

## Notes on the South East Research Framework public seminar on the Anglo-Saxon period (03/11/07)

**Chair:** Gabor Thomas

**Speakers:** Andrew Richardson, Nicholas Brooks, Sue Harrington, Stuart Brookes and Gabor Thomas

**Notes:** Jake Weekes

### **Identity and Material Culture in the 5<sup>th</sup> Century South East**

Andrew Richardson (AR)

AR first noted that for many years this debate has been dominated by questions of ethnicity, with a recent backlash concerning complex constructions of ethnic identity. But there is a potential problem of “throwing the baby out with the bath water” by avoiding what are considered to be outmoded approaches. A fresh look at the material culture of the 5<sup>th</sup> and early 6<sup>th</sup> centuries offers an opportunity to continue to address these issues, which will remain important.

Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS) and particularly metal-detected data offer an important new dataset. The corpus of material is growing, and there would seem to be a very interesting over-representation of certain brooch types in the PAS data from Kent in particular as compared with finds from burials, with Cruciform, Small Long and Button brooches being particularly heavily over represented in metal-detector finds. Most of the latter appear to be from casual losses rather than burial, so it is perhaps no surprise that Annular brooches are very under-represented in the PAS data, since the design of these brooches means that they don't come off clothing very easily. Proportions of different brooch types across the area show clear regional patterns. There is considerable diversity in the Kent data, and actually the most similar assemblage is the Hampshire/Isle of Wight region, perhaps suggesting some maritime connection between the two areas in the late 5<sup>th</sup> century.

AR pointed out that Cruciform brooches (essentially Scandinavian type) were produced throughout the 6<sup>th</sup> century in England (although not in Kent, apparently). PAS data have augmented earlier finds to show a high concentration of these in East Kent. In fact, these are one of the most common types found by metal-detectorists, and present a different picture from burials evidence. They are more commonly found in Denmark in hoard contexts. This and other emerging evidence from PAS finds actually suggest it is material from Denmark which appears to be most comparable with that from Kent.

In fact, such evidence would appear to lend further weight to Sonia Hawkes' view that the two groups were related. PAS data are filling in the gaps in previous datasets for certain object types that were previously taken to mitigate against such a view, and lend more weight to Frankish material and therefore cultural affinities. The chiefly burial and antiquarian evidence was also therefore held to contradict Bede's account

of Jutish origins in this area. Relative ubiquity and absence of Relief brooches and Gold Bracteates has been seen as another contrast between Jutland and Kent. However, it should be noted that Jutland has a comparatively minimalist inhumation rite at this time, and such material is now turning up in hoards in contrast to a predominance of burial contexts for the Kent material (some possibly votive contexts for Kent objects can now be suggested also, however).

If the PAS data generally are added to evidence from excavated burials and antiquarian finds the picture changes, and distributions of Cruciform brooches, Scandinavian Relief/Square-headed brooches, Bracteates and 'Jutish/Frisia' pottery all find correlates in East Kent (especially the Wantsum Channel, Little Stour /Valley, and Lyminge areas, with an increasingly sporadic distribution westwards) to a significant degree, suggesting much affinity with Scandinavian material culture in the 5<sup>th</sup> and first half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century for this area.

Interestingly, material of Kentish origin from the later 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> centuries, in particular copper alloy and silver Kentish Square Headed brooches and Class 2.1 Kentish Disc brooches, also concentrate in exactly the same areas as the 5<sup>th</sup> and early 6<sup>th</sup> century objects already discussed. Moreover, the nearest equivalents for these brooch assemblages are to be found not in Surrey or East or West Sussex, but in the Isle of Wight, again appearing to indicate some form of ongoing maritime connection which by-passed overland affiliation in some way.

The archaeological visibility of such Scandinavian associations of material culture in East Kent (South East of the Stour) seem to have been outweighed by an apparent ubiquity of continental Frankish material in the past, and even new discoveries at Ringlemere appear to strengthen the case for Frankish connections again. But southern Scandinavian material has more limited chronology. Perhaps it is better to see the near continental connections as a much more general pattern, with material moving either way along this nearest route being the norm. By contrast, the southern Scandinavian material is an anomaly, but a real and potentially very important one.

AR therefore suggested that the declining Roman Empire and commensurate rise of Germanic identity generally is the context within which we should posit discrete episodes of migration (of which people of Jutish origin were but one). Such a process characterised the transition from Roman Britain to the Anglo-Saxon periods. In order to pursue such hypotheses further, burial evidence needs to be set in wider context, and a more holistic approach to the data adopted, with other material culture types and other data sources being included in comparative surveys. Work has now begun on this, but more needs to be done. It is important that the results of such research are made accessible and understood widely, and we should certainly communicate more with continental colleagues on this subject.

## **Discussion:**

It was pointed out that the use of PAS data has already become a valuable part of archaeology in Britain; there is a continued need however to monitor and improve this information source. While there are peaks and troughs in the data chronologically, it is noticeable that there are vastly more quantities of material from the later medieval

period onwards. It should also be remembered that it is most often the items most easily lost that form this data, and there is moreover a heavy bias towards bronze in terms of recovery.

### **Early evidence for the Canterbury/Rochester diocesan boundary**

Nicholas Brooks (NB)

Charter records are full of useful material for archaeologists. NB has been involved in a recent scheme which has set out to record all the available Latin and Anglo-Saxon charter texts, and to make them available on-line (see [www.trin.cam.ac.uk/kemble](http://www.trin.cam.ac.uk/kemble)). The material will be of interest to scholars in various fields, including linguists, historians, ecclesiastical historians, social historians, and, of course, archaeologists (particularly in terms of reconstructing landscape). The charters can provide phenomenal detail but are thinly spread and difficult to interpret. NB would focus by way of example on the Canterbury/Rochester diocesan boundary, the first diocesan boundary to be recorded (in written description).

Later sources, such as the 1291 lists of papal taxation for parishes, and parish lists drawn up in 1535 for the Dissolution, have often been used for reconstructing the Anglo-Saxon boundaries. Other later Medieval sources are also much cited, such as the Domesday *Monachorum* for Kent, etc. The Tithes in 1840 are also available for comparison: but these demarcations were not the same as earlier parishes. In fact there was a huge amount of reformation of boundaries, for both civil and ecclesiastical purposes, during the medieval period and beyond, so it is important to recognise a much more fluid and dynamic picture of parish development, even at the smallest scale.

The early charters, therefore, are rare and precious in the new light they can throw on the past, even through being reassessed. The charter for the Canterbury/Rochester diocesan boundary is just such an example. In particular, NB noted an erroneous assumption by Wallenberg and others based on misreading of certain letters in the document, which had led to situating the southern end of the boundary in the wrong place. Much debate had been founded on this mistake; correct re-reading of the Charter had therefore ‘exploded’ a whole century of work!

Also, NB pointed out that this particular charter described a ‘Wyc’ (Anglo-Saxon trading centre) at Maidstone, and should be correlated to the existence of ‘Week Street’ in the town. The use of this word, and its association with the Latin *vicus*, could be cited as evidence for a Romano-British foundation, or at least precedent for Maidstone. Similar examples could also be pointed out from this and other such documents, making them an important and somewhat neglected historical resource for the region in the Anglo-Saxon period and occasionally earlier still.

## **Lost in the museum: notes from explorations of early Anglo-Saxon archives in southern Britain**

Sue Harrington (SH)

SH reported on the the recent Tribal Hideage Project, and the degree to which the project had been hampered by the availability and quality of data in Museum collections; the expression 'lost in the archives' was applicable all too often. She pointed out from the first that this was not an attack on Museum colleagues, but rather a way of raising questions about current systems for curating, cataloguing and making data available on a regional scale. The key point is whether museum archives can cope with the questions we would wish to ask of the data.

The Tribal Hideage Project was based on a number of research hypotheses:

- That the archaeological biographies of specific places will exhibit clear continuity or discontinuity with late Roman landscape
- That there existed definable relationships between the creation of economic systems and state formation processes
- That the scale and extent of kingdoms would be identifiable, qualitatively or statistically, from the geographical distribution of burial and settlement data
- That communities in key areas that had an unevenly spread resource base and unevenly distributed populations, shaped the history of entire regions by stimulating change in their neighbouring communities
- That the formation of kingdoms was a uniform and coherent process over time and space.

A wide-ranging dataset had therefore needed to be assembled, to be entered into a database and analysed via a GIS facility. The main analytical criteria focussed on material type, material content, and weight of objects dating to between AD 410 and 750. PAS data were also included. In all, for Kent and Sussex combined, the project collated information on:

- 213 inhumation and mixed rite cemeteries, including:
- 4300 recorded individuals, with a total of:
- 13,500 artefacts, including:
- 7000 of iron, including over 2000 knives and 1000 items of weaponry and military equipment.

One immediate problem with data collection was that weight of objects had rarely been recorded. Problems in accessing and collating the data were also apparent throughout, and the sheer volume of material and storage difficulties (also many reports were only available as 'grey literature'), dispersal of archives into various locations, long-term storage problems, few sensitive stores, and the lack of a dedicated county wide museum service (for Sussex at least), were all barriers to effective data collection.

It also emerged that many recording and archiving discrepancies existed, creating further difficulties in being able to access the material once deposited. Frequently

different (and sometimes confusing arrays of) numbers had been given to objects on site, including small finds, burial, skeletal, context and group numbers. Then new numbers had been given for accessioning the objects in museums, and still further numbers if the data were put into a digital database. In publication the finds were often put back into groups, adding to the confusion.

Beyond recording and accessioning, it was noticeable that many finds assemblages are diminishing *after* deposition in the archives, with many assemblages seeming to decrease in size over the years through loss, theft etc. The condition of individual objects was also often deteriorating (and their weight decreasing). Again, in publication of the material, there would seem to have been much bias in terms of what was considered important enough to report, with much left unpublished. For example, textiles are under-researched and the least well preserved of finds, and even metal objects have often not been subjected to a full range of tests. Work conducted on organics and environmental evidence has been infrequent, and not always put in publication. We might wonder how much of this material has survived for future analysis?

Researchers need to be able to compare between sites at local and regional levels: analyses of individual sites is not enough. There is a backlog of unpublished sites to consider, but it might actually be a better idea for now to concentrate on agreeing regional standards for archiving and conservation etc. Ideally, information would be digitally published in table form so that researchers can continue to manipulate the data and contribute to its understanding. We may not be able to preserve many of the objects, but we need to preserve and disseminate the information they provide.

### **Discussion:**

AR reported the same situation with Kent with specific reference to Anglo-Saxon cemeteries. In order to conduct analyses on a regional scale, researchers need to be able to cross-reference within and between datasets. This is a major issue for the long term, and is not just a problem for this particular period.

## **Life and Landscape in the Later Anglo-Saxon Southeast**

Stuart Brookes (SB)

SB said that life and landscape in later Anglo-Saxon South East (AD 850–1100, an understudied but very important and formative background to the later Medieval period) was characterised by Viking incursions and the military response to these. This period therefore brings with it the emergence of centralised military, economic and administrative centres. Work at Canterbury and Chichester is producing interesting findings, and the earliest defences and grid systems now appear earlier than late ninth century. But how urban the 10<sup>th</sup> century *burhs* were is still an important research question. There is little evidence of international trade at this time, and these centres did not apparently have such a range of functions as later. In the early 11<sup>th</sup> century there was actually a renewing of towns, in the form of new defensive work, street frontages and town houses.

We therefore should be considering long-term development rather than the sudden appearance of urban centres, and should also attribute many new planned settlements to this phase (for example those which would later become Cinque Ports). Place name evidence indicates large number of 'lower order' settlements, and this would be a good focus for new research, dealing with networks of such sites in articulation with major centres. Beacon sites are a further network to be studied, as are communications between the sites. In order to conduct such research, multidisciplinary approaches are needed, combining archaeological evidence with historical texts and map regression analyses, for example. After all, sites don't operate in isolation, but form a pattern, so we need to look at links and assess origins and developmental complexities as well as interaction issues. While recognising a sea-oriented defence system, the various centres need to be considered in landscape and geo-morphological context, considering overland routes and intervisibility (especially in tracing beacon chains). Researchers need to excavate roads and linear earthworks (e.g. Fostonwick in Surrey), many of which are undated and not contextualised at present.

Further areas for research are numerous. The Burghal Hideage doesn't include Kent, for example, so in that county much work with evidence from other sources is still required. We also need to account for a shift from centres of defence to territorial defence, and the development of late Anglo-Saxon manorialisation (burh geats) in 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> centuries. Comparison between areas of ecclesiastical and non-ecclesiastical ownership should be carried out, as well as comparisons across the South East. And, indeed where is the *evidence* for Vikings? Portable Antiquities Scheme data might help to find them.

While much of England developed open field systems around nucleated settlement in the Medieval period, this is much less the pattern in Kent and Sussex (with a less dense pattern overall in the South East). Rather, the pattern would seem to be more often one of dispersed hamlet farmsteads. The situation is often seen as having been dynamic, with large scale abandonment of nucleated settlements. But such abandonment may not have been medieval, let alone Anglo-Saxon. There is clear evidence of numerous route ways into and from the Weald, but when does this pattern of transhumance actually begin to emerge? This all seems to relate to the creation of an administrative structure in late Anglo-Saxon England, and needs to be reassessed in this light in the research framework. There is actually much debate around the antiquity of these boundaries. The region has relatively few charters and documents generally, but Kent, Surrey and particularly the West Kent coast are better for this type of evidence. More needs to be done in this area to compare the South East with the rest of England.

At a more local scale, it is possible to elucidate many small hundreds, relating to a complex pattern of local administration. At Saltwood in Kent there is evidence of the development from a 'folk' cemetery to a later meeting place. Riddler noted this in early work on the Channel Tunnel Rail Link site, and Reynolds has more recently revised the interpretation. Bronze Age burial mounds, the focus for the early burials, remained conspicuous in landscape, and ideal as foci for meetings. Saltwood also produced finds and features well beyond the dates of the last burials being interred. There is a parallel at Eton Rowing Course: the site was used for up to two centuries as

a place of burial, but continued as a hundred assembly point, and had become a hundred court by Domesday. The latter is a good example of a multidisciplinary study yielding good results.

The following paper is adapted from a text supplied by the speaker.

## **Between Downland and Weald: early medieval rural settlement in the South-East**

Gabor Thomas (GT)

### *Introduction*

When thinking about the archaeology of Anglo-Saxon settlement in terms of a resource assessment exercise it is all too easy to stand back and complain about a lack of evidence. Excavated settlements are certainly few and far between in the South East. But precisely the same could be said for many other parts of the country: indeed most places west of Birmingham. The basic fact remains that in comparison to the late Prehistoric and Romano-British periods, Anglo-Saxon settlements are very difficult to pinpoint in the landscape, more often than not being masked by succeeding generations of occupation on the same site, and due to their ephemeral nature of course they are also very, very easily missed.

However, it would be wrong to delay the process of developing a research agenda in vain hope that one day our coffers will overflow with Anglo-Saxon settlement archaeology. Quite apart from the misconception that the passive act of data collection will of itself answer questions and settle debates, the particular challenges of the period require us to think imaginatively about the sort of evidence we should be searching for and the sort of places where we might find it. In my view this can only be achieved by taking an inter-disciplinary approach drawing upon both archaeological and historical sources as well as information derived from related disciplines, such as place-name and palaeo-environmental studies. Whilst our region may lag behind eastern counties in terms of its quota of excavated settlements, some parts of it – and Kent in particular – are far better served by documentary sources, most notably charter material which provides the level of topographic detail required to make a meaningful contribution to our understanding of the economic and landscape context of Anglo-Saxon occupation sites.

Another distinct advantage that the South East has over some of the other regions recently subjected to the agenda process is its geographical cohesion, a cohesion that lends itself to the identification of common themes which may be investigated using standardised methodological approaches. This is not to deny the existence of intra-regional variation in the nature and character of settlements; this is only to be expected over such a large and internally variable land-mass. Rather than we might legitimately expect to see patterns repeated in the distinctive countrysides or '*pays*' which characterise the Wealden counties of Sussex, Surrey and Kent. It is inter-relationships between these different *pays*, as reconstructed particularly from place-names, and documentary sources, which have provided the basic template for how the Anglo-Saxon landscape of the South East evolved. Accordingly, we may make the fundamental distinction between areas of primary Anglo-Saxon settlement restricted

to the coastal plains, river valleys (including the Thames basin), the fertile soils hugging the scarp-foot of the North and South Downs, and those areas of Downland not capped by Clay-with-Flints, and areas of secondary colonisation – coastal marshes, Downland with poorer soils and the expanse of woodland known as the Weald.

One of the primary objectives of an archaeological research agenda for the South East should be to test and refine our understanding of these processes, particularly by attempting to bring some chronological refinement to the contested issue of when and at what rate settlement took place in the different zones of colonisation. Under this over-arching objective, I would like to propose four settlement-related themes which could be used to drive forward our period-specific research agenda

### *1. Total landscapes – settlement dynamics and interactions*

Large-scale, developer-funded projects in places such as Raunds (Northamptonshire) and Yarnton (Oxfordshire) have shown us the rich yields to be gained from examining total landscapes. The complexity and fluidity of Anglo-Saxon settlements means this is often the only secure way of gaining a long-term perspective on how communities evolved in spatial, chronological and morphological terms and for exploring such major landscape transitions as the origins of villages and open-field agriculture. This scale also offers an opportunity for examining links between settlements, whether hierarchical or based upon patterns of economic inter-dependence as predicted by the model of extensive, multi-vill estates characterising the Middle Saxon landscape. Finally, it provides a means of examining topographic relationships between spaces of the living and spaces of the dead, spheres that have been artificially separated by our concentration on recovering grave-goods and cemetery data.

With the results of the Channel Tunnel Rail Link (CTRL) work north of Folkestone and also from a series of excavations on the outskirts of Margate on the Isle of Thanet, we can for the first time attempt this level of synthesis in the South East, albeit if the evidence is heavily weighted towards east Kent. Whilst more piecemeal, there is also potential for gaining similar synthetic overviews for parts of the Thames basin in north Kent and Surrey – one thinks here immediately of the density of sites and cemeteries focused around Shepperton Green.

Whilst we have little systematic control over where large-scale commercial developments and infrastructure projects take place, as archaeologists we can at least place a priority on ensuring that holistic methodologies are put in place for recovering the data and that the data are fully synthesized, drawing upon models derived from other parts of the country whilst remaining sensitive to regional variation, manifest in the morphology of settlements, structural traditions in house and building types, and modes of economic exploitation and consumption. On the subject of methodology, I'm sure that more use could be made of dry valley transects in the investigation of changing land-use and soil conditions in Downland landscapes – a technique that was after all pioneered by Martin Bell in Sussex.

### *2. Tracing settlement biographies*

The advantages of the total landscape approach outlined above should not prevent the pursuit of viable single parish or settlement/village projects, and it is at this scale where the voluntary/research/university sectors can make a significant contribution to



the research agenda, as is currently happening with the Villages Research Project run under the auspices of the Surrey Archaeological Society.

A question here is how closely parts of the South East subscribe to the models of settlement nucleation and landscape re-organisation experienced in the so-called Champion landscapes of England between the 9<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> centuries? Indeed, is it relevant at all when speaking of Kent, Sussex, Surrey and other 'ancient landscapes' where dispersed settlement predominates? Some scholars have dismissed the idea that nucleated villages in the classic sense ever existed in the South East, arguing that the closest we get to them is in areas of strong post-Conquest lordship, such as the Chertsey Abbey estates of Surrey, where some settlements show signs of deliberate planning in the 12<sup>th</sup> century. But new work in the Champion belt of England enshrined in the Whittlewood project indicates that elements of dispersed and nucleated landscapes could exist side-by-side. Surely, the implication is that we should be open to the possibility of similar mosaic landscapes in the South East?

Whilst we can get some way to answering these questions using cost-effective and largely non-invasive methodologies such as test-pitting, we should not be afraid of undertaking more ambitious schemes of excavation within village cores. I want to quickly take a look at two recent case-studies from Sussex to demonstrate the potential of this approach in revealing the varied trajectories which settlement biographies could take, even in very similar landscape settings.

The first excavation, undertaken by Mark Gardiner next to the parish church of Botolphs, down-river of Steyning in the Adur Valley, produced two phases of Anglo-Saxon occupation, the earlier dating to the 5/6th centuries and the later to the Saxo-Norman period – the 10th and 11th centuries. This sequence is especially revealing. First, it challenges the assumption Early Anglo-Saxon settlements were confined to chalk uplands as proposed by the model known as the Middle Saxon shift (which proposes a wholesale abandonment of these sites into surrounding vales); as shown here a significant number may lurk beneath accumulations of medieval hillwash. Second, the 300 year hiatus hints at fluidity in the Middle Saxon landscape marked by minor shifts in settlement locations. And third, it captures a transition to a more permanent pattern when settlements began to coalesce around churches and manorial complexes.

Work at Bishopstone in the lower reaches of the Ouse Valley downstream of the burghal hideage town of Lewes has revealed a somewhat different sequence. Here we do appear to have a classic case of a Middle Saxon shift as revealed by Martin Bell's 1970s excavations on Rookery Hill, which remains a paradigm for Early Anglo-Saxon settlement in the chalklands of South East England. Recent research excavations in the present-day village below Rookery Hill, adjacent to the well-known Anglo-Saxon church of St Andrew, were successful in tracking the post-settlement shift trajectory from the 9th century down until the Norman Conquest. In this case, the settlement appears to have been on a grander scale, as revealed by successive phases of a courtyard complex of timber buildings in one phase furnished with an impressive timber tower- shown in this hypothetical reconstruction. Quite how we choose to conceptualise this occupation is an interesting question, one which encourages us to engage with live debates on site characterisation in the early medieval landscape. The point I wish to make is that the South East region has much to offer in furthering our

general understanding of the embryonic stages of village growth and thus can help to redress the Midlands dominated focus which has prevailed of late.

### 3. *Monastic settlements*

In a more localised geographical and historical context, a further group of settlements, which could be profitably examined using a similar methodology, are Anglo-Saxon monastic settlements in east Kent. A number of these sites have witnessed piecemeal and intermittent work over the past two centuries but this has largely targeted monastic churches with little or no consideration of their wider setting. Whilst charters provide excellent documentary coverage for the growth of monastic endowments, particularly as functioning economic units, we have a very limited understanding of the impacts which these institutions had upon local communities and how this manifested itself in physical and topographical terms.

A project has recently been initiated to explore these questions and preliminary results from a site adjacent the royal foundation of Lyminge (AD633), suggests that in some cases we could be looking at expansive areas of occupation, perhaps relating to lay brethren engaged in industrial and processing activities. Watch this space.

### 4. *Approaches to investigating settlement in the Weald*

Early medieval exploitation of the Weald, principally for grazing (the pannage of pigs), hunting, fuel and building materials, is fundamental to our understanding of rural developments in South East England. A succession of detailed studies employing documentary sources, place-names and other field evidence has left us with a testable model for understanding how the Weald was colonised. The indications are that in the early Saxon period the forest was originally shared by extensive territories (*regiones*) centred on royal villas based in areas of primary settlement. These territories were configured in such a way that each took in a portion of communally exploited forest following an ancient system of seasonal transhumance utilising droveways. As exploitation became more intensive in the Middle Saxon period, the woodland portions of these territories were detached and granted to parent estates in the process forming more precisely defined enclaves - dens or woodland pastures. In time, with further fragmentation and delineation, these enclaves eventually became foci of permanent settlement. This reading of the evidence runs counter to the traditional view that the Weald was conquered gradually by nibbling away at the edges of a primeval forest; conquest was made from the inside out.

The challenge remains on how best to bring archaeological evidence to bear on this crucial axis in the development of the early medieval countryside. Whilst attempts have been made in the past, progress has been hampered by the fact that the traditional blanket application of site reconnaissance methodologies such as fieldwalking doesn't work well in the Weald, much of which is still wooded or under pasture. We need a more informed strategy. Excitingly, a possible way forward in identifying sites of early colonisation has been provided by detailed topographic analysis recently attempted by Judy English/Dennis Turner in the hundred of Blackheath in Surrey and Mark Gardiner and Diana Chatwin in West Sussex Weald. This work has isolated a morphologically distinct and potentially early type of curvilinear boundary that could very well mark primary dens or grazing areas where sites of early occupation ought to be located. This methodology needs to be extended

to other parts of the Weald, and, crucially, followed up by fieldwork where possible to date physical remnants of these curvilinear boundaries and to sample their interiors.

Another possible strategy that we could adopt is to target some the larger Wealden settlements granted market charters in the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries. The development of places such as Ticehurst in East Sussex reveals how the sites of medieval market places frequently occupied funnel shaped areas of open ground. The fact that churches appear to respect these focal zones indicates that they are of some antiquity; indeed they are very likely pre-1100, by which time most Wealden churches had been founded. Whilst some of these sites have witnessed infilling by post-medieval and modern housing, we should be actively identifying places offering windows of survival.

### *Conclusion*

To conclude, taking forward a research agenda on the lines which I have proposed requires collaboration on a number of levels. It requires archaeologists, historians and related specialists to put their heads together to frame relevant research questions and to devise methods for their examination. It also requires active channels of communication between the professional, research and voluntary sectors to identify which questions are likely to fall beyond the remit of day-to-day PPG16 archaeology and to ensure that the results of fieldwork undertaken across the spectrum are integrated and synthesised as fully as possible. Only in this way will we create new and innovative ways of seeing the Anglo-Saxon landscape.