 281-94

**Selection of References:** Kelly 1990  Richardson 2000, site 35

### Boxley

**BOX-FS4**

**Easting:** 576000  **Date From:** 500  **To:** 550  
**Northing:** 159000  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

Locality only: Ae cast saucer brooch with 4 spirals from a central square and rounded in flat relief, & Ae tweezers.

**Selection of References:** Kelly 1992  Richardson 2000, site 36
Boxley

**BOX-FS5**

**Easting:** 577000  **Date From:** 730  **To:** 760

**Northing:** 158000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series L sceatta find

Selection of References:  EMC 1988.0130

---

Boxley

**BOX-FS6**

**Easting:** 577100  **Date From:** 828  **To:** 839

**Northing:** 158000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Wessex silver penny find

Selection of References:  EMC 1994.0190

---

Boxley

**BOX-FS7**

**Easting:** 576900  **Date From:** 805  **To:** 832

**Northing:** 158000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Archbishop Wulfric of Canterbury silver penny

Selection of References:  Bonser 1998

---

Boxley

**BOX-FS8**

**Easting:** 577000  **Date From:** 828  **To:** 839

**Northing:** 158900  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Ecgberht of Wessex silver penny find.

Selection of References:  Bonser 1998

---

Brabourne Iden Corner

**BRB-IB1**

**Easting:** 610720  **Date From:** 500  **To:** 600

**Northing:** 142000  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

1955: Shield-Boss and skull fragment found during house construction. Dated to the 6th century by Evison. Meaney's co-ordinates are confused, this is the real location of the burial site, though Richardson locates it to 6104 1420. C. 1995: 2 inhumations excavated by Ashford Archaeological Group when new driveway completed across road to the NW of 1955 site; another possible grave was visible in section by the driveway. The site is just above the Pilgrim's Way. Probably the same cemetery as BRB-IB2-3

Selection of References:  TR 14 SW 20 Richardson 2000, site 38

---

Brabourne Il Lees

**BRB-IB2**

**Easting:** 608000  **Date From:** 500  **To:** 600

**Northing:** 140000  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

Brent states: "At the period when the cemetery at Stowting (6th century A.D. Anglo- Saxon inhumation cemetery - TR 14 SW 3) was in use there was probably a population scattered through the valley immediately beneath it. At Brabourne Lees (TR 08 40) and on Stowting Common (TR 14 SW 44) similar interments have been found."

Selection of References:  TR 04 SE 12 Richardson 2000, site 37

439
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>BRB-IB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>610750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>142000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finds from AS graves disturbed by badgers just below Pilgrim's Way over a ten year period by Ashford Archaeological Group including 3 x brooches, 3 x buckles, 1 or 2 shield bosses, some spearheads. Probably the same cemetery as BRB-IB2, composing of one cemetery next to the Pilgrim's Way, exact coordinates are not known.

Selection of References: Richardson 2000, site 39

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>BRD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>620670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>148900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type 4 Barrow cemetery. C.1809 several barrows excavated. 1841: 113 barrows visible. 59 excavated (Conyngham), containing 64 graves. C.1843 several small tumuli excv. (Bartlett), 1844: 16 barrows excavated (Conyngham). Also the location of a c.700-730 sceatta find.

Selection of References: Meaney 1964, Richardson 2000, site 16

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>BRD-FS1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>620300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>148500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There have been a number of finds from this location. NW 19: Six AS silver sceattas (sited to locality only), there have also been finds of a 6th century brooch, a knife and pin. An additional porcupine sceatta find, a jar and a bowl at NW 71 (i.e. TR 2048, sited to the approximate location of Breach Down only).

Selection of References: TR 24 NW 19

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>BRD-FS2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>620500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>150000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMR records sceatta finds near here (locality only) -[NB see TR 24 NW 19 also]-- at TR 24 NW 74: (620700,149500) 5 x AS sceattas & at this location (TR 25 SW 130) Sceattas - BAR 128, 1984, 246. Both records have been subsumed under the same identifier here.

Selection of References: TR 25 SW 130

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>BRD-IB1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>620300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>149000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anglo Saxon barrow, Barham at TR 2044 - sited to parish only

Selection of References: TR 24 NW 32, Ashbee & Dunning 1960, 55, Meaney 1964

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>BRD-SET1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>620300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>149500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Iron Age, Roman and Anglo-Saxon Finds from Barham. (TR 20 50 Sited to locality only west of the church).

Selection of References: TR 25 SW 132, Youngs & Clark 1982, 187
Bridge

Easting: 618900    Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 154600    Site-type: Early Medieval Cropmark
SMR: "Four pits, three of them rectangular or square, and a ring ditch at 19005455."

Selection of References: TR 15 SE 133

Barham aka Kingston Down

Easting: 620600    Date From: 600 To: 700
Northing: 151500    Site-type: Cemetery
Barham Down finds listed in Meaney are probably an extension of the Kingston Down cemetery i.e. KGD-3. Barham Down in this gazetter is reserved for the finds from south of the Roman road i.e. Barham Broom Park to avoid future confusion.

Selection of References: TR 24 NW 32

Barham II, Upper Digges

Easting: 621300    Date From: 600 To: 700
Northing: 150800    Site-type: Cemetery
SMR: "TR 213 508  Four Anglo-Saxon graves, Barham"

Selection of References: TR 25 SW 45 Wilson & Hurst 1969, 233

Barham III Wick Wood

Easting: 622350    Date From: 600 To: 700
Northing: 149150    Site-type: Cemetery
Iron Age and Roman ditches and Anglo Saxon graves, Wick Wood. J. Wilson 1984,166-74 (KAR 77)

Selection of References: TR 24 NW 75 Richardson 2000, site 19

Barham Broom Park

Easting: 622260    Date From: 600 To: 700
Northing: 148840    Site-type: Cemetery
Anglo-Saxon inhumation cemetery cut by a gas pipe line in September 1969. Five graves recognised, one containing several burials, all orientated north-south. Finds comprised a green bead and several potsherds, one 8th-9th century.

Selection of References: TR 24 NW 21 Richardson 2000, site 18

Barham II Broome Park

Easting: 622630    Date From: 500 To: 600
Northing: 148520    Site-type: Find-Spot
SMR: AS silver spoon find with zoomorphic feature, Brown 1913-4; Brown 1915 IV, pl. XCV.1 Found in Broome Park estate next to the Dover-Canterbury road

Selection of References: TR 24 NW 13 Richardson 2000, site 17 Evison 1987
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>BRH-FS2</th>
<th>BRH-FS3</th>
<th>BRH-FS4</th>
<th>BRO</th>
<th>BRR-FS1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>620000</td>
<td>620000</td>
<td>620100</td>
<td>629270</td>
<td>588000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>151000</td>
<td>151000</td>
<td>168670</td>
<td>160000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Locality Only. English sceat find</td>
<td>Locality Only. Series E sceatta find</td>
<td>Locality Only. Series K sceatta metal-detector find</td>
<td>Large barrow cemetery visible in aerial photography. Probably one cemetery rather than 2. 1958: 3 burials found in Minnis Bay may not be related to the visible cemetery. TTA site 67 shows a number of AS barrow burials</td>
<td>Locality Only. Continental Series D sceatta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References:
- EMC 1960.0002
- EMC 1993.9194
- EMC 1993.0173
- EMC 1997.0048
- TR 26 NE 38
- Richardson 2000, site 24 &
- EMC 1989.0064

442
Broadstairs 1910

Easting: 639330  Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 168540  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

1909: AS Fe spearhead find, 1911: 2 x AS burials found containing bones and knives were found at the junction of Lindenthorpe an Stanley Roads, Broadstairs. The site is half a mile from the hill top and three quarters of a mile from Valetta House. TTA site 101

Selection of References: TR 36 NE 6  Richardson 2000, site 41

Bishopsbourne

Easting: 619100  Date From: 600 To: 700
Northing: 153000  Site-type: Cemetery

Type 4 barrow cemetery: Possibly in two separate groups. 1771: 9 barrows excavated (Faussett) who says that c. 500 yds. to the NW of these tumuli, c. 100 more were visible on Hanging Hill; 1844: several barrows excavated (Conyngham). 1844: Wright opened 3 barrows in front of Bourne Place. 1844: 2 x barrows opened. Most scarcely furnished.

Selection of References: TR 15 SE 6  Richardson 2000, site 26 &

Bishopsbourne, Bourne Place

Easting: 618680  Date From: 600 To: 700
Northing: 153680  Site-type: Cemetery

See note to BSB. i.e. Hanging Hill mentioned by Faussett. This grave mound cluster is partly in woodland and partly under the plough; only eleven mounds survive and these, in general, are in a poor condition.

Selection of References: TR 15 SE 2  Richardson 2000, site 27

Bishopsbourne

Easting: 619700  Date From: 600 To: 700
Northing: 152500  Site-type: Cemetery

Inhumation cemetery excavated in 1973 in advance of road works. 23 WE inhumations with 7th to late 8th century artefacts. Brow of steep hill overlooking the Little Stour.

Selection of References: TR 15 SE 32  Richardson 2000, site 29  Webster 1974

Bishopsbourne

Easting: 619000  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 152000  Site-type: Find-Spot

Anglo-Saxon glass palm cup, Bishopsbourne. (TR 1952 sited to place name only).

Selection of References: TR 15 SE 54  Harden 1956

Bishopsbourne

Easting: 619000  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 152200  Site-type: Find-Spot

AS Bichonial Bowl found near Bishopsbourne. (Sited to place-name only).

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)  Evison 1979, site 79
### Bishopbourne BSB-FS3

**Easting:** 619000  **Date From:** 500  **To:** 550  
**Northing:** 153000  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

Gilt copper equal-arm brooch donated to the Canterbury Museum. Style I anthropomorphic ornament and 2 garnet setting. (Sited to place-name only).

**Selection of References:** Canterbury Museum Record Richardson 2000, site 30

### Bishopbourne/Kingston BSB-IB1

**Easting:** 619890  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 152090  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

Is this AS? Doubtful inhumation burial. SMR: "A crouched burial was excavated April 1940 by G. Webster at TR 19895209 (sited from dimensioned sketch map); there were no small finds but the Royal College of Surgeons dated the skeleton as pagan-Saxon. There is nothing on the ground to mark the site."

**Selection of References:** TR 15 SE 21 Richardson 2000, site 290

### Bishopbourne BSB-IB2

**Easting:** 619240  **Date From:** 600  **To:** 700  
**Northing:** 153200  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

SMR: This probable barrow, 17.5m in diameter and 0.5m in height, is situated on a hill slope well below the crest, suggesting a Saxon rather than a B.A. origin. It is not listed by Ashbee and Dunning 1960. Published 1/2500 Survey correct.

**Selection of References:** TR 15 SE 3

### Broadstairs St. Peter's Tip BSP

**Easting:** 637530  **Date From:** 525  **To:** 700  
**Northing:** 169260  **Site-type:** Cemetery

Type 3 AS barrow cemetery excv 1969-1971 (Hogarth) grave free areas around some burials and other orientations respecting poss. Barrows. 388 inhumations, much skeletal material with artefacts. 28 Wheel-thrown pots; Many grave structures: penannular ditches and external ditches or slots. Much contemporary grave robbing. Some graves and a round barrow survive to the north west. TTA site 200

**Selection of References:** TR 36 NE 60 Richardson 2000, site 42

### Broadstairs St. Peter's Tip BSP-FS1

**Easting:** 637400  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 169600  **Site-type:** Early Medieval Cropmark

Doubtful inhumation cemetery. Cropmarks identified as a possible inhumation cemetery. SMR: Ditched enclosures and AS burials [at TR 3743 6967] Cropmark of ring ditch. [TR 374 696 - sited to nearest 50 metres only] Cropmarks of Bronze Age barrows, now built over.

**Selection of References:** TR 36 NE 139 Richardson 2000, site 173

### Broadstairs St. Peter's Tip BSP-FS2

**Easting:** 638000  **Date From:** 700  **To:** 710  
**Northing:** 168000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series E sceatta metal detector find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1998.2065
SMR: Saxon pottery find at TR 085311. Findspot of Roman and Saxon pottery. Not thought to derive from manuring, and may indicate possible settlement.

SMR: 106 pieces of early medieval and 19 pieces of medieval pottery found by fieldwalking.

AS cemetery, secondary in BA barrow. Kept separate to BBS, same cemetery 1910: No mounds noted. Graves numbered 1-6 from Meaney's paraphrasing of Hurd, 7-15 equate with graves listed as E,I,L,O,Q,R,S,T,U from the same source. This latter group found in association with BA ditch feature. There are a number of uncontexted finds. TTA site 125

AS inhumation cemetery. 1880: Cut through in flat ground near the marshes and the rectory, during railway excavations. Only remains preserved were a spearhead, bronze belt fittings, the bottom of a bronze dish with raised concentric circles (evidently the base of a Roman skillet) and 2 Roman coins of Nero and Maximian. A large quantity of bones was carted away.

Selection of References:

Selection of References:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Date From/To</th>
<th>Site-type</th>
<th>Selection of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cliffe-at-Hoo</strong></td>
<td>573000</td>
<td>175000</td>
<td>700/715</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Locality Only. Continental Series D sceatta find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canterbury I St. Augustine's Abbey</strong></td>
<td>615400</td>
<td>157730</td>
<td>600/900</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>St. Augustine's saxon cemetery: 1955: excavations at the W end of St Augustine's Norman Abbey Church (Saunders 1978) There had been much reburying and many burials were jumbled, but parts of 14 articulated skeletons were found and 19 skulls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canterbury Church Lane</strong></td>
<td>615070</td>
<td>158210</td>
<td>700/1000</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Doubtful churchyard. 1977: mid-to late Saxon pits, Roman rampart and Saxon pottery found. Sequence of late Saxon or early Norman intra-mural streets identified. Five coffined inhumation burials, which cut some of the layers of street metalling, were uncovered. These were probably interred some time after the foundation of the church of St Mary-upon-Northgate probably in the late Saxon or early Norman period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canterbury III Cathedral</strong></td>
<td>615150</td>
<td>158130</td>
<td>900/1070</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>1978-80 Charnel Pit of 11th century disturb soon after 1070 by Lanfranc's cathedral construction. Late Saxon burials to the S of Gabriels' Chapel. A 6th century Ae square-headed brooch was found here in 1956, possibly from a burial or associated settlement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canterbury IV Old Westgate Farm</strong></td>
<td>613990</td>
<td>158290</td>
<td>650/800</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Possible Mid-AS cemetery attached to Roman cemetery. 1868: chatellaine fragment found. 1982: 53 Rom cremation burials (AD50-250), possible boundary ditch and a number of early Saxon finds: early 7th century gold pendant; possible cremation burial - 2 palm cups &amp; 2 reused Roman vessels. Possible second cremation with sceatta; inhumation burial and a possible robbed grave containing an intaid gold filigree brooch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canterbury I</strong></td>
<td>614700</td>
<td>157000</td>
<td>0/0</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>EM strap fitting and brooch find, also a number of locality only finds from Canterbury including brooches, glass vessels etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canterbury IV  
Easting: 614830 Date From: 0 To: 0  
Northing: 157610 Site-type: Find-Spot  
Roman, Saxon and Medieval pits were discovered during April 1950 in four trenches excavated in the cellar of Nos 20-21 Watling Street  
Selection of References: TR 15 NW 190 Andrews 1985 Freer et al. 1987

Canterbury V  
Easting: 614890 Date From: 0 To: 0  
Northing: 157610 Site-type: Find-Spot  
Same as SMR TR 15 NW 122, EM building? I have rectified it so that it is so. SMR: Belgic Huts, Roman buildings, Gruebenhaus and other EM finds, Medieval buildings, rubbish pits. (Sited to Marlowe Theatre only).  
Selection of References: TR 15 NW 205

Canterbury VII  
Easting: 614760 Date From: 0 To: 0  
Northing: 157680 Site-type: Find-Spot  
Late Saxon road: 1979: Rom water tanks & courtyard metalling sealed by black loam, which may have accumulated during a protracted period of abandonment. Soil containing a mixture of 8th to 11th century pottery, suggested agricultural activity during the Saxon-Norman period. At the frontage of Beer Cart Lane was the edge of a metalled street aligned roughly east-west - LAS to 14th C.  
Selection of References: TR 15 NW 213

Canterbury VIII  
Easting: 614660 Date From: 0 To: 0  
Northing: 157530 Site-type: Find-Spot  
SMR: The eastern side of Marlowe Avenue Car Park was prepared for excavation but the only finds were on the extreme western side of the prepared area where Roman levels were found intact and two Saxon pits full of burnt daub and late Saxon pottery. A coin of Alfred was also found.  
Selection of References: TR 15 NW 262

Canterbury IX  
Easting: 614540 Date From: 0 To: 0  
Northing: 157478 Site-type: Find-Spot  
LAS pits: 1976 -77: Multiple Rom phases from 1stC military occupation to 4thC pits. cAD200 two cremation burials & elements of one or more contemporary timber buildings. Double inhumation with two swords, belt and scabbard fittings dated to the 2nd/early-3rd C. A number of late Saxon pits cutting the post Roman levels.  
Selection of References: TR 15 NW 272

Canterbury X  
Easting: 614905 Date From: 0 To: 0  
Northing: 157730 Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church  
Is this the same as TR15NW206, EM building supposedly at 614930/157650? I have rectified to make them the same: EM occupation deposits: A rectangular building, the foundations of which lie under and diagonally across the remains of the C12 and C13 fraters (TR 15 NE 270) was discovered during excavations in 1927. It is probably part of the Anglo-Saxon monastery.  
Selection of References: TR 15 NW 293
## Canterbury XI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>Date To:</th>
<th>Northing:</th>
<th>Site-type:</th>
<th>SMR:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>614750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157650</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>EM occupation deposits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

## Canterbury XII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>Date To:</th>
<th>Northing:</th>
<th>Site-type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>614820</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157600</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1950: Belgic, Roman, Saxon and medieval pits discovered when two trenches were excavated in the cellars of Nos 29-30 Watling Street. In trench 1 a very large Roman pit, probably a quarry to obtain brickearth was found. Two other pits were noted, one of Saxon date containing 9th century pottery and one of medieval date c1050-1100. In trench two, one Belgic pit and one Roman pit were discovered.

Selection of References: TR 15 NW 449

## Canterbury XIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>Date To:</th>
<th>Northing:</th>
<th>Site-type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>614858</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157469</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1952: Roman, Saxon and medieval pits. Excavation in the south-east corner of Marlowe Avenue Car Park. Trench 1 revealed a 12th-13th century pit; Trench 2 a Roman and a 16th or 17th century pit were found; In trench 3, three pits, probably medieval. In trench 4 a medieval pit; In trench 5 a Roman pit and 6th and 9th century pits.

Selection of References: TR 15 NW 461

## Canterbury XIV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>Date To:</th>
<th>Northing:</th>
<th>Site-type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>614950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>158210</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Belgic finds, early Roman streets, second century pits, an Anglo Saxon pit, two sunken huts and a medieval structure were found during excavations at St Radigund's Street Car Park.

Selection of References: TR 15 NW 480

## Canterbury XV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>Date To:</th>
<th>Northing:</th>
<th>Site-type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>615160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157740</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1955: 2 trenches excavated. Belgic pottery and a Roman building - probably early 3rd C. Trench CXX - part of a late Saxon building. Badly disturbed by later pits, but a little of its plan was recovered. Trench CXX - sequence of medieval occupation layers and floors was found dating from the late 11th or early 12th century onwards.

Selection of References: TR 15 NE 253

## Canterbury XVI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>Date To:</th>
<th>Northing:</th>
<th>Site-type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>615030</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157690</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1947: 6 Roman pits from the late 2nd to late 4th C. On either side of a narrow alley on the south side of St George's Street three late Saxon pits were also found along with a fourth, possibly dating to the second half of the 8th century. One medieval pit was excavated which produced pottery between 1050 and 1150.

Selection of References: TR 15 NE 254
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Site-type</th>
<th>Selection of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury XVII</td>
<td>CAT-FS17</td>
<td>615020</td>
<td>157730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>TR 15 NE 255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury XVIII</td>
<td>CAT-FS18</td>
<td>615360</td>
<td>157890</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>Kent SMR (Maidstone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury XIX</td>
<td>CAT-FS19</td>
<td>615310</td>
<td>157730</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>TR 15 NE 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury XX</td>
<td>CAT-FS20</td>
<td>615130</td>
<td>157690</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>TR 15 NW 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury XXI</td>
<td>CAT-FS21</td>
<td>614310</td>
<td>157770</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>Kent SMR (Maidstone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury locality</td>
<td>CAT-FS22</td>
<td>615000</td>
<td>158000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>Richardson 2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Canterbury XXIII St Sepulchre's

**Easting:** 615200  
**Northing:** 157300  
**Date From:** 0  
**Site-type:** Find-Spot

1861: J. Brent's excavation of Roman cremation cemetery at St. Sepulchre's Nunnery found a small AS pot initially misidentified and stored in the KAS catalogue No.57 as Upchurch ware.

**Selection of References:** Richardson 2000, site 49  
Myres 1977, 249

### Canterbury XXIV Barracks

**Easting:** 616500  
**Northing:** 158000  
**Date From:** 0  
**Site-type:** Find-Spot

isolated find of anglo-Frisian pot, possibly a cremation urn, found during the construction of a barracks extension outside the city walls

**Selection of References:** Richardson 2000, site 50  
Myres 1977, 1078

### Canterbury

**Easting:** 614000  
**Northing:** 157000  
**Date From:** 500  
**Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. From the EMC there are c.13 pre AD900 coin finds from various locations and of a variety of provenances. In Bonser 1998, 1 x Cenwulf of Mercia silver penny (800-10) from St. Augustine’s; 1 x Burgred of Mercia silver penny (852-874) from St George’s Gate; 2 x Aethelwulf of Wessex (843-851) excavation finds; 1 x Aethelberht of Kent silver penny (858-863) from St. Augustine’s Church; 1 x Alfred Cross-and-lozenge type silver penny excavated in city centre 1955 (c.875-c880); 1x Alfred lunettes type penny from St. Augustine’s excavation 1964 (871-875);

**Selection of References:** EMC various  
Bonser 1998

### Canterbury II, St. Martin’s churchyard

**Easting:** 615850  
**Northing:** 157770  
**Date From:** 575  
**Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

AS inhumation in St. Martins Churchyard. c.1844: 6 or perhaps 7 coins fitted with loops found with a Roman intaglio and a circular Frankish gold ornament set with garnets and a green stone. Thought to be English although imitating Merovingian and Byzantine coins.

**Selection of References:** TR 15 NE 80  
Richardson 2000, site 44  
Taylor 1998

### Canterbury V Stour Street

**Easting:** 614900  
**Northing:** 157600  
**Date From:** 450  
**Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

Inhumation Burials, Late Roman 1980: Large pit cut through latest phases of Roman courtyard: 2 adults, 2 children and a dog accompanied by late roman jewellery and glass and amber beads. 5th century, near the line of the Dover to Canterbury roman road

**Selection of References:** Richardson 2000, site 47  
Bennet 1980, 406-410

### Canterbury III St Pancras'

**Easting:** 615570  
**Northing:** 157750  
**Date From:** 720  
**Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

1975: F. Jenkins excavated a child grave containing a series V type 7 sceat (720-725) near the south wall of St Pancras church under an added porticus

**Selection of References:** Richardson 2000, site 52  
Webster 1976, 163-4
Canterbury, St. John's Lane

Easting: 614740 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157580 Site-type: Settlement
LAS?/Med settlement and pits. 2 St. John's Lane - Multi-period site. The uppermost Rom deposits and medieval pits lay truncated beneath a thick sequence of horizontal, dark brown loam deposits. Likely that truncated horizon created by agricultural activity associated with the first of these soils. Loam layers formed poss. 1349 or later, when parishes incorporated after Black Death depopulation.

Selection of References: TR 15 NW 378

Canterbury, St. Mary's

Easting: 614470 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157620 Site-type: Settlement
St Mary's. A church of St Mary referred to in an early-9th century charter was close to St St Mildred's Church.

Selection of References: TR 15 NW 420

Canterbury, St. Mildred

Easting: 614500 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157520 Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church
Church of St Mildred with St Mary de Castro. 13th to 15thC. With LAS remains (probably 10thC) in the S and W nave walls. Original church on the site was erected c.700-50 and recorded as a monastery/minster on or near this site. This was destroyed by fire in 1246 although the Nave still retains Roman tiles and quoins of Roman oolite. St Mildred's Church was certainly in existence by 1089.

Selection of References: TR 15 NW 7

Canterbury

Easting: 614935 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157524 Site-type: Settlement
Must be the same as TR 15 NW 125, EM building recorded at 614940/157690. 1954: 2 trial trenches cut to the rear of No 3 Watling Street c.50ft to the east of Lady Huntingdon's Chapel. Trench I contained a gravel path overlain by layers containing Saxon and Medieval finds. Trench II revealed the gravel floor of a probable Belgic or early Roman hut. Later levels revealed medieval pottery and one Saxon sherd with stamped rosettes.

Selection of References: TR 15 NW 194

Canterbury

Easting: 615000 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157600 Site-type: Settlement
1985: Saxon SFB, industrial structures, late Saxon, medieval rubbish pits. 15thC bakehouse, St Georges Street. (Sited to street name only).

Selection of References: TR 15 NE 134

Canterbury

Easting: 615060 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157540 Site-type: Settlement
A useful series of pottery dating from the early Saxon period to the 12th century and from the post-medieval period was recovered from the many pits in the area and from the deposits sealing them from trenches dug along the south-east side of St George's lane at the south west end of Canterbury Bus Station in 1949.

Selection of References: TR 15 NE 318
Canterbury CAT-SET09

Easting: 615090  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 158110  Site-type: Settlement

-1980 Mint Yard excavation: Sequence of IA pot, Rom drainage ditches and waterlogged dumps, 7th-8thC: series of 3 successive courtyard metallings and post holes perhaps indicate a Saxon boundary. A quantity of grass-tempered sherd and a Saxon bead necklace were found. These sealed by a thick layer of LAS/Norman black soil. Med levels - flimsy timber-framed, clay-floored tenement properties sealed by remains of the Almonry chapel built 1324 and 1328.

Selection of References:  TR 15 NE 103

Canterbury, St Augustine's CAT-SET1

Easting: 615410  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157800  Site-type: Settlement

Great court of St. Augustine's - MAS settlement evidence: 1983-4: sequence of early C14 outer court metallings (part of abbey enlargement), medieval drains, EM pits, and AS features recorded. Sequence of deposits and features indicates that parts of the college grounds may have been occupied from the MAS period onwards. Indeed, there is some evidence to suggest that a cemetery and extra-mural agricultural area existed here in the Roman period.

Selection of References:  TR 15 NW 292

Canterbury, Mint CAT-SET10

Easting: 615100  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 158120  Site-type: Settlement

Canterbury Mint, (Sited to Mint Yard and the 1979 excavated mid-12thC Almonry Hall and early 14thC Almonry Chapel) Coins have been minted at Canterbury since the early 7th century. It seems likely that the mint may have been here. AS- 'In Canterbury (there are to be) 7 moneyers, four of the king's, two of the bishop's and one of the abbot'.

Selection of References:  TR 15 NE 245

Canterbury, Christ Church Cathedral CAT-SET11

Easting: 615110  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157940  Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church

Christ Church Cathedral. Founded 598 (collegiate or monastic?); refounded 997. Orig. church on the site was RB. Present buildings are C11 on mix. 1993 excv: RB layers, RB pebbled street running NE-SW beneath the cathedral. AS cathedral in 4 main phases. Poss remains of the original church of St. Augustine (AD 597), the oratory of St. Mary and the poss site of a large ring crypt (housing the remains of St. Dunstan?).

Selection of References:  TR 15 NE 125

Canterbury CAT-SET12

Easting: 615140  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 158120  Site-type: Settlement

1977-84: Excavations took place close to the main gate of the Benedictine Priory and just behind the unique Norman staircase. Remains of early Norman and late Saxon houses and pits were found underlying the mid 12th century vaulted undercroft of the Almonry Hall.

Selection of References:  TR 15 NE 99

Canterbury, Oaten Hill CAT-SET13

Easting: 615270  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157390  Site-type: Settlement

Oaten Hill. Oaten Hill (the tumulus at the top of Dover Street) seems to perpetuate the name of an early oat market.

Selection of References:  TR 15 NE 231
Canterbury CAT-SET14

Easting: 615380 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157720 Site-type: Settlement

A short length of wailing eight and a half ft high, possibly contemporary with the original foundation of St Augustine's Abbey runs for c 30ft from the NE angle of Cemetery Gate (TR 15385772). The S. side is re-used Roman brick and probably dates from the Saxon period. The N side has been refaced in Tudor times.

Selection of References: TR 15 NE 268

Canterbury, St. Augustine's Abbey CAT-SET15

Easting: 615450 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157750 Site-type: Settlement


Selection of References: TR 15 NE 269

Canterbury, Chapel of St. Mary CAT-SET16

Easting: 615500 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157750 Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church

Chapel of St Mary. Built by King Edbaid 616-18. Ground plan survives. Later joined with the Church of Saint Peter and St Paul into a single enlarged Abbey Church by Abbot Wulfric. Demolished by Abbot Scotland soon after 1070. St Mary's Chapel, now represented only by the base of the W wall, a structure of Roman brick with a central doorway.

Selection of References: TR 15 NE 267

Canterbury CAT-SET17

Easting: 615800 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157700 Site-type: Settlement

1985: Saxon pits, metalled track, medieval timber buildings. Post medieval occupation, conduit meadow south of St Martins Churchyard. (Sited to locality only).

Selection of References: TR 15 NE 133

Canterbury St. Martin's Church CAT-SET18

Easting: 615860 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157750 Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church

St Martin's Church. 7th century foundation with ? earlier Roman building. 7thc nave and chancel, altered in the C14th. Said to be the site of the earliest church in England and oldest work may well be Roman. On the same site was a church used by Roman Christians and it is supposed to be the extra-mural church where, before the Conversion, Queen Bertha.

Selection of References: TR 15 NE 6

Canterbury Castle Street CAT-SET19

Easting: 614800 Date From: 500 To: 600
Northing: 157600 Site-type: Settlement

150mm thick deposit loam above a final phase late Roman courtyard surface. 6th C pot group and an early AS copper alloy brooch

Selection of References: Med Arch 34, 196 no.139
Canterbury Longmarket CAT-SET20
Easting: 615000 Date From: 600 To: 1100
Northing: 157900 Site-type: Settlement
5 SFBs Mid-Late Saxon date and residual AS pottery of the 5th-7th century

Selection of References: Med Arch 199, 170, no 196

Canterbury 41 St George's St. CAT-SET21
Easting: 615200 Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 157600 Site-type: Settlement
SFB of the 6th or 7th century

Selection of References: Med Arch 30 1986, 156

Canterbury Christchurch College CAT-SET22
Easting: 615510 Date From: 700 To: 900
Northing: 157930 Site-type: Settlement
MAS occupation. A track with shallow side ditches, pits of the 8th and 9th century, many containing metalwork debris, some yielded Ipswich boss-decorated ware


Canterbury St. Margaret's Church CAT-SET23
Easting: 614880 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157740 Site-type: Settlement
Brief phase of Saxon activity above demolished Roman public baths and below first stone church of the mid 12th century

Selection of References: Med Arch 31,1987, 148

Canterbury 36-37 Stour St. CAT-SET24
Easting: 614620 Date From: 475 To: 525
Northing: 157680 Site-type: Settlement
SFB late 5th or early 6th century associated rubbish-pits sealed by mid 13th C timber structures, dark earth deposits overlie RB strat.

Selection of References: Med Arch 31,1987, 149

Canterbury St. Radigunds' St CAT-SET25
Easting: 614950 Date From: 600 To: 700
Northing: 158200 Site-type: Settlement
Saxon pits and 2 possible SFBs of 7th century with early-middle Saxon pottery finds

Selection of References: Med Arch 32, 1988, 259 no 1
Canterbury

Easting: 614900  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157700  Site-type: Settlement

Canterbury City (historical). Various sources.

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

---

Chart Sutton

Easting: 580500  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 149400  Site-type: Find-Spot

Anglo-Saxon pot find. Pot referred to by Evison 1956 from this site in Maidstone Museum.

Selection of References: Maidstone Museum Records  Richardson 2000, site 55  Evison 1956

---

Chartham Downs

Easting: 610970  Date From: 575 To: 800
Northing: 154260  Site-type: Cemetery

Type 4 AS inhumation cemetery. C.100 barrows. 1729: Workmen found burial during road widening. 1730: 20 opened (Mortimer). 1764 & 1773: 53 opened (Faussett). Some cremations. All destroyed before 1856. The site is at the W end of the Downs, sloping down on all sides except E. The barrows were all along the top of the hill (the OS marks them on the end of the spur, above the 200’ contour).

Selection of References: Smith 1856  Richardson 2000, site 56

---

Cartham II Horton

Easting: 611400  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 155200  Site-type: Find-Spot

1987: Ae cruciform brooch, large variant of Aberg Group I at the base of the Stour Valley

Selection of References: Kelly 1987  Richardson 2000, site 57

---

Chesterfield

Easting: 613000  Date From: 680 To: 700
Northing: 165000  Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. Kentish Series A3 sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1987.0038

---

Chilham

Easting: 606650  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 153480  Site-type: Find-Spot

SMR: 5 x annular loomweights found by Sir E. Davis during the construction of an indoor swimming pool at Chilham Castle. He is now believed dead and the loomweights are lost.

Selection of References: Ant J 1936 (16)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHL</th>
<th>Chatham Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 576400</td>
<td>Date From: 450 To: 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 168100</td>
<td>Site-type: Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type 3 Barrow Cemetery (?possibly 4). Now heavily disturbed by military works. A group of small tumuli, situated on the western slope of the steep hill facing Rochester, about 200 yds. from the Roman building. 1756: damaged by military lines finds of spearheads etc. 1779-82: excv with 7 descibed (Douglas)

Selection of References: Douglas 1793, Richardson 2000, site 58, V.C.H. 1908, 375-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHL-FS1</th>
<th>Chatham II Star Inn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 576000</td>
<td>Date From: 400 To: 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 167500</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gold ring 4th-5th century found in the fields behind the Star Inn, exact find spot not identified

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone), Richardson 2000, site 59

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHR</th>
<th>Charing I Bishop's Palace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 595500</td>
<td>Date From: 500 To: 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 145900</td>
<td>Site-type: Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doubtful inhumation burial site: c.1864: burials accompanied by swords, pots, beads, coins in the field next to the Bishop's Palace in Charing. Now a lost document Mr. Harris to Mr. Norwood. Payne informed by Mr. Hogg, Great Buckland farm, Luddersdown

Selection of References: Richardson 2000, site 54, Payne 1896, 232

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHR-SET1</th>
<th>Charing Minster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 595410</td>
<td>Date From: 700 To: 900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 149400</td>
<td>Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certain 'old' Minster church, probably 7th/8th century - according to Tatton-Brown 1988 "The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the 11th century"

Selection of References: Tatton-Brown 1988a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHS-FS1</th>
<th>Chlslet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 622300</td>
<td>Date From: 0 To: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 164250</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMR: AS spear find. Feb 1949, in the NW corner of a new churchyard found a spearhead and the fragments of 2 knives and a pin

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone), Richardson 2000, site 61

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHS-FS2</th>
<th>Chlslet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 622330</td>
<td>Date From: 0 To: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 162930</td>
<td>Site-type: Early Medieval Cropmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMR: Road, presumed to be Roman since it continued the line of RR 11. Also a curving section of road or track which partially overlies the Roman road. Part of a rectilinear enclosure lies to the north.

Selection of References: TR 26 SW 59
Chartham  
**CHT-FS1**

- **Easting:** 610000  
- **Date From:** 0  
- **To:** 0  
- **Northing:** 154000  
- **Site-type:** Find-Spot

2 x AS squat jars of Group B VIII a iii found on Chartham Downs, but now lost (Sited to locality only)

Selection of References: TR 15 SW 25

---

Cliffsend, Ramsgate  
**CLF-FS1**

- **Easting:** 634000  
- **Date From:** 710  
- **To:** 715  
- **Northing:** 164000  
- **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Continental Series E sceatta metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1996.0091

---

Cliffsend, Ramsgate  
**CLF-FS2**

- **Easting:** 634100  
- **Date From:** 720  
- **To:** 740  
- **Northing:** 164000  
- **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series K sceatta metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1996.0115

---

Cliffsend Farm  
**CLF-IB1**

- **Easting:** 635680  
- **Date From:** 0  
- **To:** 0  
- **Northing:** 164780  
- **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

Doubtful inhumation cemetery, 1 recorded grave. 1992-4: Survey in advance of Sandwich Bay Wastewater Treatment Scheme. Grave at Chalk Hill: adult and younger 2nd individual indicating grave disturbance? More likely AS (Perkins) 4 ring-ditch cropmarks to the S and 1 ring-ditch cropmark N of grave. As these 5 ring-ditches = 4-6m Dia. Implies AS rather than BA burials. Polychrome bead on one cropmark site found by a metal detector. The AS burial excavated in 1993 was probably disturbed in antiquity.

Selection of References: Hearne et al 1995  
Richardson 2000, site 213

---

Coldharbour  
**CLH**

- **Easting:** 625300  
- **Date From:** 0  
- **To:** 0  
- **Northing:** 169300  
- **Site-type:** Early Medieval Cropmark

SMR: "At the north mouth of the Wantsum (TR 253693) is the eroded fragment of a former island, that may have been the site of medieval settlement, perhaps a fishing hamlet (the name 'Coldharbour' is Old English: a shelter for travellers in bad weather)."

Selection of References: TR 26 NE 159

---

Court-le-Street, Aldington  
**CLS**

- **Easting:** 608250  
- **Date From:** 700  
- **To:** 900  
- **Northing:** 135180  
- **Site-type:** Cemetery

AS inhumation cemetery. 1850: AS cemetery said to have been cut through on the brow of the hill at Manwood Farm, Court-le-Street. Many skeletons were found but no details of other finds are recorded. Site located by local gardener in SMR. 1998: metal-detector finds also at this location. Hawkes wonders whether POSTLING finds belong to this site.

Selection of References: TR 03 NE 16  
Richardson 2000, site 4
### Claylane Wood, Shorne II (Cobham)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>566400</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>To:</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>170400</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Doubtful inhumation cemetery, exact location not known. 1825/6: Anglo-Saxon skeleton with spearhead, armour, etc., found in 1826 in an entrenchment in Claylane Wood on Watling Street. SMR: Perambulation of the area, under heavy undergrowth and thick leaf mould produced no further evidence.

Selection of References: TQ 67 SE 7 Richardson 2000, site 234 Payne 1893, 151

### Canterbury Martyr's Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>614700</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>500</th>
<th>To:</th>
<th>600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>157000</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AS inhumation cemetery? pre-1958: AS grave containing polychrome bead was found a little way to the west of Martyrs' Field on the Wincheap side of the railway. C. 1900: AS strap-end was figured with objects of other periods known from this site. 1942: square-headed brooch acquired by BM. Pot by Canterbury Museum.

Selection of References: TR 15 NW 48 Richardson 2000, site 43

### Cobham

#### COB-FS1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>567000</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>715</th>
<th>To:</th>
<th>750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>168000</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locality Only. English Vernus Group 2 sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1993.9150

#### COB-FS2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>567100</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>695</th>
<th>To:</th>
<th>715</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>168100</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locality Only. Continental Series E sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1987.0058

#### COB-FS3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>567000</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>775</th>
<th>To:</th>
<th>792</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>168100</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locality Only. Canterbury silver penny find

Selection of References: EMC 1999.1002

#### COB-FS4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>568000</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>665</th>
<th>To:</th>
<th>680</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>168000</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locality Only. English gold thrymsa find. Pada Shilling.

Selection of References: EMC 1988.0103
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>Date To</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Site-type</th>
<th>Selection of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cobham Park</td>
<td>568000</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>168100</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>EMC 1988.0109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>575000</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>175000</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Kent SMR (Maidstone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman's Pit, Norton</td>
<td>597180</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>159170</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>TQ 95 NE 2 Richardson 2000, site 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crundale</td>
<td>606320</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>149330</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>TR 04 NE 3 Richardson 2000, site 66 Hogarth 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crundale Downs</td>
<td>608500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>148500</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>TR 04 NE 3 Richardson 2000, site 67 Avent &amp; Leigh 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crispe Road</td>
<td>630100</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>167850</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>TR 36 NW 217 Richardson 2000, site 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: EMC 1988.0109

Chapman's Pit, Norton

AS inhumation burials. Exact location unknown (see main text), ante 1893: Human skeletons, spearheads, etc. probably AS' found in 'Chapman's Gravel Pit, Norton'. However the site is possibly the old pit, actually in Ospringe parish on the other side of the road, on a slope below the 200' contour.

Selection of References: TQ 95 NE 2 Richardson 2000, site 199

Crundale Downs

AS inhumation burials (Location only- though the steep W side of the NS ridge most likely). 1881: grave with sword & 2 buckles (Durden coll). 1962: grave with 15 beads, silver rings, pin and 2 pendants. 1895: catalogue of Durden's collection prepared by Payne listed other artefacts, some of which really came from Sarre. Hawkes noted small square-headed brooch and oblong Style I garnet buckle.

Selection of References: TR 04 NE 3 Richardson 2000, site 67 Avent & Leigh 1977

Crispe Road

Cropmarks suggesting a group of Anglo Saxon burials were observed here in June 1975. Probably an AS barrow cemetery superimposed on a BA barrow group on the brow of the ridge. Could be an extension of CSP-2. TTA site 108/211.

Selection of References: TR 36 NW 217 Richardson 2000, site 2
Crispe Road CSP-2

Easting: 630400  Date From: 600 To: 700  Northing: 167800  Site-type: Cemetery

Cropmarks show a group of small diameter ring ditches, possibly Jutish barrows, positioned around TR 304678. They are bordered to the east by a series of rectangular enclosures. To the south were the hill falls to meet Crispe Road there are a number of isolated ditches of larger diameter, perhaps Bronze Age round barrows. Probably an extension of CSP-1. TTA site 210

Selection of References: TR 36 NW 158  Perkins et al 1987, site 47  Richardson 2000

Church Whitfield, Dover CWD

Easting: 631300  Date From: 575 To: 675  Northing: 145800  Site-type: Settlement

Settlement with 2 timber halls, 4 SFBs suggested by Parfitt and Brugmann 1997

Selection of References: Parfitt & Brugmann 1997

Coombe Woodnesborough CWN

Easting: 629800  Date From: 575 To: 600  Northing: 157500  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

AS cremation burial/s in Type 1 barrow, c.1855: c.20 yds. diam. barrow, containing Ae bowl with burnt human bones, 2 swords & Fe spearhead, fransica, glass & amber beads & part of an ornament set with garnets & coloured glass. One sword appeared to have been wrapped in cloth, and 'a veil of cloth' was laid on the bowl. A glass cup was also said to have come from the grave. Most probable location is in an area of the'old sandpiut' next to the roman rd.

Selection of References: TR 25 NE 13  Richardson 2000, site 278  Davison & Webster 1967

Cuxton CXT

Easting: 572000  Date From: 550 To: 650  Northing: 167350  Site-type: Cemetery

AS Cemetery - N side of the R. Medway. c.2.0ha site (MOLAS). LBA/EIA features incl. PH building. 36 AS inhum & 2 crems in pots. Grave structures: 11 penannular ditches (most with a central post betw the termini); one PH structure; internal ledges, simple cuts. All ages. Grave goods incl. jewellery, bosses, spearheads, knives, buckles, fittings, mounts, shears, chatelaines, keys, rings, glass bead necklaces, coins, pottery vessels and two purses. Same as SDB

Selection of References: Glass 1999

Deal Beacon Hill (Northbourne) DBH

Easting: 634130  Date From: 600 To: 700  Northing: 151050  Site-type: Cemetery

Type 3/4 AS cemetery (unexcv). Cropmarks on the northern slopes of Beacon Hill, Great Mongham suggest a min. Of 200 Anglo-Saxon graves. Small ring ditches; linear features; ring-ditches in NS corners cnetred on a rectangular enclosure. NO excavations to date

Selection of References: TR 35 SW 31  Richardson 2000, site 82  Chadwick-Hawkes 1976

Dover II Buckland DBU

Easting: 631000  Date From: 475 To: 750  Northing: 143000  Site-type: Cemetery

Typ 3 (?) AS cem. S&SW slopes of broad southerly spur, blw the crest of a hill now built over 1951/2: 126 inh (Evison). 1984:244 inh (Parfitt) incl. seperate satellite group of burials. IA-MD cultivation terraces. 2 small ring ditches, i.e. barrows. More graves prob. destroyed during the construction of the Dover-Deal railway line 1879-80. May have been 500 graves in total. Limit defined arch. In 1996 at TR 310 433 & TR 305 434. 1879: no. of finds, prob. from Buckland.

Selection of References: TR 34 SW 32  Richardson 2000, site 89
Dover Buckland, Castle View

**DBU-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 630800</th>
<th>Date From: 475 To: 750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 142900</td>
<td>Site-type: Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMR: Trenching on new residential site at Castle View Dover revealed 2 definite and 11 probable AS graves plus 3 possible further AS burials, 2 of which had been disturbed. Other features including a linear ditch and associated finds of AS date. Interpreted as an extension of the Buckland cemetery site.

Selection of References: TR 34 SW 461

---

Deal

**DEA-FS1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 636800</th>
<th>Date From: 0 To: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 156700</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMR: EAS mount found on the Deal foreshore

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

---

Deal Odeon Cinema

**DEA-FS2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 637560</th>
<th>Date From: 0 To: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 152600</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1937: Frankish pot find. Also from the same site, 2 further Jutish pots were found as well as some more AS pot from 637620 152850

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone) Richardson 2000, site 84

---

Deal Sand Hills

**DEA-FS3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 637600</th>
<th>Date From: 0 To: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 154300</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spear, seax, knife "...from the Sand Hills near Deal..." Hawkes suggests near Sandown Castle

Selection of References: Richardson 2000, site 86

---

Deal

**DEA-FS4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 637000</th>
<th>Date From: 805 To: 832</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 154000</td>
<td>Site-type: Coin-find</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locality only. Archbishop Wulfred of Canterbury silver penny find.

Selection of References: Bonser 1998

---

Derringstone, Barham

**DGS-FS1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 620000</th>
<th>Date From: 798 To: 821</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 149000</td>
<td>Site-type: Coin-find</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locality Only. Mercian silver penny metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1996.0181
Ditton DIT-FS1

Easting: 571300 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 158800 Site-type: Find-Spot

SMR: AS spearhead Swanton H3 found in a cutting through a sand knoll on Reed's playing fields suggesting the disturbance of a grave

Selection of References: TQ 75 NW 41 Richardson 2000, site 87

Dover I Priory Hill DPH

Easting: 631450 Date From: 550 To: 725
Northing: 141750 Site-type: Cemetery

AS inhum. Cem. 1883: Gold brooch & other obj found. 1889: inhum., swords & spears. 1956: grave with bracteate, Ae ring & pottery bead less than 180m from 1889 finds. 1967: 1883 brooch stolen from Dover Museum, other finds from the Priory Hill possibly destroyed in WWI. 1968: restoration at 68 Priory Hall: 3 graves (1-2) KARU excavated. 1986: 3 more graves (3-5) excavated in gardens of 63 & 64 Priory Hill (KARU), cem mid-way down the street

Selection of References: TR 34 SW 6 Richardson 2000, site 88

Dence Park, Littlebourne DPL-FS1

Easting: 618790 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 158100 Site-type: Find-Spot

Saxon midden: 1923: during development on the highest part of The Downs, 2 trenches for sewers cut through a LBA-Saxon midden. This lay 1 to 2 feet below present ground level, was 2 to 3 feet in height and was oval in plan being orientated NE-SW. LBA plain and decorated sherds, IA sherds, Ro pottery & a Jutish pottery bottle were found. A selection of the finds are on exhibition in Herne Bay Museum. No further material has since come to light in the area.

Selection of References: TR 16 NE 7

Dence Park, Littlebourne DPL-FS2

Easting: 618580 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157930 Site-type: Find-Spot

Coordinates designate Herne Bay, not Canterbury have adjusted 10km further south SMRTR16NE19: AS weight find

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Dover Temple Ewell DTE

Easting: 629140 Date From: 600 To: 700
Northing: 144350 Site-type: Cemetery

Inhumation Cemetery secondaries in BA barrows. Central co-ordinate. 3 BA bowl barrows situated upon a SW slope in woodland on the end of a spur of high ground overlooking the Dour valley, prob the "several tumuli" referred to by Hasted. pre1800 "some of which were lately opened, and in each of them was found a skeleton, a sword about three feet long and two inches broad, and the head of a spear".

Selection of References: TR 24 SE 14 Richardson 2000, site 255 Evison 1987, 176

Dover Temple Ewell Watersend DTE-2

Easting: 628200 Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 144700 Site-type: Cemetery

AS many as 20 skeletons buried in rows feet to the W: one grave had buckles, pair of tweezers, 2 graves had spearheads, 1 body had chalk pillow supporting skull and a short sword and dagger. Graves were c.45cm below the ground surface and covered an area of. C 10m. Bones of men women and children reburied near the site of the burial. Site is near the Watersend villa. Dover Telegraph 11/2/1843

Selection of References: Parfitt 1998, 89-90 Richardson 2000, site 256
Dover (LA-S) Castle Hill

Easting: 632640  Date From: 850 To: 1100
Northing: 141780  Site-type: Cemetery

Doubtful churchyard. SMR: Late Saxon cemetery: Thirteen shallow graves with traces of coffins orientated E-W were found within the earthwork S of the Church of St Mary de Castro at TR 32644178. Sherds of late Saxon pottery were also found. The discoveries were made during excavations carried out in 1962 by the Ministry of Works under the direction of Mr Martin Biddle.

Selection of References: TR 34 SW 66  Richardson 2000, site 93  Wilkinson 1990

Dover (LA-S) Durham Hill

Easting: 631800  Date From: 850 To: 1100
Northing: 141300  Site-type: Cemetery

Inhumation cemetery (possibly Med). 1980: 4 adult inhum (Philp) at Albany Place. The site included the west side of the Roman naval fort, locating part of the S gate of the fort & parts of 2 major chalk block buildings. Demolition rubble covering these buildings was cut by the burials, probably part of a hitherto unknown cemetery of Saxon or Medieval date. 1939: 2 pennanular brooches and 2 buckles found at Durham Hill and acquired by Dover Museum.

Selection of References: TR 34 SW 141  Richardson 2000, site 90

Dover, St. Radigund's Rd.

Easting: 630781  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 142586  Site-type: Find-Spot

Evison 1987,117: "wheelthrown pottery sherd. Evison 1979a, 84-5, fig.37"

Selection of References: Evison 1987

Dover, Cannon Street

Easting: 631900  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 141500  Site-type: Find-Spot

SMR: AS bone comb find. Smith 1908a, 384; Meaney 1964, 117; Evison 1987,178

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Dover, Durham Hill

Easting: 631700  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 141300  Site-type: Find-Spot

SMR: Before 1939. Two pennanular brooches and two buckles found just to the west of the Saxon shore fort at Durham Hill, may possibly suggest the position of an AS cemetery. The occurrence of the very close Dover IX finds may indicate that this is a multi-period cemetery continuing into the late Saxon period. (Evison 1987, Fig.36 No.17)

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Dover

Easting: 631850  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 141500  Site-type: Find-Spot

SMR: AS glass cup find, and various other finds of this locality only. Probably centre point of AS settlement and port.

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

463
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>DVR-FS06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 631600</td>
<td>Date From: 0 To: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 141700</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR: AS scramasax and bead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Selection of References                             | Kent SMR (Maidstone) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dover, Pilgrim's Way</th>
<th>DVR-FS07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dover, Pilgrim's Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 631000</td>
<td>Date From: 0 To: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 142000</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR: A metalled road, possibly part of the Pilgrims Way, was identified, and both Roman and medieval sherds were found during a brief dig on a building site between the Dover and London road (centred TR 310423) in 1972.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Selection of References                             | TR 34 SW 163 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dover, St. Peter's</th>
<th>DVR-FS08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dover, St. Peter's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 631930</td>
<td>Date From: 0 To: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 141450</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR: &quot;A stone slab, probably a coffin lid, with a possibly 7th century AD Runic inscription, now in store in Dover Museum, was found before 1832 during alterations to the Antwerp Inn (TR 31934145(e)) on the N. side of Dover Market Square, under the foundations of the former church of St. Peter. The church which fell out of use after 1611, and is now built over, had a cemetery adjoining it.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Selection of References                             | TR 34 SW 14 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dover</th>
<th>DVR-FS09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 631000</td>
<td>Date From: 645 To: 655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 141000</td>
<td>Site-type: Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. London gold thrymsa find</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Selection of References                             | EMC 1948.00501 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dover</th>
<th>DVR-FS10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 631000</td>
<td>Date From: 645 To: 655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 141100</td>
<td>Site-type: Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. London gold thrymsa find</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Selection of References                             | EMC 1993.9024 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dover</th>
<th>DVR-FS11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 631800</td>
<td>Date From: 715 To: 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 141500</td>
<td>Site-type: Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. Continental Series E sceatta find within the Philp excavated settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Selection of References                             | EMC 1977.0024 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>DVR-IB1</th>
<th>DVR-FS12</th>
<th>DVR-SET01</th>
<th>DVR-SET02</th>
<th>DVR-SET03</th>
<th>DVR-SET04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latitude</td>
<td>631100</td>
<td>631000</td>
<td>631000</td>
<td>631823</td>
<td>631892</td>
<td>631824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude</td>
<td>141000</td>
<td>141000</td>
<td>141000</td>
<td>141548</td>
<td>141548</td>
<td>141574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date To</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of References</td>
<td>TR 34 SW 76, Richardson 2000, site 91</td>
<td>Bonser 1998</td>
<td>TR 34 SW 85</td>
<td>Evison 1987</td>
<td>Evison 1987</td>
<td>TR 34 SW 85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dover, High Meadow

Isolated AS burial? 1956: AS grave containing gold bracteate, bronze ring & pottery bead found during the building of a small garage at High Meadows, Dover, on waste land on the right bank of the Dour, immediately SW of London Road. It was suggested that the grave might be an outlier of the Priory Hill cemetery. This probably belongs to the same cemetery as the 1883/1889 site, which is less than 200 yds away.

Selection of References: TR 34 SW 76, Richardson 2000, site 91

Dover, Market Square

SFB at the Painted House. 1970-6: Excav. (Philp) revealed Roman town house c. AD200. 1975: Grubenhäuser cut through the north wall of room 3, containing about 30 clay loomweights, pottery and a Ae workbox of the 8th C. Measuring about 25' in length it is one of the largest found in Britain. Several med cess-pits also cut into the building. Part of a series of finds found within the Saxon shore fort and possibly Saxon settlement within the centre of Dover.

Selection of References: TR 34 SW 85
Dover, Queen Street  
Easting: 631895  Date From: 600 To: 900  
Northing: 141477  Site-type: Settlement  
AS & Med occupation evidence. 1972: (Philp) Queen St: 5th-7th C. metalling, occ. deprivs & hut containing burnt daub & loom-weights. Local pot & sceata. Market St: nr. W entrance of Rom Fort - deep deposit of AS occupation-rubbish lay over & under a metalled area - 6th-7th C. Imported pot, frags of glass vessels, decorated bone objects & gold finger- 
ing. 1978: Market St, part of a MAS rect. build 30ft x 40ft. 8th or 9th C. Fire destruction. Whole area part of St. Martin's to the S? "A jug of the AS period, seen by Smith in Dover Museum, was understood by him to have been found in a  
Selection of References: TR 34 SW 11

Dover, St. Martin's  
Easting: 631894  Date From: 696 To: 2000  
Northing: 141516  Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church  
St. Martin's Le Grand church & garden. Founded AD 691, refounded elsewhere 1131 - now destroyed. 1895: ?LAS child's coffin. 1950: several chalk covered graves. 1881: remains of a Rom build were found beneath. 1952-8: Rom & 
med sherds. 1975:12th C phases excv (Philp).  
Selection of References: TR 34 SW 36  
Richardson 2000, site 94  
Wilkinson 1990

Dover, St. Mary in Castro  
Easting: 632832  Date From: 630 To: 2000  
Northing: 141926  Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church  
St. Mary's in Castro Church. Link, date, but prob C.AD1020, mix fabric: 12th C. restored 19th C. Rom brick & lighthouse (as annexe). Extant. Possibly an AS minster transferred into town c.AD1000. Commanding position within the castle on the E heights at Dover.  
Selection of References: TR 34 SW 42

Dover, Biggin Street Post Office Site  
Easting: 631720  Date From: 0 To: 0  
Northing: 141620  Site-type: Settlement  
Rom, AS, late Med & Post Med features. Number of 2x2m test-pits at Biggin St GPO. Defining the function of the features generally proved impossible and more information is expected from the numerous soil samples taken. However 9 pits produced Rom features, generally gullies and ditches, one produced a Saxon feature, two produced 11th/12th century features, five produced late medieval features and four produced post medieval features.  
Selection of References: TR 34 SW 532

Dymchurch, Romney Marsh  
Easting: 609800  Date From: 500 To: 1000  
Northing: 128600  Site-type: Find-Spot  
AS knife find-spot. During the building of the sea wall at Dymchurch "vast masses of pottery", including Samian and other wares, were found up to a furlong inland from the line of the wall". Also found were 2 second brasses and a small Ae coin, querns, hones, whetstones, "amulets of burnt clay", a horn knife handle, glass neck of a jar, human and animal remains. A knife handle inlaid with silver is thought to be Saxon, whilst most of the other finds are Roman.  
Selection of References: TR 02 NE 1

Dymchurch, Romney Marsh  
Easting: 608100  Date From: 0 To: 0  
Northing: 130700  Site-type: Find-Spot  
SMR: "41 EM and 10 Md sherds of pottery found by feildwalking."  
Selection of References: TR 03 SE 53  
Reeves 1995
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Site-type</th>
<th>SMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dymchurch</td>
<td>608200</td>
<td>131400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>&quot;26 pieces of EM pottery found by fieldwalking.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of References: TR 03 SE 45 Reeves 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>609300</td>
<td>129700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>&quot;19 EM and 10 Md sherds of pottery were found by fieldwalking.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of References: TR 02 NE 49 Reeves 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Mailing I</td>
<td>568900</td>
<td>157900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>pre 1988: button brooch class Ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of References: Kelly 1988 Richardson 2000, site 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Mailing II</td>
<td>570000</td>
<td>158000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>Location only: description and drawing of shoulder-boss pot with wide mouth and rim with probably of small applicked bosses and linear punch decoration, only upper part remaining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of References: Myres 1977, corp. 343 Richardson 2000, site 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of References: TR 35 SW 1 Richardson 2000, site 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastry</td>
<td>630970</td>
<td>154480</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td>A large tree was blown over during the hurricane of 1987, revealing a pot, some bones and a fingerring. All presumably from a grave associated with the Buttsole cemetery. Grave immediately next to the Roman road. Pot dated to the late fifth or sixth century and the finger-ring is possibly a residual Roman survival. Part of EBT cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selection of References: Parfitt 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ecoles ECC

Easting: 572200  Date From: 650  To: 800
Northing: 160500  Site-type: Cemetery


Selection of References: TQ 76 SW 37  Richardson 2000, site 11  Detsicas 1971, 31

Eastry 2 Eastry House EEH

Easting: 630900  Date From: 570  To: 600
Northing: 154900  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

Possibly an isolated AS burial. 1970: (Hawkes) late-6thC. woman with beads, a silver pendant and a Gotlandic square-headed brooch in a pipe trench. No other graves are known from near this one despite some excavations at Eastry House in 1997 (Parfitt 1999). The site is a few hundred metres N of Buttsole cem. Eastry was an important administrative centre from the third quarter of the C7. Maybe a cemetery.

Selection of References: Chadwick-Hawkes 1979  Richardson 2000, site 99

Eastry IV Eastry Mill EEM

Easting: 630300  Date From: 600  To: 700
Northing: 154400  Site-type: Cemetery

AS cemetery. 1968: 4 burials were found about 0.5 mile W of the main cemetery site (Buttsole). One, oriented NE-SW and accompanied by a small iron knife, was discovered in the face of a chalk-pit in the garden of a house in The Mill. Three further unaccompanied burials, similarly oriented were found 100 yds to the S, suggesting a large cemetery. Possibly not part of Eastry anymore, but the site of an adjacent settlement.

Selection of References: Chadwick-Hawkes 1979  Richardson 2000, site 101

Eastry Palace EEP-SET1

Easting: 631120  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 154810  Site-type: Settlement

Suggested AS villa regalis (palace at Eastry Court). Numerous historical allusions to MAS/LAS vill. 1980: area I post-med ditch & sherd of Belgic pottery. Area II - complex of pre-C13 ditches. A corner of the pre-C13 timber-framed building was examined. No earlier finds were recovered except small quantities of C10-C11 'Saxo-Norman' pottery. 1982: Nothing 1992: Nothing, except for one pit with a residual sceatta find: i.e.EMC 1992.0244, EST-FS08

Selection of References: TR 35 SW 2  Parfitt 1999, 50

Elmsted ELM-FS1

Easting: 610570  Date From: 800  To: 900
Northing: 145670  Site-type: Find-Spot


Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Elham, Mill Down EMD

Easting: 618300  Date From: 500  To: 700
Northing: 143100  Site-type: Cemetery

SMR: Site of Saxon burial ground, discovered during road widening work in 1760. Cited as a reference from 'Hasted 1799' but no further details given. NGR possibly uncertain.

Selection of References: TR 14 SE 74
Eastry

Eastry EST-FS01
Easting: 630500  Date From: 675  To: 750
Northing: 154300  Site-type: Coin-find
May relate to one of the EMC entries. SMR: AS sceatta find found by a metal detector (see Sceattas England and the Continent, pp.251)

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Eastry EST-FS02
Easting: 630990  Date From: 675  To: 750
Northing: 154820  Site-type: Coin-find
May relate to one of the EMC entries. SMR: AS coin found at 4 High St

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Eastry EST-FS03
Easting: 631000  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 155000  Site-type: Find-Spot
Location only: supporting-arm brooch (chipcarved ornament) to the BM for identification said to be from N or Ne of eastry on the opposite side of th road from unspecified excavations

Selection of References: Ager 1989, 148-50  Richardson 2000, site 102

Eastry EST-FS04
Easting: 630000  Date From: 700  To: 730
Northing: 154000  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Continental Series E sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1995.0087

Eastry EST-FS05
Easting: 631000  Date From: 720  To: 740
Northing: 154000  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. English Series K sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1995.0096

Eastry EST-FS06
Easting: 631000  Date From: 720  To: 750
Northing: 154100  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. English Celtic Cross with Rosettes Group sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1995.0101
Eastry

EST-FS07

Easting: 630000 Date From: 720 To: 750
Northing: 154100 Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. English Celtic Cross with Rosettes Group sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1995.0100

Eastry

EST-FS08

Easting: 630999 Date From: 720 To: 725
Northing: 154820 Site-type: Coin-find
English Series 5 (type 7) sceatta excavated find from No.4 High Street

Selection of References: EMC 1992.0244

Eastry

EST-FS09

Easting: 631200 Date From: 798 To: 805
Northing: 154100 Site-type: Coin-find

Selection of References: EMC 1963.0023 Bonser 1998

Eastry

EST-FS10

Easting: 631100 Date From: 792 To: 796
Northing: 154300 Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Mercian silver penny find

Selection of References: EMC 1922.0003

Eastry

EST-FS11

Easting: 631200 Date From: 491 To: 518
Northing: 154300 Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Byzantine gold solidus metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1996.0266

Eastry

EST-FS12

Easting: 630820 Date From: 500 To: 550
Northing: 154120 Site-type: Coin-find
Metal detector find of a Style I chi-carved face-mask Ae Triangular mount, probably from a belt

Selection of References: Parfitt 1999
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>EST-FS13</th>
<th>EST-FS14</th>
<th>EST-SET1</th>
<th>EUP</th>
<th>EYT</th>
<th>FAV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>631000</td>
<td>630900</td>
<td>631170</td>
<td>631100</td>
<td>628000</td>
<td>601220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>153900</td>
<td>154000</td>
<td>154640</td>
<td>153700</td>
<td>148800</td>
<td>160920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon Church</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only.</td>
<td>Cenwuif of Mercia silver penny</td>
<td>Alfred Two-line type penny</td>
<td>Certain 'old' church, possibly a Minster</td>
<td>AS Type 3 (?) cemetery</td>
<td>Locality Only. AS Type 4? barrow cemetery.</td>
<td>Rom &amp; AS cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: Bonser 1998

Selection of References: Tatton-Brown 1988a

Selection of References: Chadwick-Hawkes 1979

Selection of References: TR 24 NE 17

Selection of References: TR 06 SW 16

Selection of References: TR 06 SW 17

Selection of References: TR 06 SW 17

Selection of References: TR 06 SW 17

471
Faversham II  
Easting: 601300  Date From: 675 To: 725  
Northing: 160900  Site-type: Coin-find  
SMR: sceatta find  

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Faversham III  
Easting: 602000  Date From: 0 To: 0  
Northing: 161000  Site-type: Find-Spot  
SMR: AS Ae gilt disc brooch  

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Faversham  
Easting: 601660  Date From: 0 To: 0  
Northing: 161280  Site-type: Find-Spot  
SMR: An AS loomweight was found in 1954 in a trial hole for the foundations of the New Post Office at the corner of East St. And Newton Rd. See also Arch Cant 69 1955,208-10. This may be the first evidence for the location of the Faversham settlement (FAV-SET1)

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Faversham  
Easting: 601000  Date From: 650 To: 670  
Northing: 161000  Site-type: Coin-find  
Locality Only. Kentish gold thrym sa find  

Selection of References: EMC 1948.0024

Faversham  
Easting: 601000  Date From: 792 To: 796  
Northing: 161100  Site-type: Coin-find  
Locality Only. Mercian Offa Grp III silver penny metal detector find  

Selection of References: EMC 1993.0194

Faversham Villa regalis (historical). Origins in 6th C from cam. Place-name: 'the village of the smith', from the latin element. Early- 9th C., the town was divided up & in the 10th C. was once again an impt. royal centre, at which Athelstan held a council in 930. Not quite a town in 1066, but by 1086 it had a market worth £4. Royal abbey in 1147 & became a major town & Cinque Port limb of Dover.

Selection of References: TR 06 SW 124
Faversham Minster

FAV-SET2

Easting: 601810  Date From: 700 To: 900  
Northing: 161540  Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church

Possible 'old' Minster church, probably 7th/8th century - according to Tatton-Brown 1988 "The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the 11th century"

Selection of References: Tatton-Brown 1988a

Faversham I Churchyard

FCY

Easing: 601810  Date From: 500 To: 700  
Northing: 161530  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

AS Isolated burial? 1853: A small frontal bone of a human cranium was found with an AS cup of green glass when a grave was being dug. Church - foundations of Roman build under the N side of nave and S side of the chancel. 1755: Rom altar & Rom bricks under the central tower & umns & coins were found when the western tower was taken down in 1794. There has been no grave-digging near the church during the past 50 years.

Selection of References: TR 06 SW 18  Richardson 2000, site 110

Folkestone III Dover Hill

FDH

Easing: 623800  Date From: 500 To: 650  
Northing: 137590  Site-type: Cemetery

AS cemetery. Pre-1849: radiate brooch find. 1889: 9 graves & finds found during chalk-quarrying. 1906-7: Road-widening revealed 36 AS burials & a few Roman coins. No external indication of the graves, although the down had never been cultivated. Some deviant burials included. 1910: (Parsons) excv 4 graves, one with a bottle-vase, Ae pin & stud, 3 unfurnished. Many chalk-pillows. Cam partially destroyed by chalk pit. More recent road widening again cut into the cemetery (the centre of which now falls under the road) without producing further evidence.

Selection of References: Payne 1893, 199  Richardson 2000, site 114  Meaney 1964

Fingalesham Northbourne

FGL

Easing: 632550  Date From: 520 To: 750  
Northing: 153420  Site-type: Cemetery

AS Type 3? Inhumation cemetery. E edge of North Downs above Wantsum inlet (the sett location?) 1928-9: (Stebbing) 30 graves - 28 fully recorded. 1960 (Hawkes) excavated 12 further undisturbed graves. 1977?: Remainder of cemetery excavated bringing total number of graves to 257, though some without burials. Some grave structures etc.

Selection of References: TR 35 SW 20  Richardson 2000, site 197

Folkestone Folly Rd

FLK-4

Easing: 623560  Date From: 600 To: 725  
Northing: 136710  Site-type: Cemetery

Rom Building & AS interments (churchyard?): Rom tomb-house as the nucleus of St Botolph's.1869-75 re-excavated (Jenkins) 1952: 5 Rom buildings at E end of Folkestone. 2 fragmentary, 2 higher on the ridge (within St. Bartholemew Chapel field) incl. a small two-roomed building with an underground crypt. Skeletons in the walls of this building suggest it may have been a church. Buildings interpreted as Villa & adjuncts. The S side of one had been much disturbed by MAS C7th-C8th grave digging. Of the 5 burials, one at least had a coffin.

Selection of References: TR 23 NW 6  Richardson 2000, site 116

Folkestone, Martello Dairy Farm

FLK-FS01

Easing: 624150  Date From: 550 To: 625  
Northing: 137880  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

SMR: AS disc brooch from Martello Dairy Farm. Locality of find only known. Evison 1987,117: * Kentish silver-gilt jewelled disc brooch (Leeds class 1, a, Avent class 2.10). Webster 1972, 157; Avent 1975 ii, no.71, 19, pl.14.* found next to the Valiant Sailor pub at the top of Dover Hill and grave was in the yard behind the pub. 1998: more AS finds reported on the opposite side of the Dover Rd from the Valiant pub. C.100m from the cliff edge Webster 1972, 157 (med arch 16); Avent 1975, corpus no 71

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)  Richardson 2000, site 115
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folkestone</th>
<th>FLK-FS02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 624000</td>
<td>Date From: 0 To: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 137000</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR: Saxon fibula find.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folkestone</th>
<th>FLK-FS03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 620000</td>
<td>Date From: 0 To: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 135000</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[locality only] AS AE bucket mount in the BM - VCH Kent 1, 1908, 386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folkestone</th>
<th>FLK-FS04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 621000</td>
<td>Date From: 600 To: 675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 136000</td>
<td>Site-type: Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. Merovingian gold tremissis find</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: EMC 1913.0003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folkestone</th>
<th>FLK-FS05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 621100</td>
<td>Date From: 600 To: 675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 136000</td>
<td>Site-type: Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. Merovingian gold tremissis find</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: EMC 1913.0002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folkestone</th>
<th>FLK-FS06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 621000</td>
<td>Date From: 685 To: 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 136100</td>
<td>Site-type: Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. English Series Blc sceatta find</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: EMC 1985.0027

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folkestone</th>
<th>FLK-FS07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 621100</td>
<td>Date From: 700 To: 710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 136100</td>
<td>Site-type: Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. Kentish Series C sceatta find</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: EMC 1985.0028
Folkestone I The Bayle
Easting: 623100 Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 135900 Site-type: Isolated Burial?
AS cremation burial. Isolated? 1850: in building foundation a AS spearhead & cremation urn uncovered. Despite suspicions of its authenticity, would appear (in light of the Hollingbourne cremations and the expertise of Wright) to be a bona fide cremation. see also 1991 Kent Minster Sites series 5. The 1907-1989 finds were within 40 m of one another. The Bayle is site of a nunnery of St Eanswith founded in the 7th century
Selection of References: TR 23 NW 19 Richardson 2000, site 112

Folkestone II Cherry Garden Hill
Easting: 620830 Date From: 625 To: 700
Northing: 138010 Site-type: Isolated Burial?
AS inhumation burial, secondary in a barrow. C.1848 (Smith): a jug of Frankish type, with a fowl’s spur and some of the foot bones, in a barrow within an earthwork on top of the hill, W of Caesar’s Camp. Some other finds in this vicinity also - pre 1999: AS bucket mount
Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone) Richardson 2000, site 113

Folkestone, St Eanswith’s Nunnery
Easting: 623100 Date From: 630 To: 2000
Northing: 135850 Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church
(Historical). Nunnery, more or less Benedictine (?) founded pre-AD 640 & dissolved prior to AD 942. Exact site of AS church unk. 1885: Med reliquary (St. Eanswith’s?) found in the wall of extant church. Traditionally sited to the ‘the Bayle’ which was much disturbed by 18th C. fort. Leland (1540’s) noted a burial ground exposed here by coast erosion, & ruins of ecclesiastical character with Rom tile. Lambarde (1826) reported much the same. Stukely saw pieces of old wall on the cliff edge, “seemingly of man work”, and recorded the common occurrence of roman coins.
Selection of References: Evison 1987

Folkestone, Cheriton Hill
Easting: 619910 Date From: 750 To: 850
Northing: 138190 Site-type: Settlement
?LAS occupation site. Multi-period site on slope below Cheriton Hill found in pipe-trench. PHs & pits, some BA. AS remains - late 8th -early 9th C inc 3 rubbish pits with pottery & animal bone in the fill along with daub fragments & wattle impressions. No direct evidence of structures was encountered. AS deposits - “The post-holes of a large, timber-framed structure were uncovered, possibly a barn and a forerunner to the documented MD hamlet of Dalmington(?)”, later occupied by Danton Farm. The structure was probably destroyed by fire, pottery dates it to shortly before 1066.
Selection of References: TR 13 NE 61

Folkestone Cherry Garden Hill Channel Tun
Easting: 620800 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 137900 Site-type: Settlement
EM settlement discovered by CAT at site of Channel Tunnel terminal. Site dating to c.AD 725, on a high plateau at Cherry Garden Hill. 2 groups of intercutting rubbish pits containing pottery, animal bones and sea-shells, reveal the presence of an isolated habitation site. No trace of a house found, but position of pits may reflect the position of a building which was removed by ploughing.
Selection of References: TR 23 NW 176

Fordwich
Easting: 618100 Date From: 850 To: 2000
Northing: 159830 Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church
St. Mary’s Church, Fordwich. Some LAS work in the nave & tower but mainly Norman with later windows. The chancel and the north aisle are C12. Unrestored and in use.
Selection of References: TR 15 NE 25
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>Date To</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Site-type</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fordwich, nr. Canterbury</strong></td>
<td>618100</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>159500</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Selection of References: Bonser 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fordwich, nr. Canterbury</strong></td>
<td>618200</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>159500</td>
<td>Coin, find</td>
<td>Selection of References: Bonser 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gillingham, Central Hotel</strong></td>
<td>579150</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>166680</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td>Selection of References: TQ 76 NE 30, Jessup 1934, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Chart</strong></td>
<td>598000</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>141000</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Selection of References: EMC 1995.0102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gillingham</strong></td>
<td>581240</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>167600</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone), Richardson 2000, site 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gillingham</strong></td>
<td>582000</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>167000</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Selection of References: Bonser 1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locality Only. Cenwulf of Mercia silver penny find.
Locality only. Eanred Northumbrian styca found.
Locality only. Ecgberht of Wessex silver penny found.

SMR: Merovingian coin. Also locality only: c.1800 small conical shield boss, sword, spear from the Kennard collection which Hawkes dates to the 7th century.
Gillingham Otterham Creek  
**GGH-IB1**

**Easting:** 582840  
**Date From:** 500  
**To:** 700  
**Northing:** 167150  
**Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

Possible AS interment. 1930: Saxon spearheads, pottery and beads found by Peter Gray. Grove's siting confirmed by Gray. Whereabouts of the finds not known. Probably forms an extension of the UPC cemetery.

**Selection of References:**  
TQ 86 NW 21  
Richardson 2000, site 118

---

Gillingham, Woodlands-Grange Rd.  
**GGH-IB2**

**Easting:** 579000  
**Date From:** 500  
**To:** 700  
**Northing:** 168700  
**Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

SMR: AS burial - Isolated set of bones found in a field between woodlands and Grange roads, on site of new tavern. Fairly complete skeleton, with broken AS pot, (in Gillingham museum).

**Selection of References:**  
TQ 76 NE 306  
Hasted V.2, 228

---

Gilton  
**GIL**

**Easting:** 628110  
**Date From:** 480  
**To:** 650  
**Northing:** 158260  
**Site-type:** Cemetery


**Selection of References:**  
TR 25 NE 6  
Med Arch 1974

---

Gilton II  
**GIL-FS1**

**Easting:** 628000  
**Date From:** 527  
**To:** 565  
**Northing:** 159000  
**Site-type:** Coin-find

Visigothic gold tremissis find. SMR: AS gold coin find

**Selection of References:**  
EMC 1982.9014

---

Great Mongeham  
**GMH**

**Easting:** 635070  
**Date From:** 600  
**To:** 750  
**Northing:** 151020  
**Site-type:** Cemetery

AS inhumation cemetery? 1911: HM pot find near Great Mongeham - Ripple Rd. Though sep hundred m from 1913 finds, maybe assoc.1913: Stone Pits (Mongeham Bottom): Button Brooch Aii, belt plate, decorated 7th C pin. Additional finds reputedly from this location incl piece of AS pottery; SW173: AS coins. 2 Ae finger rings and a small C6th saucer brooch decorated with a human face, found with the burial, are in Deal Castle Museum also.

**Selection of References:**  
TR 35 SE 48  
Richardson 2000, site 381

---

Great Mongeham  
**GMH-FS1**

**Easting:** 634000  
**Date From:** 650  
**To:** 670  
**Northing:** 151000  
**Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Kentish Sutherland II thrymsa '2 emperor' type metal detector find

**Selection of References:**  
EMC 1993.0137
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Mongeham</th>
<th>GMH-FS2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>634100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>700 To: 710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>151000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality:</td>
<td>Only. English Series BII sceatta metal detector find. E. Anglian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of References:</td>
<td>EMC 1993.0139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Mongeham</th>
<th>GMH-FS3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>634100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>715 To: 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>151100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality:</td>
<td>Only. Continental Series E porcupine sceatta metal detector find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of References:</td>
<td>EMC 1993.0165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Mongeham</th>
<th>GMH-FS4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>634200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>710 To: 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>151000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality:</td>
<td>Only. English Seroaldo Group sceatta metal detector find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of References:</td>
<td>EMC 1993.0183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Mongeham</th>
<th>GMH-FS5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>634200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>715 To: 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>151100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality:</td>
<td>Only. Continental Series E porcupine sceatta metal detector find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of References:</td>
<td>EMC 1993.0161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Mongeham</th>
<th>GMH-FS6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>634200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>710 To: 750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>151200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality:</td>
<td>Only. Continental Series X sceatta metal detector find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of References:</td>
<td>EMC 1993.0161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Mongeham</th>
<th>GMH-FS7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>633900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date From:</td>
<td>792 To: 796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>151000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality:</td>
<td>Only. Mercian silver penny metal detector find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of References:</td>
<td>EMC 1993.0195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Great Mongeham

Easting: 633900 Date From: 796 To: 805
Northing: 150900 Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Mercian silver penny metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1993.0196

Great Mongeham

Easting: 633950 Date From: 600 To: 675
Northing: 151000 Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Merovingian Quentovic tremissis metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1993.0136

Godmersham

Easting: 606000 Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 142000 Site-type: Isolated Burial?
SMR: AS burials and an AS sword - "Skeletons, one with an iron sword, were found at Godmersham before 1720." according to Roach Smith

Selection of References: TR 05 SE 7

Godmersham II

Easting: 606500 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 150500 Site-type: Find-Spot
SMR: AS strap fitting and weight find

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Godmersham III

Easting: 606150 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 150420 Site-type: Find-Spot
1974: beneath wall of churchyard at 8m S of W gate: a knife 1975: context examined, possibly from a grave disturbed by a later burial

Selection of References: Bradshaw 1975, 202-4 Richardson 2000, site 120

Graveney

Easting: 606600 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 163900 Site-type: Find-Spot
LAS boat find. 1970: In drainage channel (Jenkins & Hogarth) excv waterlogged LAS clinker-built boat. Finds from the excavations included:- pebbles, shells, Roman tile fragments, sheep bones, pieces of Kentish rag and lava, and twelve Continental pottery sherds of 10th or 11th century date. Ship in National Maritime Museum. c. 895 A.D. Date from dendrochronology. Preliminary research suggests that the Graveney boat is of a hitherto unrepresented class, a sea­going trading ship probably constructed in south or east England.

Selection of References: TR 06 SE 9
Guston

Easting: 632000  Date From: 520  To: 620
Northing: 144000  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

AS isolated burial? ante 1864: A silver-gilt brooch with a cruciform design in garnets was found on the breast of a man in a stone cist or coffin. A shield-boss and sword, presumably from the same burial, are still in the Leeds Museum, but the brooch must have been destroyed during the second world war.

Gravesend I Denton Court

Easting: 556100  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 173500  Site-type: Cemetery

Doubtful inhumation cemetery: 1937: When Denton Court was demolished a large cemetery found near Old Chapel, Denmton. No grave finds reported. Shallow graves cut into the soil.

Gravesend II Brown Rd

Easting: 566500  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 173100  Site-type: Cemetery

Doubtful inhumation cemetery: drain-laying in Brown Rd, Denton revealed 2 or 3 skeletons.

Gravesend

Easting: 565000  Date From: 705  To: 710
Northing: 174000  Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. Kentish Series C sceatta find

Ham

Easting: 632000  Date From: 685  To: 695
Northing: 154000  Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series Bib sceatta metal detector find

Harrietsham I, Churchyard

Easting: 587240  Date From: 500  To: 700
Northing: 153570  Site-type: Cemetery

Doubtful churchyard site. AS isolated burial? ante 1892: A crystal ball, without metal bands, was found in a Saxon grave in Harrietsham Churchyard. It was given to Maidstone Museum by Riddell with a tall-necked bottle vase of reddish clay ornamented with roulette stamps and a bronze radiate brooch, also found in the churchyard."

Selection of References:

TR 34 SW 59  Richardson 2000, site 126

Gravesend I Denton Court  GVE-1

Gravesend II Brown Rd  GVE-2

Gravesend  GVE-FS1

Ham  HAM-FS1

Harrietsham I, Churchyard  HAR

Selection of References:

Tyler 1992  Richardson 2000, site 121
Philp 1937

Richardson 2000, site 122

EMC 1993.0175

EMC 1996.0067

Richardson 2000, site 129
### Harrietsham II, Court Farm Lodge

**Easting:** 586520  **Date From:** 650  **To:** 700
**Northing:** 154030  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

1932: An AS skeleton, accompanied by a buckle, a strap end and a knife, was found in a chalk pit on Court Lodge Farm, Harrietsham. The Court Lodge Farm Manager states that when this part of the farmland was reclaimed from scrub recently, there was nothing to show that a chalk pit had ever existed here. The nearest pit of any size is at the field edge, 315.0m. to the WNW of the above given siting. The farm has had several owners since 1932 and nothing is known about the finds.

**Selection of References:** TQ 85 SE 4
Richardson 2000, site 131

### Harrietsham Pilgrim's Way (Deodora House)

**Easting:** 587300  **Date From:** 500  **To:** 700
**Northing:** 153600  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

Isolated AS burial? c.1931 or 1925: skeleton with glass beads, silver ring, a bronze armilla, a key & part of a knife, (weaving beater & shears) were found on the south side of Pilgrim's Way at Harrietsham. The siting falls within a small field of rough pasture. The ground has at some time been dug into and terraced in this area. The present whereabouts of the finds are not known. Meaney places burial at S side of the Pilgrim's Way whilst Hawke's suggests that there used to be a house called Deodora now at this location.

**Selection of References:** TQ 85 SE 3
Richardson 2000, site 130

### Hartlip

**Easting:** 583000  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0
**Northing:** 163000  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

SMR: An Anglo-Saxon pot from Hartlip (TQ 83 63) is now in Maidstone Museum.

**Selection of References:** TQ 86 SW 22

### Hartlip

**Easting:** 583000  **Date From:** 710  **To:** 715
**Northing:** 164000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Continental Series E sceatta find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1995.0084

### Harbledown Bigbury

**Easting:** 611500  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0
**Northing:** 157500  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

Locality only: 2 x spearheads D2 and E3

**Selection of References:** Swanton 1974, 35
Richardson 2000, site 128

### Holborough

**Easting:** 569670  **Date From:** 575  **To:** 700
**Northing:** 162620  **Site-type:** Cemetery

AS Type 5/6? cemetery. AS burials secondaries in spur-top BA barrow near Rom barrow Holborough Knob, overlooking the Medway, now quarried out. 1943: 8thC. pot & hone discovered. 1944: 3 spearheads, skeletons & necklace found. 1950-2: Burials found. 1952-3: (Evason) 39 graves, 9 with grave goods, 3 disturbed. Oriented EW & some lidless coffins. Largely destroyed, N boundary indeterminate. Graves in 2 groups, possibly in indiv. Mounds (though may have been disturbed betw groups). No obvious grouping according to age or sex.

**Selection of References:** TQ 66 SE 14
Richardson 2000, site 240
Evason 1956

---

**Page:** 481
Holborough, Snodland Parrington's Lane

Easting: 570130 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 162700 Site-type: Find-Spot

Locality only, possibly finds associated with Holborough cemetery. Ante 1893 Raven informed Payne that when Parrington Lane, leading to the Roman barrow, was made, AS swords, spearheads and knives were found, which were then in his possession. These finds were made j m. W of the cemetery later discovered at Holborough. Ante 1928 A buckle-plate was found on the site of the Gasworks and is now in the BM.

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone) Richardson 2000, site 239

Holborough, Snodland II Gasworks

Easting: 570300 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 162560 Site-type: Find-Spot

AS finds from Snodland Rom villa, pre-1928: AS buckle plate found near a roman structure on the Gasworks site. Pre-1973: 7thC. AS bead necklace in the BM from Snodland Roman villa site. Site just above the Medway, with a roman vill dating from late 1st to late 4th century.

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone) Richardson 2000, site 242

Holborough II Lad's Farm

Easting: 568720 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 163220 Site-type: Isolated Burial?

Conflicting grid references. Could either be at Lad's Farm or TR6880 16320 at the top of Parrington's Lane. SMR: Anglo-Saxon graves found at Lad's Farm, Holborough. [Shown as a single burial on distribution map. Listed as cemetery.]

Selection of References: TQ 66 SE 24 Richardson 2000, site 241 Evison 1956, 110

Higham, Shorne I Hoo Junction

Easting: 570310 Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 173660 Site-type: Cemetery

AS inhumation cemetery. Assoc. settlement presumably 'Buliam hame' - named in a grant of land at Higham by Offa to the Archbishop, A.D. 774. 1905: Rom finds, AS spearheads & frags of a Ae bowl, found in Lower Shorne Uralite works. C.1906: Several AS graves were cut through in railway excavations; objects saved incl. Number of brooches, Ae buckles, Ae pins, knives, Ae ring, Ae loop, 6 spearheads, a shield-boss, a sword, bucket, & 2 Roman coins.

Selection of References: TQ 77 SW 2 Richardson 2000, site 233

Higham

Easting: 571000 Date From: 695 To: 705
Northing: 171000 Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series F sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1989.0069

Higham

Easting: 571000 Date From: 880 To: 899
Northing: 171100 Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. Canterbury silver penny find

Selection of References: EMC 1995.0154
Hougham Without
Easting: 628000 Date From: 675 To: 750
Northing: 140500 Site-type: Coin-find
SMR: Sceatta hoard

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Herne Bay I Dence Park
Easting: 618800 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 168100 Site-type: Find-Spot
1923: pottery bottle, but no other AS features or material and no sign of a burial. On a cliff-top plateau

Selection of References: Chadwick 1958, 67 Richardson 2000, site 133

Herne Bay II Mickleburgh Hill
Easting: 618580 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 167930 Site-type: Find-Spot
1960: Rom coin reused as a Saxon weight on waste ground behind 59 Mickleburgh Hill by schoolchildren

Selection of References: TR 16 NE 19 Richardson 2000, site 134

Hoath Millbank
Easting: 620480 Date From: 500 To: 650
Northing: 165320 Site-type: Isolated Burial?
Conflicting grid-references, though could be TR 2048/6532 or 2046/6530 or 2047/6529 SMR: "Human bones with a dark green drinking glass now in the British Museum, and a broken bottle, were found in a gravel pit at Mill Bank, Hoath parish, about 1772. Harden lists two pouch bottles from Hoath. One in the BM, one lost.

Selection of References: TR 26 NW 11 Richardson 2000, site 135

Hoath
Easting: 620000 Date From: 700 To: 730
Northing: 164000 Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Continental Series E sceatta metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1996.0092

Hoath, Broomfield
Easting: 619900 Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 166700 Site-type: Isolated Burial?
[Locality Only], this antique record probably details the same site as the finds detailed from Hoath, and may therefore relate to the same Gravel Pit at Mill bank seen under that entry HOA i.e. Pre-1852 green glass clawbeaker is thought to have come from a gravel pit near Broomfield, along with iron weapons and pottery. In Cant. Mus. are a brooch and a variegated blue bead, probably from Broomfield or Hoth.

Selection of References: Meaney 1964 Richardson 2000, site 136/2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>Date To</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Site-type</th>
<th>SMR</th>
<th>Selection of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hougham Court</td>
<td>626600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>139000</td>
<td>Early Medieval Cropmark</td>
<td>System of ditches located over a wide area, most dating to the AS period and probably represent parts of an agricultural field system associated with a nearby settlement.</td>
<td>TR 23 NE 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne Whiteheath</td>
<td>582000</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>154770</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Mixed AS Type 5 secondaries in BA barrows cemetery. 2 locations = TQ 8199 5481 &amp; TQ 8201 5473. 1819: Maidstone-Ashford road cut through one of 2 tumuli. 1842: 2 barrows excavated (Poste). In barrow [B] late BA &amp; AS burial urns containing cremated human remains were found together with, 2 shield bosses, spearheads &amp; a drinking cup. There are now no remains of these barrows to be seen. 1843: 2 shield-bosses, chain, 3 spear-heads &amp; knife found in the barrows. Pryer also exhibited glass, clay, and amber beads from Hollingbourne to the BAA.</td>
<td>TQ 85 SW 5 Richardson 2000, site 137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>584000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>155000</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>A-S gold coin find. Merovingian gold tremissis find</td>
<td>EMC 1992.7453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>583090</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>154570</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Saxon coin found in 1845. Kentish gold thrymsa find</td>
<td>EMC 1992.7452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>584010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>153600</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>A-S bead found pre-1956 in a rabbit warren to the E of a gravel pit in Hazel Wood</td>
<td>Kent SMR (Maidstone) Richardson 2000, site 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingbourne</td>
<td>584000</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>155000</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Locality Only. English Series U sceatta find</td>
<td>EMC 1970.0330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Hollingbourne**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOL-FS5</th>
<th>584100</th>
<th>815</th>
<th>823</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. Canterbury silver penny find. Archbishop Wulfred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: EMC 1987.0102, Bonser 1998

**Hollingbourne**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOL-FS6</th>
<th>584100</th>
<th>823</th>
<th>825</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. Archbishop Wulfred Canterbury silver penny find</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: EMC 1992.0253

**Hollingbourne**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOL-FS7</th>
<th>584000</th>
<th>833</th>
<th>839</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. Canterbury silver penny of Archbishop Ceolnoth found</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: Bonser 1998

**Hollingbourne**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOL-FS8</th>
<th>583900</th>
<th>800</th>
<th>810</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. Cenwulf of Mercia silver penny found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: Bonser 1998

**Hollingbourne**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOL-FS9</th>
<th>583900</th>
<th>805</th>
<th>821</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. Cenwulf of Mercia silver penny found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: Bonser 1998

**Hoo**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOO</th>
<th>573000</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting:</td>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR: Early monastic site at Hoo, founded c. 686-7 by Caedwalla. Probably an erroneous siting, a much more likely position being at Hoo St. Werburgh - see TQ 77 SE 22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: TQ 77 NW 24, Stenton 1971, 69
Hoo, St. Werburgh

**HOO-SET2**

**Easting:** 578000  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 171000  **Site-type:** Anglo-Saxon Church

Nunnery (historical). Founded between 686 and 697 A.D and may have endured from about 690 to about 840. (For present church of St. Werburgh see TQ 77 SE 11). Dissolved or destroyed 9th century. The place name Abbot's Court (TQ 794 722) and the moated earthwork (TQ 77 SE 34) nearby probably relate to the medieval manor of Hoo, which was held by the Cistercian abbey of Boxley at the Dissolution.

Selection of References: TQ 77 SE 22

---

Howletts, Littlebourne

**HOW**

**Easting:** 620070  **Date From:** 475  **To:** 700

**Northing:** 156870  **Site-type:** Cemetery

AS Mixed cemetery (destroyed cremations?): c.1913-8: min 36 burials found in gravel pit on a wooded spur extending down to the marshes bordering the Little Stour (Reiph). Graves scattered over the whole area opened. Smith notes burnt pot - either AS or Rom cremations, though Meaney thinks them prehistoric. There are also a number of Rom and AS finds in BM. Usually EW. W side of the gravel pit - foundations of a building (soft mortar with lumps of chalk and flints) & there was "a tradition of a town" in the wood. The gravel pit, long since disused, is under pasture and orchard.

Selection of References: TR 25 NW 2/28 Richardson 2000, site 155 Avent 1975

---

Howletes

**HOW-FS1**

**Easting:** 619700  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 156700  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

Coordinates designate Herne Bay, not Canterbury have adjusted 10km further south SMRTR16NE10: AS claw-beaker find

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

---

Herne Bay

**HRB-FS1**

**Easting:** 621180  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 168050  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

On exhibition in Herne Bay Museum are sherds of 3 Saxon pots, of coarse gritty ware, oyster, mussel and whelk shells, and the tooth of a pig from Hillborough churchyard, found in 1930 whilst a grave was being dug at 'A' TR 21186805. In September 1962, further sherds of Saxon pottery together with mussel shells were found at 3 feet depth, during the construction of a cesspit beneath the church car park at 'B' TR 21226807. These finds are in Mr. Gough's possession. The vicar of St. Mary's, Hillborough, confirmed the above facts and indicated the exact findspots.

Selection of References: TR 26 NW 27

---

Herne Bay II

**HRB-FS2**

**Easting:** 621220  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 168070  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

On exhibition in Herne Bay Museum are sherds of 3 Saxon pots, of coarse gritty ware, oyster, mussel and whelk shells, and the tooth of a pig from Hillborough churchyard, found in 1930 whilst a grave was being dug at 'A' TR 21186805. In September 1962, further sherds of Saxon pottery together with mussel shells were found at 3 feet depth, during the construction of a cesspit beneath the church car park at 'B' TR 21226807. These finds are in Mr. Gough's possession. The vicar of St. Mary's, Hillborough, confirmed the above facts and indicated the exact findspots.

Selection of References: TR 26 NW 27

---

Herne Bay

**HRB-FS3**

**Easting:** 618000  **Date From:** 665  **To:** 680

**Northing:** 166000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series Pa lia thyrmnsa metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1998.2039

---
### Mythe HYT-FS1

**Easting:** 615880  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 135080  **Site-type:** Find-spot

Possible cemetery. c. 1863: Saxon fibulae and distaff found at Hythe exhibited as well as the 1870 finds. Folkestone Museum has a headplate of a square-headed brooch set with granets, as from the quarries above Hythe. Site now covered in housing, but is on the brow of a hill overlooking Hythe near the parish church. SMR: AS fibulae, beads etc. find. Meaney: "Hythe. Inhumation burials. K 74 SE, TR 158350. VCH,p. 385. 05 records, circa 1870 Fibulae, beads etc. were said to have been found in old quarries NW of Hythe."

**Selection of References:** TR 13 NE 4 Richardson 2000, site 142

### Hythe II HYT-FS2

**Easting:** 616000  **Date From:** 705  **To:** 710

**Northing:** 134000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

SMR: sceatta find. Continental Series E sceatta find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1971.9064

### Hythe HYT-SET1

**Easting:** 616000  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 134000  **Site-type:** Settlement

MAS - Med settlement (historical).

**Selection of References:** Kent SMR (Maidstone)

### Ickham ICK-FS1

**Easting:** 622000  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 158000  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

SMR: NW 28: AS brooches found; NW 35: Three Saxon urns found near the church in 1794.

**Selection of References:** TR 25 NW 28  TR 25 NW 35

### Ickham II ICK-FS2

**Easting:** 622000  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 157000  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

SMR: AS brooch small radiate headed brooch illustrated in Aberg, though exact find-spot unknown

**Selection of References:** Aberg 1926, 93, fig. 156 Richardson 2000, site 144

### Ickham III Roman Villa ICK-FS3

**Easting:** 623260  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 157970  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

March 1977: gilt Ae small square-headed brooch (metal-detector find), and a sceatt found on the lower part of a gentle slope

**Selection of References:** Leigh 1980, 24 Richardson 2000, site 145
Isle of Grain IOG-FS1
Easting: 587000 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 176000 Site-type: Coin-find
SMR: 2 x sceatta finds
Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Isle of Sheppey IOS-FS1
Easting: 595000 Date From: 600 To: 675
Northing: 170000 Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Merovingian Belfort 1536-9 gold tremissis find
Selection of References: EMC 1989.0059

Isle of Sheppey IOS-FS2
Easting: 595000 Date From: 879 To: 881
Northing: 170100 Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Alfred London monogram type penny found.
Selection of References: Bonser 1998

Ivychurch IVY-FS1
Easting: 602800 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 129900 Site-type: Find-Spot
SMR: "5 Rom, 11 EM and 21 Medieval sherds of pottery were found by fieldwalking."
Selection of References: TR 02 NW 41 Reeves 1995

Kingston Down KGD
Easting: 620200 Date From: 575 To: 725
Northing: 151900 Site-type: Cemetery
Selection of References: TR 25 SW 14 Richardson 2000, site 149 Evison 1979

Kingston Down II KGD-2
Easting: 620300 Date From: 600 To: 700
Northing: 151800 Site-type: Cemetery
Three barrows and one flat Anglo-Saxon grave, Barham.
Selection of References: TR 25 SW 42 Wilson & Hurst 1967, 266
Kingston Down KGD-3
Easting: 620600 Date From: 550 To: 650
Northing: 151510 Site-type: Cemetery
Eighteen flat Anglo-Saxon graves, Barham.

Selection of References: TR 25 SW 43 Wilson & Hurst 1967, 266

Kingston Down KGD-4
Easting: 620000 Date From: 550 To: 650
Northing: 152300 Site-type: Cemetery
Nine flat Anglo-Saxon graves, Barham.

Selection of References: TR 25 SW 41 Richardson 2000, site 28 Wilson & Hurst 1967, 266

Kingston Down KGD-5
Easting: 620200 Date From: 650 To: 725
Northing: 151910 Site-type: Cemetery

Selection of References: TR 25 SW 133

Kingston Down KGD-FS1
Easting: 620600 Date From: 675 To: 750
Northing: 152400 Site-type: Coin-find
Sceattas - BAR 128, 1984, 254

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Kingston Down KGD-FS2
Easting: 619000 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 151000 Site-type: Find-Spot
[Locality Only] Post-Roman road, Arch Cant 49, 1937, 290-1 (Collier)

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Kingston Down KGD-FS3
Easting: 619000 Date From: 700 To: 715
Northing: 151000 Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Continental Series D sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1960.0006

489
Kingston Down

**Easting:** 620000  **Date From:** 500  **To:** 700

**Northing:** 151000  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

SMR: "Burial of a man found by soldiers digging trenches in July 1944, on the Barham Downs just off the main Dover road at Heden. No proper record made, and no archaeological material recovered, but Prof. A.J.E. Cove considered that the remains were those of a middle-aged male of Saxon stock."

Selection of References: TR 25 SW 27

---

Knell, Ash

**Easting:** 628000  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 159000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

[locality only] Gold 6th century Theodeberth coin found at the Knell in Ash parish (23g) VCH1 1908,383

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

---

Kent Unassociated

**Easting:** 0  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 0  **Site-type:** Unassociated

Includes a number of different unassociated materials. Especially the Faussett collection from Liverpool (included here as OA material for average weights etc). Also a number of OA coin finds: 3 x Cenwulf of Mercia silver pennies (c.798-821) in Bonser 1998; 2 x Ecgberht of Wessex silver pennies (c. 825-839) in Bonser 1998;

Selection of References: unpublished

---

Little Chart, Stamber's Field

**Easting:** 593910  **Date From:** 500  **To:** 700

**Northing:** 145725  **Site-type:** Cemetery

Roman Bath-house & AS inhumations. 1936: Minimum of 3 skeletons, a shield-boss, 3 shield-studs, a spearhead, 2 knives, a group of 3 hooks and a pot were found in a ragstone quarry just outside the walls of Surrenden Park. Both sites have since been completely quarried away, and the pits are now disused. None of the finds held by Maidstone Museum.

Selection of References: TQ 96 NW 13  Richardson 2000, site 154

---

Leeds

**Easting:** 582710  **Date From:** 500  **To:** 600

**Northing:** 153880  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

AS isolated? Inhumation burial. Waste ground at entrance to a disused gravel pit on the lower part of slope just above a stream. 1910: AS interment with an iron spearhead and a bronze shoe-shaped stud found. The photograph of the burial in the Maidstone Museum Gazetteer shows 2 skeletons, lying parallel in separate graves.

Selection of References: TQ 85 NW 7  Richardson 2000, site 150

---

Lenham I

**Easting:** 589820  **Date From:** 500  **To:** 600

**Northing:** 152150  **Site-type:** Cemetery

AS inhumation burials. Is it a single multiple burial or three separate graves? 1946: 3 skeletons, with two daggers, sword, spear, shield boss and a small buckle were discovered in Lenham during the reconstruction of a shop front. Found at 1 foot depth beneath wall footings, and dated to the 6th c., the finds were passed to Mr. Goodsall of Stede Court, Harrietsham, who still retains them. The site is close to the centre of the village, on hill a slope above the 400' contour.

Selection of References: TQ 85 SE 8  Richardson 2000, site 151

---
Lenham III East Lenham

Easting: 590800  Date From: 480  To: 530  Northing: 151700  Site-type: Find-Spot

1986: Crude Style I on Ae disc brooch (metal detector find) on the lower slope of a spur

Selection of References: Kelly 1986 letter to S.Hawke  Hawkes 1986 (letter to Kelly)

Lenham, nr.

Easting: 590000  Date From: 858  To: 863  Northing: 152000  Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. Aethelberht of Wessex silver penny find.

Selection of References: Bonser 1998

Lenham II

Easting: 590240  Date From: 500  To: 700  Northing: 152800  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

Doubtful AS (Deviant) burial. 1946: burial discovered in water-main trench S of the Pilgrim's Way, on a hill slope 3/4 m. ENE of Lenham I. It was 1' deep in the chalk and orientated approximately NE-SW. Deviant burial, the skull resting on its left side and with a hip bone close to it. Only an iron buckle 'of doubtful age' was found near the skeleton. The present whereabouts of the skeleton and the buckle was not ascertained.

Selection of References: TQ 95 SW 2  Richardson 2000, site 152

Lenham Minster

Easting: 589875  Date From: 700  To: 900  Northing: 152150  Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church

Possible 'old' Minster church, probably 7th/8th century - according to Tatton-Brown 1988 "The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the 11th century"

Selection of References: Tatton-Brown 1988a

Lower Halstow

Easting: 585710  Date From: 500  To: 700  Northing: 166420  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

AS isolated? Burial. (Hawkes' location - 58565/16650). Site close to the roman villa. 1893: Payne records that the channel of an old road from Newington to Lower Haltow could still be seen near the National Schools. He says it is proved early because an AS interment was discovered along its edge, the skeleton being accompanied by a long iron sword, spearhead and other objects. The general area of this Burial is an arable field, on a stream, just S of Lower Haltow, in a steepish valley. The farmer could add no further information and there is no record of subsequent finds.

Selection of References: TQ 86 NE 17  Richardson 2000, site 157

Lower Halstow, St. Margaret

Easting: 586000  Date From: 0  To: 0  Northing: 167410  Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church

St. Margaret's Church, Lower Haltow. A Romanesque structure, largely constructed of Roman bricks, existed upon the site. The south wall of the chancel, with its blocked semi-circular headed window, is part of that structure: probably either early 9th century or late 11th century. The nave appears to be early Norman and the north and south aisles were added c. 1150-60. Early in the 13th century the tower was erected at the west end of the south aisle, the north door inserted and the chancel arcaded internally. Many of the windows were replaced in the 14th and 16th centuries.

Selection of References: TQ 86 NE 14
### Lidsing, Boxley

**Easting:** 578000  **Date From:** 500  **To:** 700  
**Northing:** 164000  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?


Selection of References: TQ 76 SE 16  Richardson 2000, site 33  Meaney 1964, 126

---

### Little Mongeham

#### LMH-FS1

**Easting:** 633000  **Date From:** 700  **To:** 750  
**Northing:** 150000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Continental Series E type 4 sceatta metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1992.0223

---

### Little Mongeham

#### LMH-FS2

**Easting:** 633100  **Date From:** 715  **To:** 750  
**Northing:** 150000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Continental Series E 'late' sceatta metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1992.0226

---

### Little Mongeham

#### LMH-FS3

**Easting:** 633100  **Date From:** 715  **To:** 750  
**Northing:** 150100  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Continental Series E 'late' sceatta metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1992.0225

---

### Little Mongeham

#### LMH-FS4

**Easting:** 633100  **Date From:** 710  **To:** 750  
**Northing:** 149900  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Continental Series X sceatta metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1992.0249

---

### Littlebourne II

#### LTB-IB1

**Easting:** 621000  **Date From:** 625  **To:** 675  
**Northing:** 157000  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

Possibly part of the Howlettes cemetery. Anglo-Saxon burials with buckles and a gold sceatta found at Littlebourne are noted by Roach Smith

Selection of References: TR 25 NW 26  Richardson 2000, site 156
Lydd

Easting: 604255  Date From: 775  To: 1000
Northing: 120945  Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church

All Saints Church, Lydd. Mainly 13th with a 15th west tower but the west end of the north aisle incorporates walling of a LAS basilican church not earlier than the mid-10th c. Documentary evidence appears to suggest however that Lydd appears near the end of the 8th century. Norman stonework suggests that a Norman church, detached from the Saxon building, once stood on the site of the nave, and caused the irregularity of its lines. Excavations in 1996 showed the building to be larger than first thought.

Selection of References: TR 02 SW 3

Lyminge

Easting: 616380  Date From: 450  To: 650
Northing: 141690  Site-type: Cemetery

AS inhumation cemetery. Highest point of a chalk spur at the head of the Elham valley. Parish boundary with Elham c.220m to the NE. 1953: (Warhurst) 8 inhumations. 1954-5: Further 55 excavated. No visible barrows, although one had been marked by a mound of chalk lumps; 2 ditched burials, but robbed. All more or less EW in rows. 8 graves of the 63 excavated had been disturbed, perhaps fairly soon after burial. 38 of the undisturbed graves were furnished, 4 richly, 3 with a knife only. Relatively rich cemetery

Selection of References: TR 14 SE 12  Richardson 2000, site 160

Lyminge II

Easting: 616470  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 140700  Site-type: Find-Spot

AS inhumation cemetery. In a shallow valley on high land, almost at the base of a gentle slope. 7thC. Lyminge nunnery on the opposite steeper slope, c.280m away. 1885: Jenkins reported objects found during railway excavations, including human bones, swords, spearheads, 3 shield-bosses, 2 brooches (one a garnet-set radiate, the other bronze cruciform), & a bracteate. Also TR14SE58: AS cruciform brooch find, TR14SE59 (TR16 41) AS claw beaker; & TR14SE60: AS button brooches (same location as claw beaker); ditto AS gold foils and AS pagan pottery

Selection of References: TR 14 SE 11  Richardson 2000, site 159  Arnold 1980

Lyminge

Easting: 616000  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 141000  Site-type: Find-Spot

Anglo-Saxon pagan pottery mentioned by Myres 1977. (Sited to locality only)

Selection of References: TR 14 SE 63

Lyminge III

Easting: 616250  Date From: 425  To: 475
Northing: 140350  Site-type: Find-Spot

1982: cruciform brooch dug up from a garden c. 380m S of the Lyminge cemetery early aberg group II brooch, mid 5th century. Find-spot c.640m SE of Lyminge Church

Selection of References: TR 14 SE 58  Richardson 2000, site 161  Ager 1983

Lyminge Church

Easting: 616100  Date From: 633  To: 2000
Northing: 140850  Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church

St Mary and St Ethelburga's Nunnery and Monastery. Founded AD 633. Erected on Site of Villa Maxima. Extant fabric includes LAS (c AD 965) church and also, in the south wall, part of an earlier small church of Kentish type which lay immediately to the S, and is believed to have been the church from AD 633 and attached to Roman villa to the South

Selection of References: TR 14 SE 8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Site-type</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lydden</td>
<td>626000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>145000</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td>Two skeletons were found together beneath a grubbed-up ash tree at Lydden in 1760. Their feet lay towards the east and a dagger was found beside them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lympne, Bellevue</td>
<td>610960</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>134990</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>AS inhumation cemetery. On the brow of a ridge of hills overlooking the sea in the neighbourhood of the old Roman station at Lympne. c1828: In the quarry on the edge of the hill skeletons, spearheads, a short sword 15inches long, an iron shield-boss, a glass vessel, a Kentish bottle vase, and an ornamented buckle and buckle-plate of Frankish appearance were found. This small stone quarry is completely grassed over and has obviously been out of use for a number of years. No confirmatory siting evidence on these burials was gained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lympne II (Port)</td>
<td>610210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134990</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>Doubtful AS inhumation burial site. The site is 1 m. WNW of Stuffall Castle, and c. 100 yds. W of the Bellevue site. (Pot catalogued by Myers as from Port Lympne is from Folkestone III, gr.12). 1913: A small pot, was found during house construction. No exact location/details known. 7 beads, unburnt, mostly of blue glass, seem to have been associated with the pot; if they were, it would strengthen the assumption that this was an accessory vessel in an inhumation burial, probably of a child. The pot contains a white substance not analysed but probably chalk rather than bone dust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lympne III</td>
<td>612500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134900</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>SMR: AS vases, copies of WT pots (Evison). Site just below brow of hill overlooking Romney Marsh and adjacent Rd thought to be continuation of Stone St to the edge of the marsh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lympne</td>
<td>612000</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>135000</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Locality Only. Kentish Sutherland II thrymsa find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lympne</td>
<td>612100</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>135000</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Locality Only. Mercian silver penny find</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Lympne Minster

**Easting:** 611950  **Date From:** 700  **To:** 900  
**Northing:** 134675  **Site-type:** Anglo-Saxon Church

Possible 'old' Minster church, probably 7th/8th century - according to Tatton-Brown 1988 "The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the 11th century"

### Maidstone Wheeler St.

**Easting:** 576250  **Date From:** 500  **To:** 600  
**Northing:** 156170  **Site-type:** Cemetery

AS inhumation cemetery? 1823: 'Various sepulchral antiquities', mostly AS, discovered in Wheeler Street, during school construction. 1836: Lower end of the road several burials, a sword, spearhead and shield-boss were found. About the centre of the street were some urns, including 'one of handsome form with 2 handles' and near it a circular fibula of gilt bronze with garnets. R. A. Smith also ascribes to this site a brooch with T-shaped garnets, a shoe-shaped stud, a bronze wheel ornament with 5 spokes, and a wire bracelet.ing the foundations of the Lancastrian School.

### Maidstone II Brewery

**Easting:** 575650  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 155590  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

SMR: AS knife and spearhead excavated at Maidstone Brewery

### Maidstone III

**Easting:** 576000  **Date From:** 600  **To:** 700  
**Northing:** 155000  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

SMR: AS gold sword mount from "at or near Maidstone". Small gold sheet, trapezoid from with a central cruciform garnet setting, filigree is probably one side of a hollow truncated pyramid mount.

### Maidstone

**Easting:** 576000  **Date From:** 796  **To:** 798  
**Northing:** 155000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Eadberht Praen of Kent penny. Three Line Type. Doubtful origins.

### Maidstone, Minster

**Easting:** 576300  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 156200  **Site-type:** Anglo-Saxon Church

There is a Domesday Book reference to a church in this manor. Maidstone (Maegdestane) is also referred to in the Domesday Monachorum for Kent under Customs of the Archbishop received from Priests and Churches, and as a church with other churches subordinate to it.

### Selection of References:

- Tatton-Brown 1988
- Richardson 2000, site 165
- Jessup 1930, 234
- Kent SMR (Maidstone)
- Bonser 1998
Monkton Court Farm

Easting: 627700 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 165200 Site-type: Find-Spot

C2 Fe spearhead found by workmen whilst cutting footings for a silo in 1977. TTA site 142. Probably from an AS grave sectioned as the find was in a feature cut into the chalk bedrock.

Selection of References: Perkins & Hawkes 1984 Richardson 2000, site 193

Minster-in-Thanet Churchyard

Easting: 631070 Date From: 500 To: 600
Northing: 164280 Site-type: Isolated Burial?

AS isolated? Burial, c.1876: A glass bell-shaped vessel was found placed over the skull of a skeleton in a grave in Minster churchyard, c. 7' deep. The skeleton was said to be 8' long. The site is on low ground near Minster Marshes. According to the vicar of St Mary's, Minster, no burials have taken place in the graveyard for many years; and no further finds are known.

Selection of References: TR 36 SW 1 Richardson 2000, site 183 Perkins et al 1987

Mill Hill Deal I

Easting: 636310 Date From: 490 To: 590
Northing: 150740 Site-type: Cemetery

AS Type 5 inhumation cemetery. Row-grave & secondaries in BA barrow. Multi-period site adjacent to late 19th-20th C. disused chalk quarries. Some possible AS finds were discovered within these pits while they were still in use, including several possible A-S graves (Woodruff 1904; Smith 1908). Modern excavations revealed over 500 archaeological features and 132 burials (a third of which were of LIA date). 4 discernable cemetery sites on Mill Hill (designated I-IV) & in 1986-9: 76 burials clustered around a prehistoric barrow were excavated.

Selection of References: Parfitt & Brugmann 1997 Richardson 2000, site 79

Mill Hill Deal II Waterworks Hill

Easting: 636040 Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 151120 Site-type: Cemetery

See MHD. AS inhumation cemetery. 1933: male AS inhumation burial, E-W, & with spearhead and a thick-backed knife. 1898: burial '500 yds NW of the Waterworks on Mill Hill' [i.e. close to the 1933 burial], with C6th silver gilt disc brooch, a long bead necklace, an iron buckle and an oval iron belt fitting. The finds from both burials are in the Deal Castle Museum. 1970: Grave 3 contained glass squat jar late 6th early 7th in front garden 147 ST Richards Rd at a depth of 2.13 m.

Selection of References: TR 35 SE 19 Richardson 2000, site 80

Mill Hill Deal

Easting: 636300 Date From: 500 To: 600
Northing: 150800 Site-type: Cemetery

SMR: "TR 3630 5080 Before 1908 on the waterworks Hill about one mile SW of Deal and just behind Walmer, several Anglo-Saxon graves were noticed in section at the top of a chalk pit and several characteristic finds were recorded. These included beads, a circular jewelled brooch and a woman's skeleton with head N-E. (These finds undoubtedly represent part of an extensive Anglo-Saxon cemetery on this hill, other elements of which are represented by TR 35 SE 19, TR 35 SE 20 and TR 35 SE 51 centred on the chalk pits). The finds are in Deal Town Museum."

Selection of References: TR 35 SE 67

Mill Hill Deal II

Easting: 636100 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 151700 Site-type: Find-Spot

SMR: AS pot find, siting from the place-name only: "TR 361 517 Sited to place name only). A sherd of Anglo-Saxon pottery from Upper Deal. Sherd of biconical vessel (see Illustration card). Two rows of rouletting, double rows of rhomboid shapes in zigzag formation. Red core with grey surfaces, red grog. Maximum c20 cms. The find is located in Deal Museum."

Selection of References: TR 35 SE 92
### Mill Hill Deal

**Easting:** 636240  
**Northing:** 150810  
**Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

AS isolated? Inhumation burials/cemetery. 1898: Belgic Umfield & 3 Saxon burials excv. Goods included necklace, disc brooch, bronze knife blade, iron buckle, shield boss & plates etc. A sherd of a C7 Frankish pot in Deal Castle Museum may come from this site. The chalk pit, disused for many years, is in process of being filled in with rubbish. 1988: A 'warrior' burial fd as isolated find at TR 3625 5078. Aligned NW-SE male skeleton with bronze head band, iron sword with cast bronze suspension loop with coral beads, bronze brooch and v-shaped corner mountings of a shield. Prob

### Mill Hill Deal III

**Easting:** 636290  
**Northing:** 151140  
**Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

Doubtful inhumation. 1939: grave with a male skeleton, orientated south west-north east, found during the excavtion of an air-raid shelter in the garden of 7 Redsull Avenue, Mill Hill, Deal. No associated objects were found.

### Margate Half Mile Ride

**Easting:** 634980  
**Northing:** 169130  
**Site-type:** Cemetery

AS inhumation row-grave cemetery. The site lies mainly under the main Margate-Minstre road and there is no record of subsequent burials either from here or from the arable fields which flank its west side. Pre-1848: number of graves discovered in the vicinity of the Chapel, probably part of the same cemetery. 1863: 9 graves discovered near top of the hill. 1922-3: c.20 graves poor in relics, found (Rowe) near Dene Chapel (1922 graves numbered 1-23;1863 graves numbered 24-32;1893 grave numbered 33). TTA site 45. 3 complete BA ring ditches and the remant of another. Barrow

### Minnis Bay

**Easting:** 629270  
**Northing:** 169520  
**Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

AS inhumation isolated? burial. 1937: skull, AS Knife & Ae buckle found during the construction of Nos. 9 & 11 Gallwey Avenue, Birchington (c.TR 29276952). Pre-1958: 3 burials, 1 with a knife & buckle, were found in Gallway (sic) Avenue & St Mildred's Avenue (See TQ 26 NE 38). Part of the same cemetery despite distance? Thanet SMR 67: Barrow cemetery stretching at least 400m to the W from this point in aerial photographs. Seems to suggest its not looking the same cemetery at all, & that Brooksend stretches along the inlet, with Minnis Bay burial separate or isolated? TTA site

### Monkton Primrose Hill

**Easting:** 629100  
**Northing:** 165550  
**Site-type:** Cemetery

Mixed AS Type 4? cemetery. Small knoll S of main Thanet ridge - arable land containing disused chalk quarry. 1880: Skeleton with knife & pot. 1942: unfurnished crouch burial. 1971: AS cemetery in pipe trench, c.550m EW (limits defined) x 190m NS. 22 burials. 1982: Cem excv. continued in Monkton pipeline. Further 12 graves. 6thC. nucleus to W end 7thC. burials spreading to E & W. 7thC. burials spaced further apart, possibly indicating barrows. TTA site 147 stretching from 628900 165600 to 629400 165700

### Monkton

**Easting:** 629350  
**Northing:** 165820  
**Site-type:** Early Medieval Cropmark

SMR: "Small ring ditch similar to those at TR 26 NE 17, so possibly Anglo-Saxon."
Monkton
Easting: 628000 Date From: 700 To: 705
Northing: 165000 Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Continental Series E sceatta metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1998.2071

Monkton
Easting: 628100 Date From: 765 To: 792
Northing: 165000 Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Mercian silver penny metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1998.2112

Monkton
Easting: 628100 Date From: 770 To: 796
Northing: 165100 Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Mercian silver penny metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1997.0113

Minster Mount Pleasant
Easting: 630110 Date From: 620 To: 725
Northing: 165650 Site-type: Cemetery
AS inhumation cemetery. 1971: (TR36 NW 198) 5 AS? inhumations without grave-goods, orientated NS (No.s 1-5). 1984: 3 further AS inhumations in Monkton pipeline (A-C). These are represented by the above co-ordinates, the 1971 finds were located 190m further E, though all assumed to be the same cemetery. May be associated with a settlement at Hoo approx. 800m S of the graves. TTA site 248

Selection of References: TR 36 NW 195 Richardson 2000, site 185 Perkins 1985

Minster Mount Pleasant
Easting: 630700 Date From: 625 To: 725
Northing: 165900 Site-type: Cemetery
AS inhumation cemetery. 1996: 18 graves close to E end of the A253 dualling excavation area, nr intersection of 2 hollow ways, NS from Birchington-Minster-in-Thanet & EW aligned Dunstret. Brow of hill. Prob excv to limits (20x10m). Only 8 with grave-goods. All relatively shallow & grouped together on gentle rise. Gr13 on the other side of the hollow way. In use for 30-40 yrs, perhaps only one generation. Possible AS ditch, coinciding almost exactly with the boundary between Monkton and Minster parishes and may mark that boundary, (established by Domneva in the LC7)

Selection of References: TR 36 NW 240 Richardson 2000, site 189 Riddler 1997

Milton Regis (Sittingbourne) Huggin’s Field
Easting: 590600 Date From: 575 To: 700
Northing: 164000 Site-type: Cemetery
AS cemetery. OA mat from railway cutting only. 1824: No of inhumations found. No sign of mounds, also AS crems or BA urns.1826: 8 graves all furnished, one fairly richly. Sev frags of animal bones found interspersed among the graves. Total no of graves c.50. 1828: BA Urns found 140 yards from the skeletons. 1916: 3 gold pendants & 6 sceattas. The site is now lost. Milton is also mentioned in documentary sources: AS Chron AD 892/893. No of deneholes in the vicinity.

Selection of References: TQ 96 SW 27/60 Richardson 2000, site 178

498
Milton Regis (Sittingbourne) II Rondeau Est

Easting: 590070  Date From: 550 To: 700
Northing: 163860  Site-type: Cemetery

AS inhumation cemetery. Lowest part of a slope. Payne states 41 skeletons found with grave goods in 1869-71 & 1879-80. The area is now built over. 1869: Cem discv c. m. NW of the Huggins Fields site, to the N of Watling Street & S of Blind Lane. 1869-71: The Blind Lane side - c. 20 skeletons discovered, shield-boss, spear-head, knives, Ae buckles, a bronze armlet, an iron strike-a-light and an iron-gilt girdle ornament. 1879-80: The Watling Street side was excavated, and 6 other skeletons were found. 10 more skeletons were later discovered. No. Of other finds also come to light.

Selection of References: TQ 96 SW 14 Richardson 2000, site 179

Milton Regis III Brickfields

Easting: 591200  Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 165050  Site-type: Cemetery

AS inhumation cemetery. 1889: AS inhum with grave-goods c.300 yrsd N of Boxhill Rom cemetery. Brickfield disused since 1900. Now a marshy field used for rough grazing. Present whereabouts of finds not ascertained. Other graves found nearby, yielding 6 spearheads, spear, 2 knives, 2 swords & part of a bronze-gilt sword hilt, two bronze armillae, three bronze finger-rings, an elegant green glass cup, a crystal ball in gold bands, and a Frankish cell-work ornament. 2 AS glass cone-beakers now in the BM. Sceatta find at 159000 164000 recorded at SMRTQ96SW67

Selection of References: TQ 96 NW 11 Richardson 2000, site 177

Milton Regis I Cook's Lane

Easting: 590490  Date From: 680 To: 710
Northing: 164770  Site-type: Cemetery

AS findspots. Poss cem or isolated burial. From pit c.1/4 mile from Milton Parish Church. 1916-26, 1958, 1962: Grave-goods acquired sep by BM from same source, prob all same grave: 1916: 3 gold pendants, all more or less cruciform design, probably of mid VII, find with 6 sceattas. Site is now lost. 1921: Circular gold poradnt to the BM; c.1920s: 2 more circular gold penadnt and 6 sceattas to the BM. 1959: Maidstone Museum purchase 14 sceattas. 1962: Ditto purchases pot, Ae buckle, 32 glass beads, 3 gold pendants. At least 2 or 3 graves, sceattas are all series A or B.

Selection of References: TQ 96 SW 56 Richardson 2000, site 176

Milton Regis (Sittingbourne)

Easting: 592150  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 166290  Site-type: Find-Spot

Approx siting of AS findspots in manuscript. "40 acres field". Material in Gravesend? Museum. "Mr. G. Arnold was Mayor of Gravesend, living c.1900, so this is quite an old site." Siting lies within an area occupied by long-disused sewage beds, the property of Kemsley Mill (Bowler & Lloyds). The site is labeled as Early Medieval and may be the extension of one of the large cemeteries at Sittingbourne

Selection of References: TQ 96 NW 13

Milton Regis Grovehurst

Easting: 590400  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 166600  Site-type: Find-Spot

Fe axehead found in Mr Wabi's brickfield at Grovehurst, exact find-spot not known.

Selection of References: Payne 1882b, entry 395 Richardson 2000, site 180

Milton Regis Kemsley Down

Easting: 591800  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 162200  Site-type: Find-Spot

Ae jewel or pendant from Kemsley Down (?also Late Roman belt set MRE-FS4)

Selection of References: TQ 96 SW 25 Richardson 2000, site 181
**Milton Regis (Sittingbourne)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 590000</th>
<th>Date From: 400 To: 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 165000</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Smith 1908a 374; Smith 1923, 41-2; Jessup 1930, 236; Kendrick 1938 (AS Art) 68, Harden 1956a, 158; Hawkes & Dunning 1961 (Med arch) 1961, 4-6, 63, 66, 68; Bohme 1986. 1880s: Late roman military 'simple' belt set in Maidstone Museum probably from a single context, a grave probably from the Kemsley Downs or the Brickfields site. 1893: gold 8 jewelled ornament inlaid with garnets and sapphire, probably a baldric fastener, probably Frankish. Pre-1905: BM acquired 4th century bowl from an AS inhumation at Milton-next-Sittingbourne.

Selection of References: TQ 86 SE 28 Richardson 2000, site 182

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 589000</th>
<th>Date From: 700 To: 715</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 164000</td>
<td>Site-type: Coin-find</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locality Only. English Series W sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1992.7489

**Margate II Gas Alley**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 635730</th>
<th>Date From: 500 To: 700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 170890</td>
<td>Site-type: Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AS inhumation? Cemetery. Located on slope of dry valley (which runs NW to sea). Trad of many skeletons found in Gas (Gorse) Alley in 1840 when the Gas Company laid pipes. The burials were said to be side by side, and to have spears with them. Two human skeletons with an iron knife found in Gasworks Yard. These are to be associated with the above. Classified as "inhumation Cemetery". Recorded only in the isle of Thanet Gazette (20-1-23) TTA site 8

Selection of References: TR 37 SE 35/36 Richardson 2000, site 169 Perkins et al 1987

**Margate IV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 634980</th>
<th>Date From: 0 To: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 169130</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMR: AS W-T bottle probably from Half Mile Ride though not necessarily located correctly in the SMR. Found at Shotenden Place, does this place it near Margate i cemetery on Shotenden Rd?

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone) Richardson 2000, site 172

**Margate III, St. Mildred's Bay foreshore**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 632700</th>
<th>Date From: 0 To: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 170700</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMR: AS silver strap-end/hooked tag find. By MD in 1980. The excavator relates that he excavated the find from an ancient buried horizon comprising of reeds and/or rushes. TTA site 81. AC 1983, 21

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)
AS burial said to be disturbed during the construction of Millmead Estate. Locality only. At this location are however several ditched enclosures and AS burials visible as CMs. These were visible before the site was built over. TTA site 54

Margate

Selection of References: Perkins et al. 1987, 48
Richardson 2000, site 171

Mersham

Selection of References: EMC 1987.0074

Minster-in-Thanet

Minster Laundry, Telegraph Hill

Selection of References: TR 36 NE 9
Richardson 2000, site 174/1

Minster-in-Thanet MST-FS1

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)
Richardson 2000, site 184

501
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Code</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Locality Only</th>
<th>English Series</th>
<th>Selection of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MST-FS2</td>
<td>Minster-in-Thanet</td>
<td>630000</td>
<td>164000</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>BX sceatta find</td>
<td>English Series BX sceatta find</td>
<td>EMC 1960.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST-FS3</td>
<td>Minster-in-Thanet</td>
<td>630100</td>
<td>164000</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>C/R sceatta metal detector find</td>
<td>English Series C/R sceatta find</td>
<td>EMC 1996.0073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST-FS4</td>
<td>Minster-in-Thanet</td>
<td>630100</td>
<td>164100</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>E sceatta find</td>
<td>English Series E sceatta find</td>
<td>EMC 1994.0138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST-FS5</td>
<td>Minster-in-Thanet</td>
<td>630000</td>
<td>163900</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Saralado Group sceatta find</td>
<td>English Saralado Group sceatta find</td>
<td>EMC 1994.0166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST-FS6</td>
<td>Minster-in-Thanet</td>
<td>630000</td>
<td>164200</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>D sceatta find</td>
<td>Continental Series D sceatta find</td>
<td>EMC 1994.0135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST-FS7</td>
<td>Minster-in-Thanet</td>
<td>629900</td>
<td>164000</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>E sceatta find</td>
<td>Continental Series E sceatta find</td>
<td>EMC 1994.0143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minster-in-Thanet

**Minster-in-Thanet MST-IB1**

**Easting:** 634120 **Date From:** 500 **To:** 700

**Northing:** 165220 **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

Doubtful inhumation burial site. TTA site 339 SMR: inhumation: "[TR 34126522 sited from plan] A grave was found during the construction of the Monkton gas pipeline in 1984. It was found at a depth of 0.30m and was orientated east-west, head west. The grave was in brickearth, with the floor of the grave consisting of the natural chalk surface. It was sectioned longitudinally by the pipe trench, and much of the skeleton destroyed. Remains of a female aged 25-35 years.*

Selection of References: TR 36 NW 189 Richardson 2000, site 108 Perkins 1985

Minster-in-Thanet

**Minster-in-Thanet MST-SET1**

**Easting:** 631600 **Date From:** 700 **To:** 900

**Northing:** 164220 **Site-type:** Anglo-Saxon Church

Possible ‘old’ Minster church, probably 7th/8th century - according to Tatton-Brown 1988 "The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the 11th century"

Selection of References: Tatton-Brown 1988a

Manston, Tesco

**Manston, Tesco MTC**

**Easting:** 636170 **Date From:** 575 **To:** 800

**Northing:** 165600 **Site-type:** Settlement


Selection of References: TR 36 NW 230

Nethercourt Estate, Manston

**Nethercourt Estate, Manston MTC-2**

**Easting:** 635730 **Date From:** 0 **To:** 0

**Northing:** 165650 **Site-type:** Settlement


Selection of References: TR 36 NE 344

Nethercourt Estate 1988

**Nethercourt Estate 1988 MTC-3**

**Easting:** 635780 **Date From:** 0 **To:** 0

**Northing:** 165210 **Site-type:** Isolated Burial

AS isolated burial? 1988: (TTA) Nethercourt estate evaluation immediately east of Ozengell. No. Of cropmark features visible. 2 arch features were discovered. Feature 1: a shallow cut in the chalk surface c.1.3m long by 0.6m wide aligned NNE-SSW. A flint scraper and a clay bead were found within the fill. - prob. AS child burial related to Jutish cemetery to W. Feature 2 RB ditch immediately to the east of the site.

Selection of References: TR 36 NE 2001

Minster Thorne Farm

**Minster Thorne Farm MTF**

**Easting:** 633370 **Date From:** 575 **To:** 700

**Northing:** 165430 **Site-type:** Cemetery

AS inhumation cemetery? 1984: (TTA) 3 graves discovered in Monkton gas pipeline. One grave disturbed in antiquity and two were identifiable as Anglo Saxon. One - boat burial. Burials prob. originate from a community of some affluence. Close to the graves a Frankish gold solidus of 7th century date was found in a spoil heap of top-soil. The low quality of the solidus suggests that it is an imitation. It had been adapted by the fitting of a suspension band in the manner of a bracteate. TTA site 188

Selection of References: Perkins 1985 Richardson 2000, site 186
Minster-in-Sheppey

**Site: MTS**

**Easting:** 595540  **Date From:** 660  **To:** 900

**Northing:** 173010  **Site-type:** Anglo-Saxon Church

St. Mary & St. Sexburga's Monastery. Benedictine & Augustinian alternately. Nunnery founded c 670 but ruined pre-1066. On high ground (50m O.D.) overlooking sea to the N & Isle S. N nave & chancel: relics of the pre-conquest (?late 7th) conventual church & later rebuilding & alterations. 1993: Multi period occupation site revealed prior to construction of Minster Pumping Station. 9 phases identified including an IA farmstead, IA- RB settlement, mid-late Saxon metalling was interpreted as poss relating to the original abbey. Md and early PM activity on the site represented by postholes.

**Selection of References:** TQ 97 SE 1 Richardson 2000, site 191

---

Minster-in-Sheppey Churchyard

**Site: MTS-1**

**Easting:** 595560  **Date From:** 650  **To:** 850

**Northing:** 172990  **Site-type:** Cemetery

1987-8: KARU rescued 50+ graves next to the Minster Abbey. No grave finds except unusual lead bloom in one grave. All EW and some has stone pillows. One had a recess. Some graves under a metalled stone surface.

**Selection of References:** TQ 97 SE 1 Richardson 2000, site 191

---

Minister-in-Sheppey

**Site: MTS-FS1**

**Easting:** 595000  **Date From:** 710  **To:** 735

**Northing:** 173000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. English Type 30b/8 sceatta find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1977.0049

---

Minister-in-Sheppey

**Site: MTS-FS2**

**Easting:** 595100  **Date From:** 710  **To:** 735

**Northing:** 173000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series U sceatta find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1977.0050

---

Minister-in-Sheppey

**Site: MTS-FS3**

**Easting:** 595000  **Date From:** 600  **To:** 675

**Northing:** 173100  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Merovingian Quentovic tremissis metal detector find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1988.0101

---

Nethercourt Farm

**Site: NCF**

**Easting:** 636790  **Date From:** 500  **To:** 700

**Northing:** 165230  **Site-type:** Cemetery

AS inhumation cemetery? 1898: Dowker mentions AS graves found in Upper Deal. 1931: AS grave found. 1949: 2 graves. One destroyed. The other woman with goods. 1953: A grave containing a spear, scaramasax and knife was discovered. Outliers of Ozengell? Bronze Age crouched burials have also been discovered there. TTA site 163

**Selection of References:** TR 36 NE 29 Richardson 2000, site 210 Perkins et al 1987
Nethercourt Farm Estate West

Easting: 636100  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 165100  Site-type: Cemetery

Doubtful inhumation cemetery. c.1949: more AS graves may have been clipped when Estate built, a separate cemetery or W part of NCF?? Ring Ditches visible in Field immediately S of A253 alongside S edge of estate.

Selection of References: Thanet SMR Richardson 2000, site 211

North Court, Tilmanstone

Easting: 630500  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 152200  Site-type: Early Medieval Cropmark

SMR: "Group of ring ditches between TR 3055243 and TR 30515233, single ringditch at TR 30395223. Large rectangular enclosure at TR 30455215, possible curvilinear enclosure at TR 30595236."

Selection of References: TR 35 SW 78

Nonington

Easting: 626300  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 152700  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

Doubtful inhumation cemetery c.1878: house building revealed skeleton; a memorial in a grove NW of the house records what might be reinterred weapon burials.

Selection of References: Perkins 1997, 228 Richardson 2000, site 196

Northbourne

Easting: 633000  Date From: 765  To: 796
Northing: 152000  Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. Mercian silver penny find

Selection of References: EMC 1922.0002

Northbourne Minster

Easting: 634100  Date From: 700  To: 900
Northing: 151100  Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church

Possible 'old' Minster church, probably 7th/8th century - according to Tatton-Brown 1988 "The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the 11th century"

Selection of References: Tatton-Brown 1988a

Northdown

Easting: 638000  Date From: 500  To: 700
Northing: 170000  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

AS burial/s. 2 graves or just one? 1898: "Glass beads found in a grave at Northdown, now in British Museum." just over 0.5 mile from Long Nose Split. TTA site 58. Found in 1841?

Selection of References: TR 37 SE 20 Richardson 2000, site 170 Perkins et al 1987
### Newington Minster

**NTN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 586200</th>
<th>Date From: 700 To: 900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 165400</td>
<td>Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Possible 'old' Minster church, probably 7th/8th century - according to Tatton-Brown 1988 "The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the 11th century."

**Selection of References:** Tatton-Brown 1988a

### Newchurch

**NWC-FS01**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 603700</th>
<th>Date From: 0 To: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 131400</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findspot of Saxon pottery. Not thought to result from manuring.

**Selection of References:** TR 03 SW 8 Reeves 1995

### Newchurch II

**NWC-FS02**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 604200</th>
<th>Date From: 0 To: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 131800</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findspot of Saxon pottery.

**Selection of References:** TR 03 SW 11 Reeves 1995

### Newchurch III

**NWC-FS03**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 605500</th>
<th>Date From: 0 To: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 132600</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findspot of Roman and Saxon pottery.

**Selection of References:** TR 03 SE 15 Reeves 1995

### Newchurch IV

**NWC-FS04**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 605130</th>
<th>Date From: 0 To: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 130380</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findspot of Roman and Saxon pottery, possibly resulting from later manuring.

**Selection of References:** TR 03 SE 21 Reeves 1995

### Newchurch V

**NWC-FS05**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 606730</th>
<th>Date From: 0 To: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 132020</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findspot of Saxon pottery.

**Selection of References:** TR 03 SE 22 Reeves 1995
Findspot of Saxon pottery.

Selection of References: TR 03 SE 22 Reeves 1995

Newchurch VII NWC-FS07

Findspots of Saxon pottery at TR 05213160, 05213149, 05443151.

Selection of References: TR 03 SE 24 Reeves 1995

Newchurch VIII NWC-FS08

Findspots of Saxon pottery at TR 05213160, 05213149, 05443151

Selection of References: TR 03 SE 24 Reeves 1995

Newchurch IX NWC-FS09

Findspots of Saxon pottery at TR 05213160, 05213149, 05443151

Selection of References: TR 03 SE 24 Reeves 1995

Newchurch X NWC-FS10

AS pottery findspot. Post-1994: "One Rom pottery sherd found and some EM and Md pottery sherds also found by
fieldwalking." Also: St Clement's church 12th-14th century. As yet there are no known MAS finds though the settlement
may date to this period. New Romney (606500 125000) has a known mint from AD975-110 (see T-Brown 1984) but is
not included in the Domesday Book, therefore it is doubtful whether New Romney is much older than that and is
therefore not included

Selection of References: TR 02 NW 37

Newchurch XI NWC-FS11

SMR: Rectangular enclosure shown on tithe map. Late AS and C14 finds discovered.

Selection of References: TR 03 SE 33
Newchurch, Romney Marsh  
Easting:  606800  Date From:  0  To:  0  
Northing:  131300  Site-type:  Find-Spot  
SMR: "99 pieces of EM and 62 pieces of Md pottery found by field walking."

Selection of References:  TR 03 SE 50  Reeves 1995

Newchurch, Romney Marsh  
Easting:  605900  Date From:  0  To:  0  
Northing:  131600  Site-type:  Find-Spot  
SMR: "480 pieces of EM and 181 pieces of Md pottery found by field walking."

Selection of References:  TR 03 SE 51  Reeves 1995

Newchurch, Romney Marsh  
Easting:  605900  Date From:  0  To:  0  
Northing:  132800  Site-type:  Find-Spot  
SMR: "22 sherds of EM pottery and 54 of MD pottery found by fieldwalking."

Selection of References:  TR 03 SE 36  Reeves 1995

Newchurch, Romney Marsh  
Easting:  606100  Date From:  0  To:  0  
Northing:  132200  Site-type:  Find-Spot  
SMR: "11 EM and 75 Md pottery sherds found by fieldwalking."

Selection of References:  TR 03 SE 40  Reeves 1995

Newchurch, Romney Marsh  
Easting:  606200  Date From:  0  To:  0  
Northing:  132100  Site-type:  Find-Spot  
SMR: "52 pieces of EM and 31 pieces of MD pottery found by field walking."

Selection of References:  TR 03 SE 48  Reeves 1995

Newchurch, Romney Marsh  
Easting:  606400  Date From:  0  To:  0  
Northing:  132500  Site-type:  Find-Spot  
SMR: "18 EM and 67 MD pieces of pottery found by field walking."

Selection of References:  TR 03 SE 44  Reeves 1995
SMR: "35 EM and 25 MD pottery sherds found by fieldwalking."

Selection of References: TR 03 SE 41 Reeves 1995

SMR: "13 EM and 19 MD pottery sherds found by fieldwalking."

Selection of References: TR 03 SE 38 Reeves 1995

SMR: "49 EM and 177 MD pottery sherds found by fieldwalking."

Selection of References: TR 03 SE 29 Reeves 1995

SMR: "40 EM and 6 MD pottery sherds found by fieldwalking."

Selection of References: TR 03 SE 42 Reeves 1995

SMR: "60 EM and 165 MD pottery sherds found by fieldwalking."

Selection of References: TR 03 SE 37 Reeves 1995

SMR: "128 pieces of EM and 159 pieces of Md Pottery found by field walking."

Selection of References: TR 03 NE 47 Reeves 1995
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>Date To</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>SMR Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NWC-FS24</td>
<td>Newchurch, Romney Marsh</td>
<td>605800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132700</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>20 EM and 47 piece of pottery found by field walking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWC-FS25</td>
<td>Newchurch, Romney Marsh</td>
<td>603500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>131100</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>340 pieces of EM and 588 pieces of MD pottery found by field walking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWC-FS26</td>
<td>Newchurch, Romney Marsh</td>
<td>603800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132500</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>16 EM and 15 Md sherds of pottery were found by fieldwalking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWC-FS27</td>
<td>Newchurch, Romney Marsh</td>
<td>603800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132500</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>20 pieces of EM and 35 pieces of EM pottery found by field walking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWC-FS28</td>
<td>Newchurch, Romney Marsh</td>
<td>603900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129500</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>17 EM and 16 Md pottery sherds were found by fieldwalking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWC-FS29</td>
<td>Newchurch, Romney Marsh</td>
<td>605600</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132600</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>49 EM and 177 MD pottery sherds found by fieldwalking.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: TR 03 SE 43, Reeves 1995

Selection of References: TR 03 SW 22, Reeves 1995

Selection of References: TR 03 SW 24, Reeves 1995

Selection of References: TR 03 SW 23, Reeves 1995

Selection of References: TR 02 NW 38, Reeves 1995

Selection of References: TR 03 SE 54, Reeves 1995
Newington NWT

Easting: 616900  Date From: 500  To: 700  Northing: 138600  Site-type: Cemetery

AS inhumations. Exact location uncertain though it would seem to be on a steep wooded SE facing slope on the down. Hawkes gives TQ1718 3893 as a possible location = lower down same slope, but it is well away from the road then. Hawkes also suggests that this is the site of the Postling finds. 1760: Deviant inhumation burial found by the roadside on Milky Down; crouched but with AS? necklace. 2 more skeletons found near by, one with beads, both in coffins. The site is in a valley, just above the 300' contour.

Selection of References: TR 13 NE 15 Richardson 2000, site 194

Newington Dolland's Moor NWT-2

Easting: 618100  Date From: 0  To: 0  Northing: 137200  Site-type: Cemetery

3 unaccompanied inhumation burials parallel to a late roman ditch bounding a hollow-way. Unstratified 6th century glass beads found. Doubtful inhumation burial site. Just south of M20 motorway on plateau between 2 deep gullies of Seabrook stream and a tributary, now part of the Channel Tunnel terminal.

Selection of References: Med Arch 1990 Richardson 2000, site 195

Newington NWT-FS01

Easting: 619590  Date From: 500  To: 600  Northing: 137900  Site-type: Find-Spot


Selection of References: Evison 1987

Newington NWT-FS02

Easting: 619590  Date From: 500  To: 600  Northing: 138000  Site-type: Find-Spot

Locality of find only known. Evison 1987,117: "Merovingian tremissis, [similar to FS124 & 125] Rigold 1975, 672, no.81.".

Selection of References: Evison 1987

Newington Dolland's Moor (Channel Tunnel) NWT-SET1

Easting: 617800  Date From: 500  To: 700  Northing: 137400  Site-type: Settlement

AS house and deposits found in multi-period settlement - E-MidA features mainly large pits, representing an extensive, open settlement. RB period settlement shifted N but the old enclosure converted into fields. Area was divided into plots, defined by new ditches. The settlement was abandoned in the LRB period, possibly due to poor soil fertility. AS occ is represented by 2 SFB's and other features associated with an isolated household. AS settlement with 2 SFBs and other features, grass tempered pottery, loomweight, sceat surface find, no evidence for continuity from the BA.

Selection of References: TR 13 NE 71 Duncan et al 1989

Newington Biggin's Wood (Channel Tunnel) NWT-SET2

Easting: 619530  Date From: 0  To: 0  Northing: 137910  Site-type: Settlement

AS settlement. SMR: "Multi-period settlement dating from the LNeo-EM periods. Discovered by CAT in advance of work on Channel Tunnel terminal. SFB located at the foot of the Downs, associated with a trackway, rubbish pits and post-holes for fences or animal pens. The floor of the hut was cut deeply into the ground and structural posts survived. Small stake-holes lining the internal edge of the house indicated a wattle wall. Midden refuse found and single item of jewellery, poss Rom origin. NGR approx".

Selection of References: TR 13 NE 72/68/66
Newington Danton Farm (Channel Tunnel) NWT-SET3

Easting: 619330  Date From: 950  To: 1100
Northing: 137850  Site-type: Settlement

11th C settlement with timber buildings. SMR: "Settlement spanning the LN to EM periods was discovered by CAT in advance of Channel Tunnel terminal works.*

Selection of References: TR 13 NE 67  Duncan et al 1989

Ozengell OZE

Easting: 635500  Date From: 475  To: 725
Northing: 165300  Site-type: Cemetery

AS Type 5 inhumation cemetery clustered on BA barrow complex & IA enclosure. Also includes EMC 1988.0102 Denier. 1845-50: AS cemetery disturbed in railway cutting at place of 'extensive sea views'. C.100 destroyed before Rolfe was able to investigate. 13 graves investigated with usual finds. Site SW of later excv. Numerous finds after this event. 1966: 7 graves to S of main site (Hawkes), & prob separate from cropmarks. 1976-81: (TTA) excv. W limit defined, stretches further S. 192 graves of which many robbed in antiquity. No of various structural features. TTA site 158

Selection of References: TR 36 NE 51/58/26 Richardson 2000, site 209

Upper Court, Ozengell OZE-FS1

Easting: 636410  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 165550  Site-type: Find-Spot

SMR: EM building and sub surface deposits at Upper Court

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Patrixbourne Church PAT

Easting: 618800  Date From: 500  To: 700
Northing: 155200  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

Doubtful inhumation cemetery. Meaney "1866: On a different part of the western brow of the downs from the Bifrons cemetery, just above Patrixbourne church, graves were found containing skeletons and iron fragments; there is no other information to help dating."

Selection of References: Meaney 1964  Richardson 2000, site 203

Pegwell Bay Cliffsend Farm PEG-IB1

Easting: 636000  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 164200  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

AS? Isolated burial? Location only. Meaney: "A cranium, described as that of an AS, found embedded in the cliff at Pegwell Bay, is in the BMNH; there is no record of the donor or the date that it was presented. This may be connected with the AS site at Ramsgate, if the use of the name Pegwell Bay reaches so far. Cliff is most likely to be below Little Cliffsend Farm, c. 725m south of Ozengell"

Selection of References: Meaney 1964  Richardson 2000, site 214

Petham PET-FS1

Easting: 613000  Date From: 680  To: 700
Northing: 151000  Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series A2 sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1996.0065
### Platt's Heath, Harrietsham  
**PLH-FS1**

- **Easting:** 587460  
- **Northing:** 150980  
- **Type:** Early Medieval Cropmark

Possible AS earthwork visible on APs. A linear earthwork running in a N-S direction immediately above the W-facing slopes of a small valley to the W of Platt's Heath, from TQ 87465098 to TQ 87175000. The best preserved stretch extending 200.0m across cleared woodland, comprises a large bank and ditch facing west with a slight counter-scarp bank. The overall traceable distance of the work is some 1000m and thus is probably a boundary rather than a defensive earthwork and possibly of DA date.

*Selection of References:* TQ 85 SE 11

### Postling  
**POS-FS1**

- **Easting:** 614000  
- **Northing:** 138000  
- **Type:** Find-Spot

Locality only AS isolated? Burials? 1773: A small gilt brooch with keystone garnets and a pair of shoe-shaped studs were evidently found at Postling, and were in Faussett's collection. C. R. Smith knew nothing of their discovery.

Subsequently discovered that it is a pair of brooches. 2 burials were implied by the report and datable to the 6th C. Hawkes wonders whether they might originate from another known site at Aldington/Lymne (Marwood Farm) or Newington, Milky Down.

*Selection of References:* Kent SMR (Maidstone)  
Richardson 2000, site 204

### Postling  
**POS-FS2**

- **Easting:** 610000  
- **Northing:** 138830  
- **Type:** Find-Spot

SMR A ninth century strap-end found in Postling in 1960, See Arch Cant 82 1967, 282-3

*Selection of References:* Kent SMR (Maidstone)

### Preston Deetson Farm  
**PRE-FS1**

- **Easting:** 623930  
- **Northing:** 159850  
- **Type:** Find-Spot

1872: Samain and other Rom Pottery including large black urns and containing burnt bones were revealed by digging.

Pre-1878: RB cremation cemetery with 15-20 pots assemblage found by Dowker in the same field. 1944: Myers identified 2 of these vessels as possibly post-roman small handmade grey fabric vessels with rounded base other "roughly WT" sub-roman

*Selection of References:* Dowker 1878b, 47-8  
Richardson 2000, site 205

### Preston  
**PRE-SET?**

- **Easting:** 625030  
- **Northing:** 160750  
- **Type:** Settlement

SMR: "Land to the E of The Street, Preston was subjected to arch trial trenching prior to housing development. Most of the site was devoid of finds except trench 5 in the SW corner of the site. The S end of trench 5 contained a large rectangular pit dated from 1 sherd of C4 pot found on the surface of the fill. An Un burnt clay hearth sealed the pit and both were cut into by a modern feature."

*Selection of References:* TR 26 SE 34

### Ramsgate  
**RAM-FS1**

- **Easting:** 638000  
- **Northing:** 164000  
- **Type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series Bia sceatta find

*Selection of References:* EMC 1994.0113
Ramsgate II, Station

**RAM-IB1**

**Easting:** 637900  **Date From:** 600  **To:** 700

**Northing:** 165470  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

AS isolated? Inhumation. 1932: A skeleton was found by workmen digging a trench to lay an electric cable c. 1' below the surface, in the chalk, at the junction of the Station Approach Road and Park Road. Near the remains were a small iron knife and a piece of glass. H. Hurd, who dated the burial to c.670 AD considered that it was part of a cemetery as "bones were found near the same spot years ago when the road was being dug". Possibly same as RAM-IB2 TTA site 166

**Selection of References:** TR 36 NE 32 Richardson 2000, site 207

Ramsgate III Ellington School Playing Field

**RAM-IB2**

**Easting:** 637700  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 165500  **Site-type:** isolated Burial?

AS? burials. Pre-1939: The material from 4 AS burials 'from Ramsgate' was given to Herne Bay Museum. With the burial of a woman aged c35 was a small black vessel. With a man aged 35-40 were 4 sherds of another pot. The other 2 were infants, c.6-7 months, sex not determined. Also found was a piece of iron 5.5" long by 0.125" wide. Possibly the same cemetery as RAM-IB1, SMR records AS burials. TTA site 82. A single burial in a form-fitted grave with flint boulders indented around the head was reported as found when slit trenches were dug, possibly one of the four in

**Selection of References:** TR 36 NE 124 Richardson 2000, site 208 Myres 1977

Ramsgate IV St Lawrence

**RAM-IB3**

**Easting:** 637500  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 164400  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

1846: silver fixed plate buckle in a grave at St Lawrence, Rolfe's collection. TTA 183: Mixed RB/AS burial site. 1846: Urns and buckle and other finds. 1877: bones, nails and horse teeth found

**Selection of References:** Akerman 1855 Richardson 2000, site 212

Reculver Foreshore

**REC-FS1**

**Easting:** 622470  **Date From:** 710  **To:** 715

**Northing:** 169320  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

It is assumed that this EMC record relates to the Philp find, though am not completely certain. Continental Series E sceatta find. SMR: Philp find of a sceatta on the foreshore, now in Maidstone Museum See also Arch Cant 22, 10,63 (Rigold)

**Selection of References:** EMC 1992.7474

Reculver

**REC-FS2**

**Easting:** 622000  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0

**Northing:** 169000  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

Variety of located finds sourced to Reculver though the exact location of the finds is unknown (Would seem to suggest that there was either a cemetery or settlement located near the Saxon Shore fort of the EAS period which has now eroded into the sea: TR26NW35: AS pot found in 1922; TR26NW66: AS pottery from Reculver; TR26NW68: Keystone Garnet Discbrooch; TR26NW71: AS bottle find; TR26NW73: AS painted sculpture; TR26NW76: Sceattas; TR26NW78: Beaker

**Selection of References:** Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Reculver

**REC-FS3**

**Easting:** 622100  **Date From:** 685  **To:** 715

**Northing:** 169000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. An English Series Bia-c sceatta and a Continental Series D sceatta recorded by Rigold in BNJ 1960-1

**Selection of References:** EMC 1960.0007-8
### Reculver

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 622000</th>
<th>Date From: 600 To: 807</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 169100</td>
<td>Site-type: Coin-find</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locality Only. 37 sceatta from Continent and England dating to 650-760 and some other coins; A Kentish silver penny from 798-807; a Merovingian gold tremissis dating to 639-657 and a Merovingian gold tremissis from 600-675, as well as a couple of coins post-900. In Bonser 1998 also a 810-840 Northumbrian styca.

**Selection of References:** EMC various

Bonser 1998

### Reculver II Foreshore

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 622000</th>
<th>Date From: 550 To: 750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 169000</td>
<td>Site-type: Isolated Burial?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AS Cemetery now probably all destroyed by coastal erosion. c.1700: 20 sceatta, Merovingian silver coin, 3 gold coins. Pre 1756: 33 coins (mostly sceattas) illustrated. 1828: Cant Mus presented with 2 Rom spearheads, battle-axe, Rom earthen vessel, 5 Rom lachrymatory. Some prob AS. Pre-1850 Roach Smith pub a keystone brooch. 1894: Copeland exhibited an AS Ae bowl. 1953: sceatta found on foreshore. Also a pair of gilt-bronze tweezers in the BM, a porospherae necklace in Maidstone Museum, and a bossed urn, in Herne Bay Museum.

**Selection of References:** TR 26 NW 66

Richardson 2000, site 216

Rigold & Metcalf 1984

### Reculver, St. Mary's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 622750</th>
<th>Date From: 0 To: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 169360</td>
<td>Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

St. Mary's Church and churchyard. Bones from 3 indiv were found protruding from cliff face. Likely churchyard burials. Historical - monastery founded AD 669. Religious house utilized Roman defences, and was built near centre of earlier fort, probably nr earlier wayside preaching cross, the early 7th C. base of which was found during 1927 excv. Ceased to function as monastery by the 10th C after which parish church. Much of the original extent of the Anglo-Saxon monastery has been destroyed by coastal erosion, although some buried traces will survive within the monument.

**Selection of References:** TR 26 NW 2

Richardson 2000, site 216

### Ringwould

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 635910</th>
<th>Date From: 500 To: 600</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 148320</td>
<td>Site-type: Cemetery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AS inhumation isolated? Burials. c1852: 2 skeletons found very near the surface, but in the chalk, at Ringwould, 6 m. from Dover on the road to Deal. With them were 2 iron spearheads, a single-edged 'coutle' (?scramasax), the iron ferrule of a spear, a belt ornament of gilt metal (set with red imitation gems), and a bronze buckle. A map in Deal Castle Museum shows the find spot at approximately TR 35914832, which falls in a shubbery on the south-west side of the drive to Ringwould House, which is still occupied by the Monins family.

**Selection of References:** TR 34 NE 8

Richardson 2000, site 217

Evion 1987

### Ringwould III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 636000</th>
<th>Date From: 680 To: 700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 149000</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMR: EM coin found at Walmer Court Farm. Assumed to mean this EMC coin. Kentish Series A3 sceatta metal detector find.

**Selection of References:** EMC 1996.0064

### Ringwould Golf Links

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting: 637500</th>
<th>Date From: 0 To: 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 146500</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1994 Stone bead may be Saxon? AF Richardson

**Selection of References:** Richardson 2000, site 220

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ringwould</th>
<th>RGW-FS3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 636390</td>
<td>Date From: 525 To: 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 149140</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal-detector find of an Ae Kentish bird mount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: Parfitt 1999b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ringwould</th>
<th>RGW-FS4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 636360</td>
<td>Date From: 475 To: 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 149120</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal-detector find of a damaged cruciform brooch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: Parfitt 1999b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ringwould</th>
<th>RGW-FS5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 636280</td>
<td>Date From: 500 To: 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 148720</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal-detector find of an ungilded button brooch with face mask</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: Parfitt 1999b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ringwould</th>
<th>RGW-FS6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 636190</td>
<td>Date From: 500 To: 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 148900</td>
<td>Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal-detector find of a gilded button brooch with face-mask</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: Parfitt 1999b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ringwould II Freedown</th>
<th>RGW-IB1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 636500</td>
<td>Date From: 500 To: 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 147100</td>
<td>Site-type: Isolated Burial?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible AS Inhumation burial, secondary in a barrow. 1945: A human skull and part of a pelvis found E of 2 BA tumuli explored in 1872. Skeleton said to have been crouched. A very fine circular brooch of c. 6th c. A.D. date, inlaid with garnets, on display in Deal Castle Museum, was found with an interment in an isolated Anglo-Saxon grave found near Ringwould Village. The date and circumstances of discovery and the actual findspot have not been recorded. Probably part of the same cemetery as RGW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of References: TR 34 NE 18/7 Richardson 2000, site 218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ringwould, Mill Service Station</th>
<th>RGW-IB2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 636470</td>
<td>Date From: 500 To: 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northing: 149350</td>
<td>Site-type: Isolated Burial?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS isolated? Burial. AS burial was revealed in pipe-line with Fe spear &amp; shield. This was apparently salvaged and recorded by a local archaeologist (Stebbing?), but no report ever published. Burial believed to be AS at the time. The finds and notes to this discovery must now be presumed lost. The 1980 pipe-line ran on the opposite side of the road to the garage but no other burials were encountered, suggesting that the earlier discovery was an isolated example. Evison thinks this one is doubtful and may not be Saxon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of References: TR 34 NE 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ringwould III with Kingsdown

**Easting:** 637700  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 148600  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

1960s: cesspool dug at Tythos St Monica’s Rd, Kindsdown, bones from a grave reburied in garden with spearhead recovered (not now lost). April 1999: nothing observed during watching brief of house construction c.30m to NE TR3772 4665

**Selection of References:** Richardson 2000, site 219

### Richborough

**Easting:** 632450  **Date From:** 600  **To:** 1050  
**Northing:** 160180  **Site-type:** Anglo-Saxon Church

AS church. Possibly 6th C. Chapel in Rom fort, beside which was a graveyard in which were found many Anglo-Saxon coins covering reigns from Offa of Mercia “757-96” to Cnut “King of England, 1016-35”. The chapel measured nearly 60ft in overall length.

**Selection of References:** TR 36 SW 45

### Richborough III

**Easting:** 632500  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 160210  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

SMR: EM axe find in the corner of Richborough Castle field near the cottage, by Akerman

**Selection of References:** Kent SMR (Maidstone)

### Richborough IV

**Easting:** 632000  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 160000  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

SMR: 2 x fibula and string of beads found in a barrow at Richborough

**Selection of References:** Kent SMR (Maidstone)

### Richborough

**Easting:** 631000  **Date From:** 680  **To:** 851  
**Northing:** 160000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. A number of coin finds from the eighteenth century, the twenties excavations and the 1968 campaign. 23 coins: Total of 10 x 7th and 8th century English sceattas, 3 x ninth century Northumbrian copper stycas (also in Bonser 1998), 5 x eighth century Canterbury pennies, 1 x eighth century London penny, 1 x eighth century East Anglian penny, 2 x unknown English mint eighth century pennies, 1 x eighth century French penny. In Bonser 1998: 1xBerhtwulf Of Mercia silver penny;

**Selection of References:** EMC various  
**Bonser 1998**

### Richborough

**Easting:** 632470  **Date From:** 350  **To:** 450  
**Northing:** 160460  **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

AS? primary barrow burial. Pre-1800: ‘In a manuscript journal in the possession of Mr Britton, Stukeley mentions the discovery at Richborough, in a barrow, of 2 elegant fibulas, made in gold and glass work, and a string of beads, evidently British. These were clearly Saxon fibulae and beads, such as are frequently found in Kent.’ (C. R. Smith.)

1928: A late 4th/5th C. AS burial was found in the Claudian ditches 722 ft. to the North of the Fort, possibly the site of a Federate cemetery (?) with iron spearhead and shield boss and pewter bowl.

**Selection of References:** TR 36 SW 16
**Richborough Castle**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>632400</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>600 To:</th>
<th>750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>160300</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of finds probably representing a cemetery including the other finds from within the castle (i.e. RIC-IB1 and RIC-FS1). 1913: finds deposited in the BM include annular/peannular brooch and strap-tag possible 7th century, returned to the owner in 1926, as well as the pre-1984 group of (c.680-735) sceattas found at the Castle.

**Selection of References:** Meaney 1964 Swanton 1973, 152-5

---

**Old Romney**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>603500</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>0 To:</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>125300</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AS settlement (historical).

**Selection of References:** TR 02 NW 5

---

**Old Romney**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>603200</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>0 To:</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>126800</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMR: "8 EM and 38 Md sherds of pottery were found by fieldwalking."

**Selection of References:** TR 02 NW 39 Reeves 1995

---

**Old Romney**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>603000</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>715 To:</th>
<th>750</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>157000</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locality Only. Continental Series E porcupine sceatta find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1993.0157

---

**Ripple**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>631490</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>0 To:</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>149690</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMR: EM brooch found near Wingleton Farm

**Selection of References:** Kent SMR (Maidstone)

---

**Ripple**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easting:</th>
<th>634000</th>
<th>Date From:</th>
<th>680 To:</th>
<th>700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northing:</td>
<td>149000</td>
<td>Site-type:</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locality Only. Kentish Series A3 sceatta find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1995.0070
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>Date To</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ripple</td>
<td>RPP-FS3</td>
<td>634650</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>149120</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Metal-detector find of a Primary Series B sceatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripple Mill Service Station</td>
<td>RPP-IB1</td>
<td>634700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1493500</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td>Doubtful inhumation burial site. Pre-1980: petrol tank construction revealed skeleton with Fe spear and shield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsgate I St Augustine's College</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>637500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>164500</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Roman and AS burials. Pre-1878: Rom cremation urn. C.1895: c.50 yards SW of this, a cist of large stones containing a male and female skeleton, many fragments of cinerary urns and portions of a Samian patera, was found with animal bones. 1846: Near Three Mills, Roman urns with calcined bones in proximity to Saxon swords placed beside skeletons. Site is near the junction of West Cliff Road and Grange Road. Also possible settlement site, visible from aerial photography and Medieval settlement discovered in 1982.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester IV Cathedral</td>
<td>RSC</td>
<td>574260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>168520</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon Church</td>
<td>Cathedral and Churchyard. Church of St. Andrew at Rochester founded in 604 by Ethelbert to the W of present cathedral. C.1080 addition of new building. 1888: AS foundations excv during cathedral underpinning. 1990: excv (CAT). 1st C. pits perhaps peripheral to a Rom settlement. 63 burials: 25 med, 6 posa AS; 35 post med, 3 late med or post med. No surviving earthworks of the AS church. 1960: 'Under Gundulph's tower - a number of AS graves possibly related to the original church. Finds include a spearhead, some pottery and a number of clench-nails from coffins.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester IV Cathedral Cemetery</td>
<td>RSC-2</td>
<td>574220</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>168540</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>MAS? Cemetery or Churchyard. 1960: 'Under the SW corner of Gundulph's tower at Rochester cathedral workmen installing a heating-system discovered a number of AS graves which may be related to the original church founded by Justus in 603. Finds include a spearhead, some pottery and a number of clench-nails from coffins.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester I Star Hill</td>
<td>RSH</td>
<td>574660</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>168070</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>AS inhumation cemetery. 1852: 20 skeletons found, with 5 spearheads, bronze armillae, buckle large and small rings, a keystone-garnet brooch an oblong belt-plate, several beads including one large one of amber, part of a 'vase' (n exhibited or described), and a bronze pi evidently Roman.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References:
- Parfitt 1999b
- TR 34 NE 28
- Richardson 2000, site 221
- Parfitt 1981
- TR 36 SE 6
- Richardson 2000, site 206
- Perkins et al 1987
- TQ 76 NW 97
- Newman 1980, 470-88
- TQ 76 NW 9
- Richardson 2000, site 225
- Smith 1945, 289-99
- TQ 76 NW 15
- Richardson 2000, site 222
- Meaney 1964, 134
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>SMR</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>Date To</th>
<th>Site-type</th>
<th>Selection of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochester FS1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>Kent SMR (Maidstone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 575000</td>
<td>Northing: 167000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR (AS bottle) 79 (button brooches)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester RST-FS2</td>
<td></td>
<td>829-829</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Bonser 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 575000</td>
<td>Northing: 167500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. Ecgberht of Wessex silver penny found.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester (Castle) RST-FS3</td>
<td></td>
<td>875-880</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Bonser 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 574200</td>
<td>Northing: 168000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locality Only. Alfred Cross-and-lozenge type penny excv.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester Short Bros. Works RST-IB1</td>
<td></td>
<td>500-700</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td>TQ 76 NW 38, Richardson 2000, site 224, Fisher 1939, 205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 573600</td>
<td>Northing: 167500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS isolated? Burial. 1939: AS grave containing a lower jaw with shield umbo, two spearheads and a long sword was found early in 1939, at the south end of Short Brothers' aeroplane works at Rochester, very close to the river.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester RST-IB5</td>
<td></td>
<td>500-700</td>
<td></td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td>TQ 76 NW 60, 'The Times' 31.10.1918 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 573000</td>
<td>Northing: 168000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMR: &quot;A skeleton buried in the chalk was discovered on 26.10.1918 by soldiers laying a drain at Rochester about half a mile west of the Medway &quot;not far from the spot where the Pilgrims crossed the river. Col.H.A.Haines reported that it lay with head west and was accompanied by a shield boss, a spearhead and two pieces of iron. Dr. C. Hercules Read pronounced the burial 'Jutish of the 5th or 6th c.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester RST-SET1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>TQ 76 NW 121, Holman 1986, 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easting: 574000</td>
<td>Northing: 168000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS town (historical). Coins from Rochester mint from the 7th C., 4th largest mint in 928. Cathedral city from 604 and mentioned in Bede. Apart from Cathedral excv, and the more distant AS cemeteries, little excv in the city to archaeologically prove origins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>Date From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Northing</td>
<td>Site Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruckinge Minster</td>
<td>602490</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>133500</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester II Watts Avenue</td>
<td>574050</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>168050</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandtun</td>
<td>612140</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>133880</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarre</td>
<td>626100</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>165050</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarre</td>
<td>625300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>164600</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References:
- Tatton-Brown 1988a
- Richardson 2000, site 223
- Meaney 1964, 134
- Brent 1862/3
- Richardson 2000, site 231
- TR 26 NE 164
- TR 26 SE 27
### Sarre (AKA Minster Cemetery)

**SAR-FS3**

- **Easting:** 626100
- **Date From:** 575
- **To:** 625
- **Northing:** 165050
- **Site-type:** Cemetery

Misidentified as burial. Actually Sarre, as pointed out by Hawkes in AC 100 1984, but recorded by Meaney as a separate site. Her entry: "Minster in Thanet: A large jewelled brooch and a bronze vessel found in 'an ancient burying ground 3 rods East of the town', in 1841. Many barrows and human bones reported."

**Selection of References:** TR 36 SW 34

### Sarre

**SAR-FS4**

- **Easting:** 626300
- **Date From:** 0
- **To:** 0
- **Northing:** 165050
- **Site-type:** Find-Spot

SFB found in pipeline trench, AC...

**Selection of References:** TTA site 600

### Sarre

**SAR-SET1**

- **Easting:** 625800
- **Date From:** 700
- **To:** 900
- **Northing:** 164900
- **Site-type:** Settlement

Me: Distribution of Middle Saxon Pottery

**Selection of References:** Kent SMR (Maidstone)

### Sandwich

**SAW**

- **Easting:** 632000
- **Date From:** 600
- **To:** 700
- **Northing:** 158000
- **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

SMR: "Anglo-Saxon finds from Sandwich, in Herne Bay Museum. No details known. Four burials. One female aged about 35, 5'3" high. One male aged from 35 yo 40, 5'6 1/4" high. Two children of from 6 to 7 months. On pot of black fabric, 1/4" thick, with striated surface, and soot in the lower exterior. Four sherds of another pot, Black, with everted rim. One iron knife. [Classified as "Inhumation Burials"] (1); Belgic cemetery dug in 1998 which included 3 saxon inhumation with c.7th century pottery"

**Selection of References:** TR 32 NW 51

### Sandwich III

**SAW-FS1**

- **Easting:** 633000
- **Date From:** 428
- **To:** 597
- **Northing:** 158000
- **Site-type:** Find-Spot

AS findspots. pre-1792: Kentish disc brooch Class I.2 in the Sandwich neighbourhood. Nightingale (1857-9 PSA long. 4, 334-5) records a gold pendant and Ae fish head In Boys collection as labelled Sandwich, part of another brooch also from Sandwich. 1830: 2 AS runic stones, dated circa 428 - 597, found by Mr. Boy's labourers in an open field nr. Sandwich

**Selection of References:** TR 35 NW 46

### Sandwich II

**SAW-FS2**

- **Easting:** 633750
- **Date From:** 0
- **To:** 0
- **Northing:** 157900
- **Site-type:** Find-Spot

SMR: Pits revealed in Manwood Grange which included EM deposits and pottery

**Selection of References:** Kent SMR (Maidstone)
Sandwich SAW-FS3
Easting: 633000  Date From: 600  To: 675
Northing: 158000  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Merovingian Belfort type tremissis find

Selection of References: EMC 1995.0064

Sandwich SAW-FS4
Easting: 633000  Date From: 796  To: 798
Northing: 157900  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Eadberht Praen of Kent penny. Three Line Type.

Selection of References: Bonser 1998

Sandwich, nr. SAW-FS5
Easting: 633000  Date From: 839  To: 843
Northing: 158100  Site-type: Coin find
Locality Only. SAXONIORVM type silver penny found.

Selection of References: Bonser 1998

Sandwich, nr. SAW-FS6
Easting: 633100  Date From: 844  To: 848
Northing: 158000  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Northumbrian styca (Aethelred II) found

Selection of References: Bonser 1998

Sandwich SAW-SET1
Easting: 633000  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 158000  Site-type: Settlement
Possible MAS settlement. LAS settlement (historical)

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Sandwich, St. Mary's SAW-SET2
Easting: 632950  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 158410  Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church
MAS? Church of St Mary the Virgin. C13th. According to tradition, a convent founded here in 664-673, but was destroyed in a Danish invasion and rebuilt by Queen Emma, wife of King Canute. Nothing remains from these times except a few sections of walling beneath the present floor. The Norman church which took its place was considerably altered during the C13, C14 and C15 and greatly damaged by an earthquake in 1579.

Selection of References: TR 35 NW 18
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Selection of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Court Farm, Deal</td>
<td>633000</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>EMC 1998.0126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strood Temple Farm</td>
<td>573300</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>TQ 76 NW 30/268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strood II (Cuxton) Railway</td>
<td>572000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>TQ 76 NW 43/139/60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strood III Coach and Horses</td>
<td>572950</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>TQ 76 NW 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stodmarsh</td>
<td>621400</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>TR 26 SW 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasalter</td>
<td>608000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TR 06 SE 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shelford Farm Hackington

Easting: 616490 Date From: 500 To: 650
Northing: 160280 Site-type: Isolated Burial?

AS inhumation cemetery? Pre-1928: burial, with 2 bronze-gilt birds with silver plates, a spearhead and a shield-boss, in a field between roads to Broad Oak and Shelford Farm from the railway crossing just above the Great Stour. All the finds except the shield-boss are in the BM. March 1985: metal detector survey recorded 4 As buckles, 1 spearhead, Anglian florid cruciform brooch, frags to RMC. CAT desktop survey 1996: Seems to show that the earlier 6th century material was from the top of the ridge (50m OD) with later 6th and 7th C material from lower part of the slope (15-20m OD)

Selection of References: TR 16 SE 2 Richardson 2000, site 127

Sholden

Easting: 635700 Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 152800 Site-type: Find-Spot

SMR: Excavated Roman building which revealed an AS bone comb

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Sholden II Upper Deal

Easting: 635910 Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 152120 Site-type: Isolated Burial?

AS isolated? Burial, c.1898. Saxon graves found in Upper Deal. 1939: "late Jutish or early Anglo-Saxon burial" was discovered when an electric cable trench was being dug below the footpath on the western side of London Road, Upper Deal, opposite the bridle path to North Deal at approximately TR 3591 5212. The grave, 19 inches below the footpath, was orientated EW and contained the skeleton of a young individual with a very thin skull and slightly worn teeth. There were no associated grave goods.

Selection of References: TR 35 SE 27 Richardson 2000, site 83

Shorne

Easting: 569000 Date From: 616 To: 640
Northing: 171000 Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only, Kentish Sutherland VII thrymsa metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1999.0004

Shrubsoles Hill, Sheppey

Easting: 598625 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 171637 Site-type: Settlement

SMR: Evaluation and Excavation by Thames Valley Archaeological Services in advance of clay extraction & infill in 1999 revealed a number of Early Medieval features. A large penuanlar ring-ditch c.25-30m diameter was found close to a number of gullies, pits, postholes and a possible sunken-feature building accompanied by pottery, animal bone and burnt and worked flint. Spot dating of the pottery suggests an early medieval date (AD 450-650) although some pottery from a large pit (Pit 424) may be Roman

Selection of References: TQ 97 SE 40

Sibertswold Barfriston

Easting: 626650 Date From: 600 To: 725
Northing: 149000 Site-type: Cemetery

AS Type 4 barrow cemetery. Incl EMC entries. Now woodland (1999). Fausett saw Sibertswold & Barfriston as 2 sep cembs but Meaney & Evison count as one, Groups are within sight of one another & dev around a crossroads & meeting point of 3 parish boundaries (Eythome/Barfriston= ioE). 1772-3: 181 graves in 162 AS tumuli in 2 groups. 3 not richly furnished; 19 only knife, 28 nothing; many weapons. C.160 paces away, Barfriston Down, 46 more in 45 tumuli. In 2 cases, Rom cremations disturbed by AS graves. Gr 1-171 in upper burial ground; gr 172-181 in lower burial ground.

Selection of References: TR 24 NE 2 Richardson 2000, site 232
Sittingbourne I Chalkwell

Easting: 589460 Date From: 500 To: 600
Northing: 163770 Site-type: Cemetery

AS isolated? Burials? 1882: 2 AS graves found c. 150 yds. SW of Watling Street & 120 yds. from Rom burials, on lowish ground. Gr.1: 2 fluted glasses (7thC. Pouch-bottles?), one on each side of the head, & a bucket near them; Gr.2: Ae buckle. The chalk-pit in which these graves were found went of out use c.1900 & it has been used as a Haulage Contractors Depot since about 1939. The pit face in the vicinity of the grave at TQ 89486377 is overgrown and mutilated by buildings. Possibly another jewelled ornament, possibly coming from the burials listed as SMRTQ86SE28.

Selection of References: TQ 86 SE 20 Richardson 2000, site 235

Sittingbourne II Fulstone Manor

Easting: 590600 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 162700 Site-type: Find-Spot

Locality only: pre-1872: spearhead c.20cm long recorded from Fulston Farm, but exact findspot not know.

Selection of References: Hawkes & Grove 1963 Richardson 2000, site 236

Sittingbourne IV

Easting: 591000 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 163000 Site-type: Find-Spot

Locality only. 2 pots listed as from Sittingbourne. Small shouldered vessel with hollow neck, and small sharp shouldered vessel.

Selection of References: Myres 1977, corp. 457-8 Richardson 2000, site 238

Sittingbourne

Easting: 590000 Date From: 645 To: 655
Northing: 163000 Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. Kentish Sutherland Ivii thrymsa find

Selection of References: EMC 1973.6309

Sittingbourne III Murston

Easting: 592400 Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 164600 Site-type: Isolated Burial?

AS isolated? Burial. Low ground, not far from Milton Creek. 1929: AS grave, containing a skeleton and a sword, was found 4ft. below ground level at Mere's Court, Murston. [TQ 92 64] : Mr Bridges, of Meres Court, cannot offer any information about this find, though he was resident here in 1928.

Selection of References: TQ 96 SW 10 Richardson 2000, site 237

Saltwood, Stone Farm Bridleway

Easting: 615970 Date From: 500 To: 600
Northing: 136960 Site-type: Cemetery

BA barrow with c.10 sixth century interments. Unnamed stream to the immediate north of the cemetery. Also a single SFB c.20m to the east of the barrow ditch which had no finds. Grave 1323 within the cemetery had 2 groups of 'clench-nails' with diamond washers, making a total of 7 clench nails and one nail (contexts 1110 and 1323).

Selection of References: CAT pers com

526
Saltwood, URS 1999c

Easting: 615750  Date From: 575  To: 700
Northing: 136950  Site-type: Cemetery

Cemetery half dug by CAT and assumed to have also been the same cemetery as was dug to the east by TWA. Also focussed on BA barrow, with mostly 7th century inhumations reintered therein. Total of c.85 burials on both sides of a modern bridleway, which is itself co-linear with a possible Saxon ditch, which has been argued on this evidence to be a real boundary, possibly suggesting 2 cemeteries rather than one. Seems a bit unlikely. At least 2 further SFBs were excavated during the construction of the M20 to the north.

Selection of References: CAT pers com

Saltwood, SLT99

Easting: 615620  Date From: 500  To: 700
Northing: 136920  Site-type: Cemetery

Third cemetery on the flatish plateau with 6th, 7th century burials reintered into a BA barrow. Roman metalled road excavated c.40m metres to the west. And a further SFB found c.40m to the NW of the cemetery.

Selection of References: CAT pers com

Saltwood Settlement

Easting: 615450  Date From: -600  To: 700
Northing: 136950  Site-type: Settlement

Holloway, ditch and late Roman/Anglo-Saxon pottery. SFB and possibly two hall structures and a barn? Excavated as part of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link

Selection of References: CAT pers. comm. Glass 1999, 199-200

St. Margaret's-Cliffe IV Tennis Court

Easting: 636410  Date From: 500  To: 700
Northing: 144490  Site-type: Cemetery

AS Type 5 (BA barrow with AS secondaries) cemetery. 1920: 6 graves uncovered by tennis court construction. Graves found 2' below surface, by side in 2 parallel rows with 3 graves in each, heads W. Nearby, 6' deep - crouch burial. No associated objects. Extended burials dated to the AS period based on skull shape and the known AS pre-dilection for burial in already existing barrows. This is probably the last of a group - see TR 34 SE 6. When a neighbouring house was built in 1957, the SW half of the barrow was levelled off during the laying out of a garden, but no finds were made.

Selection of References: TR 34 SE 2 Richardson 2000, site 229

St. Margaret's-Cliffe II

Easting: 636000  Date From: 600  To: 700
Northing: 144300  Site-type: Cemetery

AS Type 5 (BA barrows with AS secondaries) cemetery. 1724: 2 clusters of c.30 barrows on slope around a large BA barrow, c. 350m S of St Margaret's Church & covering c.1.5 acres. A further barrow lies c. 25m beyond the SW end of the main group. Part destroyed by road. 1775: 6-8 barrows opened - 20 glass beads in 1 grave, arrowhead in another. 1782: c.14 barrows opened - Fe knife. Also BA? cremation. 1943: W, 18-22 yrs old, found. AS or RB? No barrows seen during fieldwork, is possible that the round barrow at Bay Hill (TR 34 SE 2) is the last surviving one of the group.

Selection of References: TR 34 SE 6 Richardson 2000, site 227

St. Margaret's-Cliffe I

Easting: 636200  Date From: 500  To: 700
Northing: 144000  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

Locality only. AS isolated? Burial. 1911: an aged male skull was found during excavations by Pearson and Sons, Contractors. It was dated at the time to between the 6th and 8th century. In BM. Probably the same cemetery as SMC. Ante 1960 An iron knife and 3 shield-bosses from St Margaret's at Cliff are in Dover Museum. They were not brought to the Museum until long after the accidental discovery and nothing more is known about them.

Selection of References: TR 34 SE 16/11 Richardson 2000, site 226 Evison 1987
AS isolated? Burial. AS burial with an iron spearhead and glass beads was found c.1930 whilst digging foundations for a house called 'Ballygange' (now 'Wave Hill') in Salisbury Road, St.Margaret's Bay, (a) at TR 36584468. The finds are believed to have been retained by the late Colonel Cavenagh, a local historian, who investigated the site.

Selection of References: TR 34 SE 5
Richardson 2000, site 228

Smeeth

Easting: 607000 Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 139000 Site-type: Find-Spot

Collection of AS finds sited to locality only. 1828: E. Hughes presented to the Canterbury Literary Institute a 'Collection of Rom antiquities found at Smeeth, Kent, comprising a spearhead, parts of a sword, a dirk, a copper culinary utensil, a crystal boss or bulla with portions of a silver chain with which it had been suspended, a ring of twisted silver wire, copper brooch, button or fibula for the attire, 4 ornamented clasps, and a fibula for confining the toga, a coloured earthen bead, and portions of buckles and ornaments belonging to the girdle.

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

St Nicholas at Wade

Easting: 628000 Date From: 680 To: 685
Northing: 167000 Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series BX sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1993.9099

St Nicholas at Wade

Easting: 628100 Date From: 700 To: 715
Northing: 167000 Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. Continental Series D sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1993.9160

St Nicholas at Wade

Easting: 628000 Date From: 720 To: 740
Northing: 167100 Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. Hamwic Series H sceatta find

Selection of References: EMC 1993.9291

St Nicholas at Wade

Easting: 622790 Date From: 757 To: 796
Northing: 167000 Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. London silver penny find

Selection of References: EMC 2000.0055
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>STF</th>
<th>STN-FS1</th>
<th>STN-FS2</th>
<th>STN-FS3</th>
<th>STO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>Easting: 612400 Date From: 0 To: 0 Northing: 136900 Site-type: Early Medieval Cropmark</td>
<td>Easting: 625000 Date From: 720 To: 740 Northing: 162000 Site-type: Coin-find</td>
<td>Easting: 596000 Date From: 0 To: 0 Northing: 142000 Site-type: Find-Spot</td>
<td>Easting: 599000 Date From: 700 To: 710 Northing: 161000 Site-type: Coin-find</td>
<td>Easting: 599160 Date From: 730 To: 1066 Northing: 161320 Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Selection of References: TR 13 NW 20 | | | | | | Selection of References: TQ 96 SE 2 Richardson 2000, site 246

Selection of References:
Sutton II East Studdal

Easting: 632000  Date From: 600  To: 700
Northing: 150000  Site-type: Cemetery

1977: AS cemetery as soil marks in a ploughed field with 4 pennanular ditches (one enclosed 2 graves) over area c. 9m across to the S of the adjacent road. Enclosure causeways point downhill. Other graves further downhill A. Appleby in Hawkes' archive.

Selection of References: Richardson 2000, site 253

Sutton?

Easting: 632000  Date From: 600  To: 675
Northing: 149000  Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. Merovingian gold tremissis metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1998.0084

Sutton I Downs

Easting: 633400  Date From: 500  To: 700
Northing: 148500  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

c.1876: AS grave next to a cart track leading to Wickland Farm (now Wingleton Farm). 1911: some AS beads seen plus Fe objects

Selection of References: Parfitt 1992, 192-3  Richardson 2000, site 252

Swale

Easting: 595000  Date From: 600  To: 900
Northing: 173000  Site-type: Settlement

SMR: AS coin find; SMRTQ97SE30: AS Settlement - "Excavations in Minster village (TQ 9573) by Sheppey Archaeological Society have recovered material of 7th to 9th century date including seven... bronze dress pins, post-hole evidence for timber buildings... a 737-758 Saxon silver coin... samples of Anglo-Saxon glass... and as much Anglo-Saxon "Ipswich ware" pottery as produced by all the excavations at Canterbury combined."

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Stowting

Easting: 612340  Date From: 500  To: 600
Northing: 142370  Site-type: Cemetery

AS Type 4 inhumation cemetery on lower slopes with wide view N of Stowting village. Pre-1844: 2 burials & weapons. Nr 'some hundreds of Ae Rom coins ploughed up in 1790. 1844: 30< skels found during road building - weapons, Fe frags (coffins?); beads; brooches, buckles, plates & studs, bottle-vase, etc found. 1866: (Brent) 25 graves, 34 skels.1 with 6 W. 29 furnished, 1 richly, & 1 with knife. 1868: skel with spearhead. 1881: 8 more graves in diff area, 9 furnished. There may have been other graves, but the labour needed to excavate them was too great and the effort abandoned.

Selection of References: TR 14 SW 3  Richardson 2000, site 247

Stowting Common

Easting: 612000  Date From: 500  To: 700
Northing: 143000  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

1.5km N of Stowting village SMR: Arch 41 pt.2 1867,416 (J. Brent) "At the period when the cemetery at Stowting was in use there was probably a population scattered through the valley immediately beneath it at Brabourne Lees (Brabourne II Lees) and on Stowting Common (TR14SW44) similar interments have been found.

Selection of References: TR 14 SW 44  Richardson 2000, site 248
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Site-type</th>
<th>Selection of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Throwley (Belmont Park)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>598500</td>
<td>156400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>TBP</td>
<td>SMR: AS brooch from a burial; Meaney: &quot;Belmont Park, Throwley. Inhumation burials. K 44 NE, 45 NW. TQ 985564. Coll Ant, II (1852), 163. VCH, p. 383. OS records. 1852 Coll Ant records a Jutish type of square-headed brooch found here. The OS index records AS Burials near the 200' contour of the ridge.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teynham II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>596900</td>
<td>163900</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>TEY</td>
<td>AS inhumation? Cemetery? Low ground c.m. SW of Village. 1888: Workmen found sword &amp; beads; also urn, knife &amp; more beads. 1890 3 'remarkable' AS brooches, amber &amp; glass beads, Ae armilla, Ae buckles, &amp; Fe key Frag of glass vase. Payne also shown spear, boss, shield-stud &amp; sword, from another grave. Same site or King's Field, Faversham? 1894: Gr - gold &amp; garnet disc brooch, a gold &amp; garnet pendant, openwork pendant, &amp; 2 circular pendant beads of porphyritic marble, threaded with silver wire. In Cant Mus there is a Coptic bowl from Teynham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teynham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>595000</td>
<td>163580</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>TEY-FS1</td>
<td>Locality Only. London mint silver penny metal detector find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teynham I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>595450</td>
<td>163350</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>TEY-IB1</td>
<td>AS isolated? Burial. Poes duplicate of TEY. 1888: AS interment 3 fibulae, frag. spearhead, shield, beads &amp; Ae armilla, buckle, ring. frag. 1889: glass vase found. Finds possibly smuggled by workmen from King's Field, Faversham. One or more graves? with them also the other finds listed under TEY. It is possible the whole of the objects mentioned came from the same locality. Also, Saxon loom weights found on site of Black Huts just tp West of Osiers Farm, now site of council houses. No details given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teynham, Osiers Farm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>596300</td>
<td>163050</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TEY-SET1</td>
<td>MAS/LAS settlement? 1927: &quot;On the stream below Osiers Farm, near Barrow Green, Mr. Gate's father unearthed some wooden piles which seemed to form part of a landing stage. It is known that the creeks of the River Swayle were navigable in Roman times. Fragments of a large pitcher found 1927 near Osier Farm. Indications of a late Saxon settlement &amp;c - 9c near the farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teynham</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>596500</td>
<td>163350</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>TEY-SET2</td>
<td>SMR: &quot;EM Pottery found by paul Wilkinson through field-walking the area in 1996. Mr. Wilkinson believes this pottery supports the poss. of a church presence in the area as early as AD 798. The A-S charter of the same year indicates that Arch. Aethelhard was building up land at Teynham. No further details given.&quot; Maybe St. Mary's (TQ 96 SE 5) at 596600/163600 (12th century church incorporating roman tiles) is the church mentioned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teynham Manor

**Easting:** 596610  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 183660  **Site-type:** Settlement

12th to 15th C. Archbishops of Canterbury's Palace. 1982-3: KARU excv of Teynham Church; 4 major masonry builds. A substantial ditch beneath one of the buildings contained early pottery. The north wall of one range had been incorporated at a later date into the present churchyard wall. The adjacent parish church was a major element in the palace layout. Up to 1847 portions of the ruins were used as farm buildings but in that year, we are told, "the remaining vestiges were destroyed".

**Selection of References:** TQ 96 SE 1

### Teynham Minster

**Easting:** 596500  **Date From:** 0  **To:** 0  
**Northing:** 183500  **Site-type:** Anglo-Saxon Church

Certain 'old' Minster church, probably 7th/8th century - Tatton-Brown 1988 "The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the 11th century"

**Selection of References:** Tatton-Brown 1988a

### Thumham I Thumham Friars

**Easting:** 580660  **Date From:** 575  **To:** 650  
**Northing:** 157810  **Site-type:** Cemetery

AS inhumation cemetery. Nr Pilgrim's Way on lower scarp slope above the 300' contour. 1913: AS cemetery discov during bowling green construction. Although certain that a number of burials were disturbed and a quantity of grave-goods discovered, 2 iron open-socketed spearheads, 4 amethyst beads, one blue Roman melon bead and 2 small blue glass beads were all that were preserved. No subsequent finds are known to have been made, and the present whereabouts of the spearheads, etc., was not determined.

**Selection of References:** TQ 85 NW 5 Richardson 2000, site 260

### Thumham II

**Easting:** 581340  **Date From:** 600  **To:** 700  
**Northing:** 157550  **Site-type:** Find-Spot

AS findspot 1967: A-S gold cross ploughed up at Aldington Farm, Thumham. Sold at Sotheby's in November to a private collector. Find site as given to the police by Beer is TQ 81315753 (a) but the exact find spot is not really known as it is obvious the object was dragged about before recognition. Presumably from a burial but perambulation revealed nothing significant. Cross (6.7 cm. long), set with a central garnet and with garnets at each end of the arms (one stone missing). Belongs to a series of Kentish and East Anglian garnet-and-gold crosses. Made of pale gold.

**Selection of References:** TQ 85 NW 24 Richardson 2000, site 261

### Thumham

**Easting:** 580000  **Date From:** 695  **To:** 705  
**Northing:** 157000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series F sceatta metal detector find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1998.2083

### Thumham

**Easting:** 580100  **Date From:** 700  **To:** 715  
**Northing:** 157000  **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Continental Series D sceatta metal detector find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1997.0052
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Site-type</th>
<th>Selection of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tankerton</td>
<td>612000</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>166000</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>EMC 1974.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Toll</td>
<td>585170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128400</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>TQ 82 NE 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Deal</td>
<td>636000</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>151000</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>EMC 1985.0067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upchurch</td>
<td>583060</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>167250</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>TQ 86 NW 20 Richardson 2000, site 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall End, Upstreet</td>
<td>624400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163950</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>TR 26 SW 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldershare Park, Dover</td>
<td>628000</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>148000</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>EMC 1998.2042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Name</td>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>Northing</td>
<td>Date From</td>
<td>Date To</td>
<td>Site-type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldershare Park, Dover</td>
<td>628100</td>
<td>148000</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldershare Park, Dover</td>
<td>628100</td>
<td>148100</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldershare Park, Dover</td>
<td>627900</td>
<td>148000</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldershare Park, Dover</td>
<td>627900</td>
<td>148100</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldershare Park, Dover</td>
<td>627900</td>
<td>147900</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickhambreux II Grove Ferry</td>
<td>623500</td>
<td>163500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of References: EMC 1999.0020
Selection of References: EMC 1997.0122
Selection of References: EMC 1998.4001
Selection of References: EMC 1999.0137
Selection of References: EMC 1998.2113
Wingham WGH

Easting: 624950  Date From: 575 To: 650
Northing: 156900  Site-type: Cemetery


Selection of References: TR 25 NW 19  Richardson 2000, site 276  Avent 1975

Wingham II WGH-2

Easting: 624600  Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 157400  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

[locality only] Discovery of ancient implements of warfare by workmen were digging a gravel pit. Numerous spearheads and near them 3 perfect skeletons. The Antiquary 1885, 133

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Wingham WGH-FS1

Easting: 624050  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157240  Site-type: Find-Spot

SMR: AS-Friesian pottery found amongst the RB villa

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Wingham Minster WGH-SET1

Easting: 624150  Date From: 700 To: 900
Northing: 157395  Site-type: Anglo-Saxon Church

Certain 'oldest Minster church, probably 7th/8th century - according to Tatton-Brown 1988 "The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the 11th century"

Selection of References: Tatton-Brown 1988a

Wickhambreux WHB

Easting: 622700  Date From: 575 To: 650
Northing: 160440  Site-type: Cemetery

AS inhumation? Cemetery? Low ground overlooking Stour. No mention of barrow or skels. Poss crem. 1886: From gravel pit - AS swords, spears, 2 shield-bosses, pot frags. In 1 irv grave - Ae bowl, sword, Ae/garnet/gold buckle & clawbreaker. 1910: HM um from Faversham or Wick. displayed. The site of its discovery is unk. Also found were a bottle and a biconical bowl.

Selection of References: TR 26 SW 9  Richardson 2000, site 271  Davidson & Webster 1967

Wickhambreux III Church WHB-2

Easting: 622000  Date From: 500 To: 700
Northing: 158750  Site-type: Cemetery

Churchyard site: 1974: 3 pottery vessels at Wickhambreux Church near the base of the Little Stour valley.

Selection of References: TR 25 NW 35  Richardson 2000, site 273
### Wickhambreux Grove Pit

**WHB-FS1**

- **Easting:** 623760  
- **Date From:** 0  
- **To:** 0  
- **Northing:** 161950  
- **Site-type:** Find-Spot

Pre-1958: AS lead weight from Grove Pit on the edge of marshland to the end of Grove Hill

**Selection of References:**  
Chadwick 1958, 68  
Richardson 2000, site 274

### Wickhambreux

**WHB-FS2**

- **Easting:** 622000  
- **Date From:** 0  
- **To:** 0  
- **Northing:** 158000  
- **Site-type:** Find-Spot

Locality only: 1910: small grey biconical WT bowl with rouletting check Meaney

**Selection of References:**  
TR 26 SW 15  
Richardson 2000, site 275  
Whiting 1927

### Wickhambreux

**WHB-FS3**

- **Easting:** 622000  
- **Date From:** 700  
- **To:** 730  
- **Northing:** 158000  
- **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Continental Series E sceatta plumed bird type find

**Selection of References:**  
EMC 1992.0220

### Whitfield I Old Park

**WHF**

- **Easting:** 629430  
- **Date From:** 600  
- **To:** 700  
- **Northing:** 143750  
- **Site-type:** Cemetery


**Selection of References:**  
TR 34 SW 49/182  
Richardson 2000, site 269  
Rigold & Metcalf 1984

### Whitfield

**WHF-FS1**

- **Easting:** 630000  
- **Date From:** 890  
- **To:** 710  
- **Northing:** 144000  
- **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series BZ sceatta metal detector find

**Selection of References:**  
EMC 1996.0070

### Whitfield II

**WHF-IB1**

- **Easting:** 630500  
- **Date From:** 0  
- **To:** 0  
- **Northing:** 145520  
- **Site-type:** Isolated Burial?

Doubtful inhumation cemetery. 1976: burial, head to the E with 4 large Fe Nails, coffin?, revealed in sewer trench in Nursery Lane Whitfield. Date uncertain.

**Selection of References:**  
Willison 1986, 54-57  
Richardson 2000, site 270
### Whitstable

**WHI-FS1**

- **Easting:** 614310
- **Date From:** 600
- **To:** 700
- **Northing:** 167770
- **Site-type:** Coin-find

7th century gold coin (Merovingian) found in 1952 on a beach at Swalecliffe. Washed out of the cliff? Now in the BM 1953-5-4-1

**Selection of References:** Kent SMR (Maidstone)

### West Hythe

**WHY-FS01**

- **Easting:** 612000
- **Date From:** 700
- **To:** 750
- **Northing:** 134000
- **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Continental Series E sceatta metal detector find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1999.0040

**WHY-FS02**

- **Easting:** 612100
- **Date From:** 715
- **To:** 720
- **Northing:** 134000
- **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series N sceatta metal detector find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1999.0041

**WHY-FS03**

- **Easting:** 612000
- **Date From:** 720
- **To:** 735
- **Northing:** 134100
- **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. English Series O sceatta metal detector find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1999.0042

**WHY-FS04**

- **Easting:** 611900
- **Date From:** 796
- **To:** 798
- **Northing:** 134000
- **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Canterbury mint silver penny find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1985.0071

**WHY-FS05**

- **Easting:** 611900
- **Date From:** 798
- **To:** 805
- **Northing:** 134100
- **Site-type:** Coin-find

Locality Only. Canterbury mint silver penny metal detector find

**Selection of References:** EMC 1999.0043
West Hythe

WHY-FS06

Easting: 611900  Date From: 796 To: 805
Northing: 133900  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Canterbury mint silver penny find

Selection of References:  EMC 1985.0072

West Hythe

WHY-FS07

Easting: 612200  Date From: 810 To: 821
Northing: 134000  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Canterbury mint silver penny metal detector find

Selection of References:  EMC 1996.0178

West Hythe

WHY-FS08

Easting: 612200  Date From: 796 To: 821
Northing: 134100  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Canterbury mint silver penny metal detector find

Selection of References:  EMC 1996.0179

West Hythe

WHY-FS09

Easting: 612050  Date From: 600 To: 675
Northing: 134000  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Merovingian Quentovic tremissis find

Selection of References:  EMC 1970.2127

West Hythe

WHY-FS10

Easting: 612050  Date From: 755 To: 768
Northing: 134050  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. French silver penny metal detector find

Selection of References:  EMC 1998.0028

West Hythe

WHY-FS11

Easting: 612025  Date From: 796 To: 798
Northing: 134000  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Eadberht Praen of Kent penny. Three Line Type.

Selection of References:  Bonser 1998
West Hythe

Easting: 612000  Date From: 798 To: 802
Northing: 133900  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Cenwulf of Mercia silver penny found.

Selection of References: Bonser 1998

Woodnesborough

Easting: 630000  Date From: 700 To: 725
Northing: 156000  Site-type: Settlement
SMR: Woodnesborough, near Sandwich - A moated mound by the church. Probably the work of Ine in 715 - appears in a list of moated mounds or burghs.

Selection of References: TR 35 NW 106

Woodnesborough II

Easting: 630810  Date From: 550 To: 650
Northing: 156830  Site-type: Cemetery
AS Type 4? Inhumation burial/s? Pre-1793: c.30 glass-vessels find. Payne places discv in lrg tumulus behind church. Boys received a 'fibula' from Woodnesborough. Pre-1852: WT jug find. N of church - Hasted records a flat topped mound called The Mount. - (site of) number of Roman & AS finds. WT jug & bell beaker. Prob site of c.1845 dug AS burial & the 30 glass vessels. 1902: Field near Waltn c 460m fro Woodnesborough Church, layer in area c.30sqm full of calcinated bones, c.100m distant in same field further layer of burnt bones at c.1.22m deep. Funerary or ritual deposit

Selection of References: TR 35 NW 38  Richardson 2000, site 277  Davidson & Webster 1967

Woodnesborough III

Easting: 629000  Date From: 400 To: 500
Northing: 157000  Site-type: Coin-find
SMR: AS gold coin find

Selection of References: Kent SMR (Maidstone)

Woodnesborough IV

Easting: 630600  Date From: 0 To: 0
Northing: 157400  Site-type: Find-Spot
SMR: An Anglo-Saxon urn from Marshborough, near Ash found between 1908 and 1910. (Sited to locality only).

Selection of References: TR 35 NW 119  Richardson 2000, site 279

Woodnesborough

Easting: 631000  Date From: 695 To: 715
Northing: 156000  Site-type: Coin-find
Locality Only. Continental Series E sceatta metal detector find

Selection of References: EMC 1998.2069
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>Date To</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodnesborough</td>
<td>WNB-FS4</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Locality Only. Northumbrian Series Y sceatta metal detector find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldham I</td>
<td>WOH-FS1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>Cocked hat sword pommel found by G. Bullock. Locality only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>WRT-FS1</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>AS mixed? Inhumations in RB cemetery. Highest part of a wide ridge. 1938: Late 5thC. Bowl &amp; dish in RB cemetery (a few hundred yards S of the Romano-Celtic temple), find in a telephone ditch south of the Sandwich/Deal road. Pagan Anglo-Saxon pottery is listed in the Index of Sites and Illustrated Pieces. Worth, corpus no 459, fig 18. The human remains are said to have been cremated, but the frags of bones preserved seemed little damaged by fire, and as some of the pot is late Roman, presumably there were also inhumation burials. The groups were scattered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worth</td>
<td>WRT-FS2</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>Nov. 1993: metal detector find on the foreshore just N of Deal a Ae circular mount Style I anthropomorphic and zoomorphic ornament, human mask design resembles a Class I button brooch design, while animals around edges is transitional to Style II. Shingle Foreshore just above sea level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbere</td>
<td>WSB</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>AS mixed (possible barrow) cemetery. 1931: Cem find during gravel workings on N bank of Stour, c.100' contour, on a gravelly hill above the marshes. Much damaged, no skels preserved. In area 160'x 130' 60-70 burials in rows fn. No sign of mounds. No figs of cem to inhums. Impossible to associate all the objects found in grave groups, but wide variety fn. Claw beakers reported as coming from tumulus-may denote barrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbere II Stanes Hill</td>
<td>WSB-FS1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Find-Spot</td>
<td>SMR: AS vessel. Westbere I is 900m to the NE. Meaney: “Stanes Hill, Westbere. ? K 36SW. TR 190612. OS records. ante 1958 ‘Pot found at Stanes Hill considered Saxon by Kendrick. Others found.’”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Westbere WSB-FS2

Easting: 619000  Date From: 0  To: 0
Northing: 161000  Site-type: Find-Spot

SMR: AS claw-beaker, and gold foils, and AS pottery (SE 47): "TR1961 (Sited to locality only) Anglo Saxon pagan pottery."
All from this locality approximately

Selection of References:  TR 16 SE 38

Westwell WSW

Easting: 598000  Date From: 550  To: 650
Northing: 147000  Site-type: Isolated Burial?

AS isolated? Burial/s? 1858: 2 amber glass cups fnd in a bronze bowl in a grave at Westwell. This is sited 1 m. N of Rothfield Station on the slope of a hill rising to Westwell Downs. The bowl, which was given to the KAS, Acc.No. 640, was in a fragmentary state and its remains are not now recognisable. Miss Chapman's holdings are in Westwell are too extensive to enable a close siting to be made.

Selection of References:  TQ 94 NE 7  Richardson 2000, site 268

Westwell Downs WSW-FS1

Easting: 598000  Date From: 880  To: 899
Northing: 147000  Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. Alfred Two-line type silver penny fnd

Selection of References:  EMC 1925.0488  Bonser 1998

Wye WYE

Easting: 607100  Date From: 575  To: 650
Northing: 146800  Site-type: Cemetery

AS Type 5 (In BA bowl barrow) AS barrow cemetery. 1858: During repairs to rd betw Wye & Dover, at the foot of hill c.1 m. from Wye, grave opened cont M skeleton, shield-boss, sword, drinking cup & some smaller objects. Smith & Larking investigated group of tumuli at the top of hill, most already disturbed. 1: child. 2: lrg M skeleton, with spearhead & knife. 3 opened (Morris) of the 18+ said to exist. BM bought many artefacts from here found in 1858 & later (Some poss from Sarre) As all quite close may therefore be counted as one barrow group possibly including Wye-IB1-4

Selection of References:  TR 04 NE 10  Richardson 2000, site 289

Wye WYE-FS1

Easting: 605000  Date From: 793  To: 796
Northing: 146000  Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. Canterbury mint silver penny fnd

Selection of References:  EMC 1996.0153

Wye WYE-FS2

Easting: 605100  Date From: 765  To: 792
Northing: 146000  Site-type: Coin-find

Locality Only. London mint silver penny metal detector fnd

Selection of References:  EMC 1996.0157
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Date From</th>
<th>Date To</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Site-type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wye, nr.</td>
<td>605000</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>146100</td>
<td>Coin-find</td>
<td>Locality Only. Alfred Cross-and-lozenge type penny found. Selection of References: Bonser 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wye II</td>
<td>606930</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>147020</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td>Possible AS Type 5? Barrow cemetery. 1939: A barrow, known as &quot;The Junipers&quot; was dug by 2 members of Wye College (Ackroyd &amp; Bellhouse) on the chalk ridge, an extension of Wye Downs, forming the southern boundary of the old racecourse, after the site had been discovered by a gamekeeper. Lies c.1 m. SW of Faussett’s excavations of 1757-59. It had been disturbed and only a few bone fragments in a rabbit burrow were found. There is nothing to date the barrow, but it is likely to have been AS. Selection of References: TR 04 NE 9 Richardson 2000, site 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wye III</td>
<td>607000</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>146530</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td>SMR: AS burial - &quot;An Anglo-Saxon grave was found during repairs to the Wye-Dover road at the foot of the hill about a mile from Wye. It contained a male skeleton, a shield umbo, a sword, a glass drinking cup and some smaller objects. A Cone-Beaker and Squat Jar are also recorded from Wye Down, probably from this grave.” Selection of References: TR 04 NE 11 Richardson 2000, site 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wye Olantigh Mount</td>
<td>605990</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>148230</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td>doubtful inhumation cemetery, possibly in barrows. Pre-1800: 2 skeletons found on side of Olantigh Mount, c.1.5m below the surface and nearly 10 pieces or 2 spearheads? Pre-1842: When top of mount levelled, bones etc. Found in it. Selection of References: Morris 1842, 48 Richardson 2000, site 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wye</td>
<td>607500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145000</td>
<td>Isolated Burial?</td>
<td>Is this AS? doubtful inhumation cemetery. 1841: human bones and antique dagger below hill near the Pickersdane Spring = presumably the spring near Chelsborne Farm below Broad Downs. Locality Only Selection of References: Morris 1842, 20 Richardson 2000, site 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wye Minster</td>
<td>606500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>146500</td>
<td>Anglo-Saxon Church</td>
<td>Certain old Minster church, probably 7th/8th century - according to Tatton-Brown 1988 &quot;The Churches of Canterbury Diocese in the 11th century&quot; Selection of References: Tatton-Brown 1988a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B:
The sites in eastern Kent containing Old English place-name elements used in the text and computations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place-Name</th>
<th>OE element</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hougham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>627900</td>
<td>139900</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ickham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>622100</td>
<td>158100</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodsham Green</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>610900</td>
<td>145700</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>571300</td>
<td>164400</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godmersham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>606200</td>
<td>150900</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>619800</td>
<td>159800</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>606700</td>
<td>153500</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adisham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>622700</td>
<td>154300</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chartham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>610700</td>
<td>155000</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teynham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>596500</td>
<td>163700</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurnham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>580500</td>
<td>157500</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>571300</td>
<td>171300</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faversham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>601000</td>
<td>161700</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoke</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>582300</td>
<td>175200</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>605300</td>
<td>139500</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>565700</td>
<td>157300</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>610800</td>
<td>148500</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodmersham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>592500</td>
<td>161800</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>577300</td>
<td>175400</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finglesham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>633500</td>
<td>153900</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutsham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>570500</td>
<td>152500</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>620900</td>
<td>150100</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>625500</td>
<td>142400</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>610700</td>
<td>155000</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>575700</td>
<td>167700</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otham</td>
<td>-ham</td>
<td>579700</td>
<td>153500</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson's Cross</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>567200</td>
<td>113200</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maytham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>584800</td>
<td>130500</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homersham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>587100</td>
<td>144700</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelsham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>581400</td>
<td>144300</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lossenham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>583900</td>
<td>127800</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mistleigh</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>599400</td>
<td>126400</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrietsham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>586600</td>
<td>152700</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>617700</td>
<td>143700</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>582500</td>
<td>129700</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>602300</td>
<td>139100</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frogham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>632000</td>
<td>154000</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>624000</td>
<td>152100</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>619800</td>
<td>159800</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>623100</td>
<td>157000</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>626000</td>
<td>156800</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snailham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>585000</td>
<td>117000</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>583500</td>
<td>129300</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobham</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>567000</td>
<td>168300</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betteshanger</td>
<td>-ham ?</td>
<td>631200</td>
<td>152500</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heminge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>611100</td>
<td>140200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennelling Farm</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>597000</td>
<td>150500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ittinge Farm</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>611900</td>
<td>146800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isles Bridge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>604100</td>
<td>121000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hucking Manor</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>584400</td>
<td>158400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersing Marsh</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>598000</td>
<td>168000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giddinge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>623900</td>
<td>146400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymbridge Green</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>612500</td>
<td>143900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-Name</td>
<td>OE element</td>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>Northing</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensinge, Lower</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>607500</td>
<td>155700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Street</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>592300</td>
<td>130400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkinge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>622900</td>
<td>139900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harringe Court</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>609400</td>
<td>137100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haddling Wood</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>630400</td>
<td>147900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hexden</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>582600</td>
<td>128900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up Hill Farm</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>621500</td>
<td>139800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chart, Little</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>594400</td>
<td>146000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensinge, Upper</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>606700</td>
<td>156000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winterage Farm</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>619700</td>
<td>141300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichling</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>591800</td>
<td>156000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wibbing</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>586000</td>
<td>167500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westenhanger</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>612200</td>
<td>137100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peening Quarter</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>588700</td>
<td>128700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wadding</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>635000</td>
<td>150000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottinge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>616800</td>
<td>142400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speringbrook Sewer</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>600000</td>
<td>134700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singleidge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>628800</td>
<td>145900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelvin</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>622500</td>
<td>147400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandlings</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>575500</td>
<td>158100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>575800</td>
<td>152000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedlinge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>613900</td>
<td>135500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottridge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>579600</td>
<td>155300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallingham Sewer</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>604000</td>
<td>125000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltinge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>619300</td>
<td>167800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iffin</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>620900</td>
<td>152400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worten Farm</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>597100</td>
<td>143400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iffin Farm</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>614100</td>
<td>154600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shatterling</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>626400</td>
<td>158400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>580500</td>
<td>154100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazeling Wood</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>622300</td>
<td>156600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balvinge Farm</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>610400</td>
<td>146600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacklinge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>634100</td>
<td>154500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beltring</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>567500</td>
<td>147600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilting</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>605300</td>
<td>149100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bockingfold</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>577700</td>
<td>136000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bockingfold</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>573400</td>
<td>139400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenchley</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>567800</td>
<td>142000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Pedding Farm</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>626800</td>
<td>157900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arpinge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>619200</td>
<td>139200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloodden</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>623000</td>
<td>153800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggringe</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>609300</td>
<td>150400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duskins</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>618600</td>
<td>149700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbourne</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>590000</td>
<td>131000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coolinge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>620200</td>
<td>136100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobham</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>567000</td>
<td>168499</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersden</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>620400</td>
<td>162000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelvingford</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>621200</td>
<td>165400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellinge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>623900</td>
<td>142900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramling</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>622200</td>
<td>157000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cockering Farm</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>613000</td>
<td>156100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlinge</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>634900</td>
<td>169500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garlinge Green</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>611300</td>
<td>152500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gestling (North Stream)</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>633000</td>
<td>155400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilling Drove</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>622850</td>
<td>164900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

544
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place-Name</th>
<th>OE element</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cilling</td>
<td>-ing 2</td>
<td>601200</td>
<td>161300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruttington Lane</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ing- 4</td>
<td>615000</td>
<td>157900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Street</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ing- 4</td>
<td>638900</td>
<td>169500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingfield</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ing- 4</td>
<td>597200</td>
<td>155000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedgingford</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ing- 4</td>
<td>574500</td>
<td>133600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etchinghill</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ing- 4</td>
<td>616600</td>
<td>139400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denton</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ing- 4</td>
<td>621600</td>
<td>147200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattenden</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ing- 4</td>
<td>575800</td>
<td>171800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holllingbourne</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -inga- 5</td>
<td>584400</td>
<td>155200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wateringbury</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -inga- 5</td>
<td>568500</td>
<td>153500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pising</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>633500</td>
<td>146500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stowting</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>612500</td>
<td>141800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stelling</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>614300</td>
<td>148700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>604500</td>
<td>156500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sellindge</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>609400</td>
<td>138400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooting</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>595400</td>
<td>145000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebbinge</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>603500</td>
<td>147500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Everden Farm</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>623400</td>
<td>142100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barming</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>572000</td>
<td>154500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartling</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>613000</td>
<td>152900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shingleton</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>628600</td>
<td>152800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratting Court</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>624000</td>
<td>153600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooting Farm</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>622600</td>
<td>153300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowling Court</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>627200</td>
<td>154900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruckinge</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>602400</td>
<td>133500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charing</td>
<td>-ing 2 + -ingas</td>
<td>595500</td>
<td>149500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnington Farm</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>625100</td>
<td>153900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sissinghurst</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>579500</td>
<td>137600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>578800</td>
<td>128300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shottenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>604500</td>
<td>154300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoddington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>599800</td>
<td>146800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>613800</td>
<td>156800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>618200</td>
<td>167000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldberhtingtun</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>615000</td>
<td>158000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southernden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>586800</td>
<td>146000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>629300</td>
<td>159200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thornden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>613900</td>
<td>164100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>627000</td>
<td>153700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappington Court</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>611400</td>
<td>152800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Place</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>588800</td>
<td>133600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossington Farm</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>623300</td>
<td>155000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarnden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>590300</td>
<td>140400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuckneys</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>573500</td>
<td>176600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottington, Little</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>573900</td>
<td>159900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottington, Great</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>574100</td>
<td>160100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottenden Wood</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>581000</td>
<td>134500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toltingrough</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>562000</td>
<td>174500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>576900</td>
<td>146700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorningduna</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>574500</td>
<td>169700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snodland</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>570400</td>
<td>161700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tappington Farm</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>621000</td>
<td>146300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swattenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>577400</td>
<td>134500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrenden, Old</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>595100</td>
<td>140100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrenden Dering</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>593800</td>
<td>145400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Southernden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>586800</td>
<td>145900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Place-Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place-Name</th>
<th>OE element</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nackington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>615600</td>
<td>154600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>590900</td>
<td>136300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickenden Wood</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>573400</td>
<td>136700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruckinge Grove</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>615300</td>
<td>165600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moattenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>581900</td>
<td>146400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordenden Wood</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>586300</td>
<td>146400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>587300</td>
<td>140300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>583400</td>
<td>145900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loddington Farm</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>576400</td>
<td>150100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickelden Farm</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>608900</td>
<td>153900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blechingley</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>577000</td>
<td>147100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>600800</td>
<td>138500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pivington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>591900</td>
<td>146500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pivington Farm</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>591800</td>
<td>152700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarriington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>605900</td>
<td>141200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwould</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>636000</td>
<td>148300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolvenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>584500</td>
<td>131500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>572000</td>
<td>136600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uffington Farm</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>624300</td>
<td>154700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>629600</td>
<td>154100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heppington House</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>614600</td>
<td>153900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>614800</td>
<td>159200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>637500</td>
<td>165400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>614900</td>
<td>158000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyerton</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>595600</td>
<td>160200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodingdale</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>614800</td>
<td>158000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelbarrow Town</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>615000</td>
<td>146000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>589400</td>
<td>131500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>572500</td>
<td>141500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>580800</td>
<td>132900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bevenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>595800</td>
<td>139700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biddenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>585000</td>
<td>138500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bletchenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>583800</td>
<td>143100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>625300</td>
<td>152400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frittenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>581500</td>
<td>141300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>586400</td>
<td>138400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lashenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>584900</td>
<td>141100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>602300</td>
<td>145200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenardington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>597000</td>
<td>132700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingleden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>589900</td>
<td>134800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunton</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>571900</td>
<td>149500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housendane Wood</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>594800</td>
<td>152300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbrook, Little</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>594300</td>
<td>131800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornbrook, Great</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>594900</td>
<td>133100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Haldon</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>589500</td>
<td>137400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heronden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>588300</td>
<td>132700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>581500</td>
<td>122700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>579200</td>
<td>149400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>578500</td>
<td>144000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggerton Farm</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>608400</td>
<td>150300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cossington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>574300</td>
<td>159900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cozenton</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>581000</td>
<td>166300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>565700</td>
<td>143500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danton Farm</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>619200</td>
<td>137400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drellingore</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>624100</td>
<td>141200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haffenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>588300</td>
<td>140900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-Name</td>
<td>OE element</td>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>Northing</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egerton</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>590700</td>
<td>147500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godinton</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>598100</td>
<td>143800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellenden Farm</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>609700</td>
<td>163000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>610900</td>
<td>145200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finchden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>590100</td>
<td>133200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>576000</td>
<td>137700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frenchford</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>582100</td>
<td>128400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hittenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>580300</td>
<td>134800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egerden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>591800</td>
<td>137400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittersham</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>590000</td>
<td>127400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linton</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>575400</td>
<td>150200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>574800</td>
<td>157800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>583900</td>
<td>156300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuttington Manor</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>593400</td>
<td>161100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglesey House</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>577200</td>
<td>136700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>607500</td>
<td>136300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverton</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>626700</td>
<td>142800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alderden Manor</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>579500</td>
<td>129200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withersden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>584500</td>
<td>145100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wissenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>590600</td>
<td>141500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winton Farm</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>586200</td>
<td>132000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington Farm</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>603000</td>
<td>145800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>578900</td>
<td>154200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wierton Place</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>578000</td>
<td>149700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>584200</td>
<td>138100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casebourne Wood</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>618300</td>
<td>136200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chilhamington Green</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>598000</td>
<td>140300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesham</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>583200</td>
<td>131700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldington Place</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>583800</td>
<td>156300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>579700</td>
<td>129900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conningbrook</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>603200</td>
<td>143600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brissenden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>590600</td>
<td>134700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branden</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>580600</td>
<td>137300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossingham</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>615000</td>
<td>149000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>605300</td>
<td>135700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addington</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>565400</td>
<td>159000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challock</td>
<td>-ing- 4</td>
<td>600800</td>
<td>150500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunbury</td>
<td>-ing- 4 + inga</td>
<td>579100</td>
<td>146400</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mongeham</td>
<td>-ing-ham</td>
<td>635000</td>
<td>151500</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engeham, Great</td>
<td>-ing-ham</td>
<td>594200</td>
<td>137500</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Mongeham</td>
<td>-ing-ham</td>
<td>633300</td>
<td>150900</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozengel Grange</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>635600</td>
<td>165600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockbury</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>584000</td>
<td>161900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingmore</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>618700</td>
<td>146500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farthingloe</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>629500</td>
<td>140500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freezingham</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>586500</td>
<td>130300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Hay</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>591400</td>
<td>132100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otterden</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>594500</td>
<td>154200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominga byra</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>578000</td>
<td>147500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aegylbrytingahyrst</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>582500</td>
<td>137500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etchinghill</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>572600</td>
<td>139700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friningham</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>582000</td>
<td>158900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loringden</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>600000</td>
<td>151500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenden</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>599400</td>
<td>159300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etchinghole</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>572800</td>
<td>140200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkenbury</td>
<td>inga-</td>
<td>580400</td>
<td>145000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place-Name</td>
<td>OE element</td>
<td>Easting</td>
<td>Northing</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastingleigh</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>609500</td>
<td>144900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glassenbury</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>574800</td>
<td>136500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallinghurst</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>587500</td>
<td>143500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shillingham Hole</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>607500</td>
<td>155500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romney Old</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>607500</td>
<td>125300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trillinghurst</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>571200</td>
<td>136300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Womenswold</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>622700</td>
<td>150700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yfinga Ho</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>619000</td>
<td>166500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bardingley</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>579900</td>
<td>145600</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binbury Manor</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>581200</td>
<td>160100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandenbury</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>572200</td>
<td>146800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensham Green</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>582500</td>
<td>129900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eothinga Burh</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>573000</td>
<td>172500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engeham, Little</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>594400</td>
<td>136900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittingbourne</td>
<td>-inga-</td>
<td>590500</td>
<td>164700</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malling, East</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>570000</td>
<td>157100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malling, West</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>568200</td>
<td>157800</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yalding</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>569800</td>
<td>150100</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidsing</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>578700</td>
<td>162300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hucking</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>584500</td>
<td>158500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastling</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>596400</td>
<td>156500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooling</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>575500</td>
<td>175900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbing</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>589900</td>
<td>164900</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birling</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>567900</td>
<td>160200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detling</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>579400</td>
<td>158300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ospringe</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>600000</td>
<td>160300</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postling</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>614500</td>
<td>139000</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brishing</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>577700</td>
<td>151500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weavering Street</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>578500</td>
<td>155500</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wytherling</td>
<td>-ingas</td>
<td>603700</td>
<td>153200</td>
<td>Kirk 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainham</td>
<td>-ingas-ham</td>
<td>581500</td>
<td>165900</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islingham</td>
<td>-ingas-ham</td>
<td>575000</td>
<td>169000</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillingham</td>
<td>-ingas-ham</td>
<td>578200</td>
<td>169100</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wingham</td>
<td>-ingas-ham</td>
<td>624200</td>
<td>157500</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terlingham</td>
<td>-ingas-ham</td>
<td>621300</td>
<td>139100</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsted</td>
<td>ham-sted</td>
<td>574800</td>
<td>164800</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemsted</td>
<td>ham-sted</td>
<td>580200</td>
<td>133800</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nettestead</td>
<td>ham-sted</td>
<td>568400</td>
<td>152000</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmstede</td>
<td>ham-sted</td>
<td>616500</td>
<td>148000</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whetstead</td>
<td>ham-sted</td>
<td>565600</td>
<td>145900</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bearsted</td>
<td>ham-sted</td>
<td>580100</td>
<td>155500</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmstead</td>
<td>ham-sted</td>
<td>611600</td>
<td>144800</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham(e)stede</td>
<td>ham-sted</td>
<td>630000</td>
<td>142000</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>ham-tun</td>
<td>615800</td>
<td>168000</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittington</td>
<td>ham-tun</td>
<td>627500</td>
<td>151600</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oar (Ore's) Farm</td>
<td>ora</td>
<td>622600</td>
<td>168100</td>
<td>Cole 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonar</td>
<td>ora</td>
<td>633300</td>
<td>159500</td>
<td>Cole 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicham</td>
<td>wic-ham</td>
<td>572200</td>
<td>168800</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickham Bushes</td>
<td>wic-ham</td>
<td>624600</td>
<td>145600</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickham</td>
<td>wic-ham</td>
<td>589800</td>
<td>116500</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wickhambreux</td>
<td>wic-ham</td>
<td>622100</td>
<td>158700</td>
<td>Dodgson 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argrove</td>
<td>ora</td>
<td>620500</td>
<td>138800</td>
<td>Cole 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicknor</td>
<td>ora</td>
<td>586100</td>
<td>158900</td>
<td>Cole 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader Lane</td>
<td>ora</td>
<td>579600</td>
<td>158900</td>
<td>Cole 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drelingore</td>
<td>ora</td>
<td>624000</td>
<td>141000</td>
<td>Cole 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Icknor</td>
<td>ora</td>
<td>584000</td>
<td>161000</td>
<td>Cole 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place-Name</th>
<th>OE element</th>
<th>Easting</th>
<th>Northing</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynsore</td>
<td>ora</td>
<td>616300</td>
<td>149000</td>
<td>Cole 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oare</td>
<td>ora</td>
<td>600500</td>
<td>163000</td>
<td>Cole 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney</td>
<td>ora</td>
<td>590000</td>
<td>147000</td>
<td>Cole 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upnor</td>
<td>ora</td>
<td>575800</td>
<td>170500</td>
<td>Cole 1990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Artefact designations used in ASKED

Adze
Amulet
Animal Bone
Animal Brooch
Annular Brooch
Applied Disc Brooch
Arrowhead
Awl
Axehead
Bag/Pouch
Bead
Bed/Bier
Bell/Crucible
Belt Mount/Plate/Adjuster
Bird Brooch
Bow
Bow Brooch
Box
Box Fitments
Box Handle
Box Lock/Hasp
Bracelet
Bracteate
Bracteate Die
Brooch
Buckle
Buckle Loop and Plate
Buckle Mount
Buckle Rivets
Button Brooch
Casket facing
Cast Brooch
Chain
Chamber
Charcoal
Chatelaine/Hanging Chain
Chisel
Cist
Clasp
Clench Bolts
Coffin
Coffin Clamps
Coin
Comb
Composite Jewelled Disc Brooch
Counter
Cowrie Shell (Amulet?)
Cruciform Brooch
Crystal Ball
Cu Alloy Vessel
Dagger
Dice
Disc
Disc Brooch
Earrings
Eggshell
Equal Arm Brooch
Escutcheon/mount/applique
Eyelet/Cleat
Fe implement
Fe Rove/Diamond
Ferrule
Figurine
Finger Ring
Flint
Flint Flake
Flint Packing
Fossil
Garnet Disc and Rosette Brooch
Garnet Disc Brooch
Gemstone
Girdle Hanger
Glass Vessel
Gold Braid
Great Square Headed Brooch
Heckle
Hinge
Hone
Hook
Horse Equipment
Instrument
Iron Pyrites
Jewel Disc Brooch
Key/Girdle Hanger/Latchlifter
Keystone Garnet Disc Brooch
Knife
Knife sheath
Lace Tag
Linked Pin
Melon Bead
Mirror
Monochrome Bead
Mount
Nails
Neck ring
Needle (other material)
Openwork disc
Other-Inorganic
Other-organic
Oyster Shell
Pebble
Penannular Brooch
Pendant
Perforated Spoon
Pin
Pin Beater
Pin Pricker
Pin/Bodkin
Pincers/grips
Plane
Polychrome Bead
Pommel
Potsherds
Pottery (Hand-made)
Pottery (wheel-thrown)
Purse mount/firesteel
Quernstone
Quoit Brooch
Radiate Head Brooch
Ring
Rivet
Rod
Roman Brooch
Rosette Brooch
S-Shaped Brooch
Safety Pin Brooch
Saucer Brooch
Scabbard
Scabbard Chape
Scales
Scissors
Seax
Shears
Sheath
Sheath mount
Sheet fragments
Shield Boss
Shield Grip
Shield Mounts/Rivets
Shroud
Small Long Brooch
Small Radiate Headed Brooch
Small Square Headed Brooch
Spangle
Spatula
Spear Fitting
Spear Shaft
Spearhead
Spindle Whorl
Spoon
Spur
Square brooch
Square Headed Brooch
Staple
Staples
Stone
Stone Lining
Stone Pillow
Stone Slab
Strap Adjuster
Strap End
Strap Hanger
Strap Mount
Stud
Stylus scriptorius
Supporting Arm Brooch
Suspension Clip
Suspension Loop
Suspension Plate
Sword
Sword bead
Sword pommel
Tab
Tablet weaving square
Terret
Thong tab
Thong tag
Thread Box
Toilet Pick
Touchstone
Trivet
Tube
Tweezers
Unidentified
Unidentified artefact
Weaving Beater
Weights
Wheel ornament
Whetstone
Wire
Wooden vessel (Cu alloy bounds)
Wooden vessel (Cu alloy mounts)
Wooden vessel (Fe bounds)
Wooden vessel (Fe mounts)
Wooden vessel (silver bounds)
Wooden vessel (silver mounts)
Wrist Clasp