EARLY ANGLO-SAXON SETTLEMENT IN THE EAST MIDLANDS AD 450-850

Michael Andrew Hawkes BA, MA

School of Archaeology and Ancient History
University of Leicester

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

2007
ABSTRACT

EARLY ANGLO-SAXON SETTLEMENT IN THE EAST MIDLANDS AD 450-850

Michael Andrew Hawkes

Knowledge of the landscape and settlement impact of the Anglo-Saxons is still patchy. How busy was the landscape in the period AD 450-850? How far did a Roman settlement pattern persist? Had nature reclaimed much of the landscape? This thesis seeks to provide a synthesized review of the evidence for early- and middle Anglo-Saxon period settlement in the East Midlands, a region previously little discussed in academic literature. Much of the archaeological data relating to Anglo-Saxon England has come from artefacts recovered from burial sites, but what can we now learn from more recent fieldwork?

It is important to consider the Roman (and late Roman) urban and rural landscape which formed the framework into which Anglo-Saxon settlement had to blend. On the basis of extensive fieldwalking data which indicates the busy settlement pattern of the Roman period, it is likely that the more limited distribution of Anglo-Saxon settlement is genuine. This is taken to indicate that Anglo-Saxon activity was influenced by the native population and/or natural factors such as woodland, water courses and geological conditions. Using data from the HER/SMR as a basis, this study draws upon recent landscape survey projects and excavations from Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire in order to examine more closely settlement in the Roman to Anglo-Saxon transition period, as well as the process of change in the middle Anglo-Saxon period and the move towards settlement nucleation. Comparison is made with a number of sites in England and, to a lesser extent, on the Continent. There is also consideration of the value of place-names in assessing settlement types and strategies.

It has been concluded that while there is some use of Roman sites, much Anglo-Saxon settlement is located in woodland fringe locations, close to water, which suggests a more self-sufficient, dispersed phase of settlement in the early phase of the period, while nucleation tends to focus on geologically-favourable sites, suggesting a return to a more outward-looking, market-based economy in the middle Anglo-Saxon period.
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Early Anglo-Saxon Settlement in the East Midlands AD 450-850

Introduction

'It must be admitted at the outset that such deductions rest upon a series of accidents, and that any day may bring fresh and conflicting evidence to light'
(Northamptonshire Victoria County History 1902, 223)

'...but at present there is little or nothing to show what happened in the district between the forests of Charnwood and Rockingham, between Arden and the Vale of Belvoir...'  
(Leicestershire Victoria County History 1907, 221)

'Unfortunately, there are very few aspects of the fifth to ninth century archaeology of the East Midlands that would not benefit from further research.'
(Vince 2006, 161)

Thesis Aims

The overall aims of this thesis are to review the evidence for rural settlement in the Anglo-Saxon period in the East Midlands of England between AD 450 and 850 and to assess its character and make-up. I also aim to assess the level and quality of evidence relating to the extent of the continuity of urban life from the latest Roman period and the subsequent move towards the nucleation of settlement in the later Anglo-Saxon period. My focus is on three counties which make up a region which has been understudied or undervalued in academic literature yet offers scope to make new statements on Anglo-Saxon settlement.

As Vince says in his introduction to the chapter on the Anglo-Saxon period in the recently published The Archaeology of the East Midlands – An Archaeological Resource Assessment and Research Agenda (2006, 161), much that is taken as fact for the period, is based upon little or no archaeological evidence. I hope to demonstrate that the evidence, while scarce, is out there, and when it is drawn together it can be used to present a fuller picture of a poorly understood period.

Specifically, the following issues will be addressed:

1. Roman imprints on the landscape.
2. Questions of post-Roman loss and/or continuity.
3. Anglo-Saxons as ‘incomers’ – many or few, and acculturation.
5. Landscape impact – busy/empty, open/wooded?
7. The need for more regional archaeologies, and consideration of methodological issues and problems associated with current modes of study and recording.

Background

A hundred years ago, the authors of the Leicestershire and Northamptonshire volumes of the *Victoria County Histories* recognised that the extent of the known Anglo-Saxon landscape was far from complete, and that what was known was largely due to chance finds rather than any organised study; in all likelihood, that was also how things were likely to remain. While this was clearly written with specific reference to these counties, one may argue that it could have been said of England in general. But in the intervening period, and especially in the last half century, we have experienced many significant changes in the conduct and organisation of archaeology. No longer is it the activity of the interested, learned gentry, the select few: now archaeology is everything from a weekend leisure activity for those with an interest in local history to a complex multi-disciplinary academic subject firmly placed within the planning and development process. Yet, as we will see, the local input is, in many ways, as vital as the academic input.

In contrast with the VCH comments on the Anglo-Saxon period, Roman settlement was clearer (if still far from complete) due to a recognisable, relatively strong material culture. It was easy to assume significant loss of population in the landscape in the post-Roman period due to the apparent decline in presence of recognisable goods in the archaeological record. The Roman occupation and administration of Britain marked an extended period of major settlement change and landscape exploitation and organisation on a scale unlike anything that had existed previously. Towns, settlements, villa estates, roads and an associated population growth were evident across much of the country and imprints of these can still be recognised. Less visible is the evidence of the post-Roman epoch and long has there been debate on the degree to which there was decline in the
Roman systems of settlement and land use. What continued and why? In what way did the population lose touch with, modify or replace this Roman pattern? Deemed crucial to the debate is the documented coming of the Germanic peoples from mainland Europe (Blair 2003, 7): can we observe their impact on the landscape and their interaction with the native population? How far is their arrival visible on the ground and how does this differ from the Roman period? How correct was Hoskins in viewing Anglo-Saxon occupation as being in a landscape reclaimed by nature?

Continuities and discontinuities of population, land and exploitation are all key areas of debate in any period of transition, both prehistoric and historic, which are dependent on many factors. These may differ in degrees of influence depending on location and need.

The Study Period and Themes

The period to be studied is specifically AD 450-850, with some consideration being given to the periods before and after the date range. The geographic focus comprises the English East Midlands, specifically the counties of Leicestershire, Northamptonshire and Rutland (Fig. 1), which fall within the Anglo-Saxon province of the Middle Angles, known as Mercia. The research will use the present-day county boundaries which form the basis for the organisation of the local authorities and the Historic Environment Record/Sites and Monument Record (HER/SMR).

The main written record of the political structure of Anglo-Saxon England is the Tribal Hidage, recorded in surviving document form in the 11th century, but relating to the situation in the later 7th century, thereby suggesting that such organisation and change had taken place by AD 600-650 (Yorke 1990, 9). What is less clear is the nature of early Anglo-Saxon kingship. Based on the Tribal Hidage, the three major ‘powers’ by the time of the 7th century were the Saxons, the East Angles and the Mercians (ibid., 11), with early Mercia comprising the North Mercians and the South Mercians, divided by the course of the River Trent (Hart 1977, 47). In terms of identity, the continental origins of the Saxons and the Angles are traced to the northern coasts of modern Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands (Walker 2000, xi), but the Mercians, while having Anglian roots, developed their identity in Britain, with their name coming from OE mierce, meaning ‘frontier’ and, arguably, reflecting their location in the west of the country (ibid., xii; Keynes in Lapidge et al. 2001, 306).
To place the physical landscape of this period into perspective, consideration will be given to the landscape of the Roman period, for it would be wrong to consider the landscape of the Anglo-Saxon East Midlands in isolation. As is often pointed out, the landscape is a palimpsest, and one cannot consider the landscape without looking at the underground evidence (Hoskins 1970, 12).

This period is significant with regard to the development of the English landscape because it encompasses two key transitional phases, both of which remain poorly understood in this part of the country.

1. The first phase is that from Roman Britain to Anglo-Saxon England. Since the late 1st century AD, southern Britain had seen the development of a partially urbanised landscape, and in the 3rd and 4th centuries further organisational change took place with the extension of the villa landscape. The precise nature of the changes that took place in the 5th and 6th centuries is unclear, however, but key issues will relate to depopulation and to cultural and economic change. What is evident from archaeological study is that there were changes in the settlement of the landscape with signs of what has been interpreted as discontinuity of settlement, marked by a major downturn in the use of towns and by the appearance of a predominantly dispersed pattern of small-scale rural settlement.

2. The 7th century marks the first phase in the re-establishment of the Church in the landscape, while the 8th and 9th centuries saw the expansion of trade and the commencement of settlement nucleation into villages and urban renewal associated with the middle to late Saxon periods (Hamerow 2001, 189).

In considering the Anglo-Saxon landscape, thought will be given not only to the natural features, but also to those of the later Roman period, seeking to assess the evolving character of the Romano-British countryside and settlement in the region since it was into this landscape that the Anglo-Saxons and their influences came.
In conjunction with data from the Anglo-Saxon period, I will consider the survival and visibility of earlier settlements and territories beyond AD 400. It is also intended to establish whether the Anglo-Saxon period shows signs of significant change in landscape organisation and whether the presence of a 'new', immigrant population can be identified, or whether it merely reflects change in the material culture across the study period. This thesis will concentrate upon the presence and interpretation of Anglo-Saxon material culture where appropriate. However, the issue of 'identity' is not core to the theme of the research, which will concentrate mainly on the issues and material data relating to settlement. Some of these themes are seen as key to the recently published volume *The Archaeology of the East Midlands – an archaeological resource assessment and research agenda* (Cooper 2006); while the major themes relate to Roman-Saxon transition, cultural boundaries, and the emergence of a monetary economy in the Middle
Saxon period, other themes that are seen as of importance include the road network, settlement hierarchy and inland towns (Vince 2006, 172-176). For my study area, as indeed for much of Britain, documentary data are patchy at the very best and thus archaeological evidence, plus toponymic/placename data, are key.

Traditionally, Anglo-Saxon archaeology focussed on the issues of burials, artefacts and identity – for example, Hope-Taylor describing Anglo-Saxon cemeteries as ‘...convenient quarries to provide raw material for the perpetuation of a habitual and unquestioning academic activity’ (1977, 262). This is largely attributable to the nature of the material culture of the Anglo-Saxons and, certainly in relation to the archaeology of the preceding Roman period, its poorer economic framework meaning a long absence of built (i.e. stone) structures.

Prior to the growth in community archaeology in the 1970s, our knowledge and understanding of the Anglo-Saxon period in the East Midlands was restricted to the recording of isolated sites and, most typically, burials, as evidenced by Audrey Meaney’s gazetteer (1964) and by reports in journals, for example, The Rutland Record. The problem from this is that in the early 20th century there were clearly insufficient sites to permit any detailed study of the landscape itself. The impetus behind further study of the landscape, specifically in the East Midlands, was the work of W. G. Hoskins, initially with his study of Anglian and Scandinavian settlement of Leicestershire (1935, 93-109), but more specifically with his work on The Making of the English Landscape (1955). In this volume, Hoskins concentrated upon the visible surface characteristics of the landscape and what they could tell of its development. Much of Hoskins’ landscape study of the Anglo-Saxon period concentrated upon later features - ‘villages’ and field systems, features largely absent from the landscape of the early Anglo-Saxon settlements (1985, 45-74). In his introduction to this subsequent reprint he drew a clear distinction between landscape history and archaeology – ‘the uncertainty about what may lie underneath’ (ibid., 12); he did, however, acknowledge the contribution of archaeologists in adding to our knowledge of the landscape through the identification of new sites, as well as stressing the complex overlapping and interrelating of sites of differing periods. The scope exists, therefore, to add in the archaeological data which could be used to develop this work.
Along with greater public awareness and interest in archaeology, the past 30 years especially have seen significant changes in archaeological techniques, including enhanced dating of artefacts, improved recognition rates (especially of pottery types) and a development of wide-scale landscape surface and subsurface survey methods enabling more sites or activities to be recognised (Aston 1985, 17). Landscape archaeology has introduced a range of non-intrusive survey techniques, ranging from fieldwalking to geophysical survey as well as more extensive area surveys, and in conjunction with new interpretative approaches (notably GIS) it has begun to reveal much more in terms of settlement patterns, making it possible to enter into debates on questions of continuity or loss of continuity of settlements and populations, and the origins of villages and estates.

Urban archaeology too has seen dramatic changes across the 20th century. Prior to the 1970s, the emphasis all lay on the Roman levels; heightened academic debate then prompted fuller consideration of the latest Roman to medieval deposits (or gaps). Now, since the advent of PPG 16, archaeology has firmly become part of the development process, and evaluation and excavation in the face of gradual urban regeneration have produced important new data relating to the Roman and Anglo-Saxon roots of our towns (Ottaway 1992).

Thus, more and more pieces of the jigsaw that make up our landscape are being found and the time is now right to try and put them together and see what the picture is beginning to look like. By drawing on these new data I hope to contribute further to the wider investigation and understanding of the landscapes of post-Roman England.

The Study Area

The study area lies in central England between the flat fenlands to the east, the Chilterns to the south-west and the Pennines to the north-west (see Fig.2, below). Three counties are covered: Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire and the boundaries that have been used to define the area are those county boundaries which are presently in use for the respective local authorities. Geographically, and with regard to the early medieval period, the study area lies to the south-east of the early Anglo-Saxon province/kingdom of Mercia, and within what was described as ‘Outer Mercia’, bounded to the south and east by the assorted grouping of the Middle Angles (Hart 1977, 47-47 and fig. 1). This
area is significant because of its central location, away from the recognised ‘invasion’ zone of eastern England, thereby offering greater scope to consider the issue of transition; it also presents a mix of an urban and non-urban Roman background in Leicestershire and Northamptonshire respectively, and the influence that such a phenomenon may (or may not) have on the later landscape.

In terms of archaeological fieldwork, the whole study area has benefited from a good level of coverage using comparable techniques of fieldwalking and recording, although, as will be seen, publication levels and access to results and data is not high. Academically the region is not particularly well studied which reflects the relative youth of archaeology as a recognised academic activity and legitimate part of the planning/development process; one of the earliest attempts to provide an archaeological

**Fig. ii: The study area of Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire**
assessment of the regional landscape was held in Leicester in 1989 looking at landscapes of Eastern England (Parker Pearson & Schadla-Hall 1994), which had a strong focus on Norfolk, Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire. This process of assessment and establishment of a research agenda has now proceeded to the publication of the Archaeology of the East Midlands volume; this volume suggests that one of the defining features of the East Midlands region is the landscape, particularly its variety (Cooper 2006, 5) which represents a microcosm of the country as a whole, comprising as it often has, a transitional zone between the south-east and the north-west.

(i) Leicestershire

In this county, the growth of fieldwalking and the activities of the Leicestershire Museums Archaeological Fieldwork Group (LMAFG) and local metal detectorists have contributed much to the multi-period study of the Leicestershire and Rutland landscape. Information from a number of major surveys will be used in looking at the late Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement of Leicestershire in Chapter 3. This growth in fieldwork started in the early to mid-1970s, leading to the establishment of a number of local fieldwork groups which have conducted their own area studies or surveys (often based on parishes). Noteworthy among these groups are those working around Great Easton in the south-east of the county, at Lutterworth and in the Melton Mowbray area. Long term research projects have also been established in south-east Leicestershire around Medbourne, and in the Wreake Valley in the parish of Barkby Thorpe, and at Brooksby, all of which will be considered in greater detail in Chapter 3 below.

Archaeologically, work within the central area of Leicester has been largely limited to small-scale excavation. This made it possible to gain glimpses of the archaeology of early Leicester without it being possible to establish the relationships (or lack of relationship) between those sites. Since 1991, work associated with the Causeway Lane and the Shires developments (Connor & Buckley 1999), particularly St Peters Lane and Vine Street (Gnanaratnam 2006), has helped to redress this imbalance collectively accounting for an area of approximately 10% of the walled town, and new data are presently coming to light with regard to the Roman, Anglo-Saxon and medieval periods of the city; notably with the excavation of areas affected by the ‘High Cross Quarter’ extension of the Shires Shopping Centre (2005 to present).
(ii) **Rutland**

Rutland is a small, well-defined and compact county, bordered by Leicestershire to the west, Lincolnshire to the north and east, and Northamptonshire to the south. In the west of the county are the rolling claylands of ‘High Leicestershire’ and to the east, the low-lying fenlands of eastern England. Following the local government reorganisation in 1974, Rutland, which had previously administered itself, came under the control of Leicestershire. Whilst having regained unitary status, some elements of local authority responsibility are still overseen by Leicestershire County Council which includes Archaeology and the Museums Service; alongside this is the work of the local fieldwork groups which operate within the scope of the LMAFG. These fieldworkers continue to undertake regular fieldwalking, with finds being reported to the HER/SMR for Leicestershire.

Two main areas of fieldwork will be the focus for this thesis. Firstly, there is the Roman small town at Great Casterton (Corder 1951, 1954, 1961) which has a series of Anglo-Saxon burials nearby as well as a villa which demonstrates evidence for Anglo-Saxon activity. Further to the east in the heart of the county is Rutland Water (formerly Empingham Reservoir). This is the largest man-made reservoir in England, formed during the early 1970s in the valley of the River Gwash. The construction process prompted a significant programme of archaeological fieldwork in the vicinity of the village of Empingham at the eastern end of the reservoir (Cooper 2000). Also of interest, situated to the north, close to the Leicestershire border is the Roman small town site at Thistleton which has been the subject of extensive investigation and is in close proximity to two Anglo-Saxon cemeteries at Market Overton (Crowther-Beynon 1904, 1910).

(iii) **Northamptonshire**

Northamptonshire is the most southerly of the three study counties bounded to the north by Leicestershire and Rutland; the boundary being formed by the River Welland; to the east and south lie Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire, and, to the west, Warwickshire. The county itself is an elongated oval in shape, aligned from south-west to north-east. The extent of the study area for Northamptonshire is the present-day boundary, excluding the Soke of Peterborough, which was formerly
included within the Northamptonshire County area. The county comprises seven district and borough council areas: Corby, Daventry, East Northamptonshire, Kettering, Northampton, South Northamptonshire and Wellingborough.

As with Leicestershire and Rutland, Northamptonshire has been the subject of extensive recent large scale fieldwalking surveys and landscape projects, most notably at Raunds (Parry 2006), Rockingham Forest (Foard et al. 2003) and at Whittlewood (Jones & Page 2003a, 2003b). Together with the fieldwork at Brigstock (Foster 1994), around Brixworth, and at the Roman villa site at Piddingon, these will form the basis of the consideration of settlement activity in the county (see Chapter 5), supported by burial data and material from the HER/SMR.

**Structure of the Thesis**

The thesis is structured around the evidence from these core counties and addresses a set of issues. Chapters 1 and 2 will consider both sources and methods of study which will include literary sources, both primary and secondary. There will also be a summary commentary on the types of fieldwork through which the physical material has been recovered and the means by which this has been recorded and assessed. Chapter 2 will look at the materials and artefacts that have served as the main evidence for the existence of the Anglo-Saxon culture in the East Midlands, together with an examination of the characteristics of early Anglo-Saxon settlements and timber buildings.

Chapters 3, 4 and 5 will focus upon the three counties of the study area – Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire – starting with the natural landscape before summarising the extent of late Roman settlement and Anglo-Saxon cemetery and settlement sites. This will be followed by closer study and the discussion of the results of fieldwork in a number of case study areas. Chapter 6 will review the evidence concerning early medieval settlement activity in the light of place-name studies. This will provide an opportunity to review the application of place-name studies; these pre-date the boom in archaeological fieldwork that occurred in the 1970s, and it is now possible to look at place-names in relation to the distribution of archaeological finds and establish whether any good correlation exists, or whether there is scope for revision on account of the sizeable rise in archaeological evidence.
Chapter 7 will offer an analysis of the emergent patterns of landscape settlement and the vexed issue of population ethnicities/identities, as well as seeking to model the transition process from the dispersed settlement of the earlier Anglo-Saxon landscape towards the nucleated village landscape that is typically associated with late Saxon and medieval England. The conclusion will review the state of knowledge overall for the study zone in the context of Anglo-Saxon archaeology and settlement, and identify the remaining gaps and problems. As with much research, no secure final conclusions/answers can be made, merely suggestions based upon the available evidence.
CHAPTER 1

Methodology

'Fieldwalking is one of the key techniques that can be used to build up a picture of past human activity in an area. In many areas it is the only technique that will yield any substantial evidence about the pre-medieval periods.'

(Liddle 1985, 7)

'Due to increased research, the advance of archaeological techniques, the development of improved planning policies and the efforts of many archaeologists – both professional and amateur, more has been achieved in the last 25 years to enhance our understanding of Anglo-Saxon Leicestershire and Rutland than in the previous two centuries.'

(Knox 2004, 104)

1.1 Introduction

This chapter will detail three main aspects. Firstly, by highlighting key events from the study period, it will be possible to place the archaeology of the period and study area, albeit broadly, into an historical context. It will then address the archaeological processes in the East Midlands and issues regarding the classification and distribution of sites. In conjunction with the physical evidence, there will be a summary literature review relating to the period and main themes. Consideration will then be given to recent trends in archaeological fieldwork across the three counties together with the recording of the data. The topography of each county will be covered in detail in Chapters 3, 4 and 5.

1.2 Historic events

This thesis centres on the period AD 450 to 850, a timeframe which covers the demise of Roman rule in Britain, the settlement of the ‘Anglo-Saxon’ peoples, and the onset of Scandinavian raids on England in the 9th century - crucial periods, therefore, of change affecting the landscape, towns and the population of England as a whole. However, it would be wrong to consider this period in isolation and in order to try and understand events more fully they must be viewed in context through consideration of the
settlement of the preceding late Roman period. At the other end of the period, it may also be possible to try and add to our understanding of life in Anglo-Scandinavian or pre-Norman England in the ninth century, including not only the establishment of the Christian Church and the growth of rulers and territories, but also the transition from a dispersed pattern of landscape settlement to a more nucleated form of settlement.

The late 4th century AD appears to have been a time of considerable turmoil, both within Britain and on the fringes of the Roman Empire (see Appendix 1). This impacted strongly on settlement patterns in Britain. It led to the breakdown of what had been, for nearly four centuries, a distinctive system of landscape organisation and social control unlike anything previously known in Britain, brought about via the Roman establishment of towns, villas and a major road network. Furthermore, in the north and west there was the presence of a strong, centralised Roman army with fixed defensive positions. Because of these perceived major changes in society, the thesis will also consider the Roman landscape of the study area to enable discussion of the theme of 'discontinuity'.
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*Fig. 1.1: Anglo-Saxon England (after Yorke 1990, map 1)*
In contrast to the Roman period, the physical evidence of the early Anglo-Saxons, related historical events and their settlements in particular, is typically scarce by its very nature, contributing thereby to the traditional nomenclature of the period as the ‘Dark Ages’. In written sources, it would be another 40 to 50 years before the settlement of ‘Anglo-Saxon’ people was recorded, both in the writings of Gildas and of Bede, the two main (but later) sources for the events of this time. Another source of material, key for the following chronology of the early Anglo-Saxon period, is *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, drawn from annals composed in the monasteries of Abingdon, Canterbury, Peterborough and Winchester (Garmonsway 1972).

The traditional view, drawn particularly from Bede (*Historia Ecclesiastica* 1.15), suggests a period of strife preceded by a sizeable immigration by incomers who were people of the land, not of towns: aggressive, but crude agricultural people, largely self-sufficient and, due to the perceived nature of their houses in the form of *Grubenhauser*, or sunken-featured buildings (SFBs), living in holes in the ground. As the evidence of the material culture of these people has long revealed, however, in particular their jewellery and finely-crafted swords (and later written material, e.g. *Beowulf* of the 7th to 10th century (Heaney 2002)), it is more than apparent that they were also highly skilled craftsmen and artists.

Due to the nature of Anglo-Saxon artefacts and their survivability in archaeological contexts, far more is known of burials in the early medieval period than of settlements and houses, mainly because cemeteries have a greater physical archaeological presence in terms of the survival of artefacts (pottery and metalwork, as well as human remains) than most settlement sites (mainly post-holes). This, in turn, presents a distorted view of the period, meaning that links with the Roman period may not easily be drawn. As will be seen, field survey and excavation are very much balancing out the picture between cemetery and settlement sites and what is known and what is not known; landscape analysis especially helps in tracing the overlap (or not) with the Roman past.

**1.3 Site Classification**

Whilst offering consideration of late Romano-British settlement, the focus for this study is upon sites attributable to occupation or usage in the early and middle Anglo-Saxon periods, from AD 450-600 and 600-850. In their broadest terms these will comprise
sites that can be shown to demonstrate the characteristics of settlement, as opposed to very short-term or temporary activity, or burial/cremation. In this regard, artefact finds - for example, brooches or other personal items found in isolation - could be interpreted as being 'casual losses' and as such have been disregarded as not being representative of habitation itself. Although such items reflect a presence, that presence may have been only transitory - i.e. movement between sites - and thus is not classified as settlement per se.

A similar approach has been adopted with burial sites. In some cases, artefacts have been recorded in archive sources as isolated finds; while they may originally have related to the disposal of a body, it is felt that often there is insufficient detail from the report to guarantee this. Such sites can involve the finding of 'an iron spearhead' (Tilton-on-the-Hill, Leics.), or 'an Anglo-Saxon pin' (Kegworth, Leics.), but these items, again, could fall into the category of 'accidental loss', and therefore sufficient doubt must remain as to the exact circumstances of their deposition. In such cases, these isolated sites have been omitted from the record of burials.

Settlement, here, is interpreted as the use of a site for the purposes of habitation and related activity. This covers three categories of site:

1. **Settlements** - Sites that have been interpreted as 'settlement' for the purposes of local authority Historic Environment Records/Sites and Monuments Record (HER/SMR) (see 1.8 below). These most typically occur as a surface scatter of pottery found in the course of fieldwalking or from finds recovered during excavation. In the case of excavated sites, there is also the presence of structural remains, namely post-holes, hearths, pits or other such features associated with domestic activity.

2. **Industrial sites** - These may often be similar in character to settlement sites, reflecting the nature and scale of Anglo-Saxon settlement activity but with scatters of slag, demonstrating evidence of metalworking. Some ordinary sites will show domestic industrial activity. The one note of caution here is that, as yet, the dating of slag by scientific means is still regarded as being unreliable.

3. **Cemetery sites** - Cemeteries are indicative of the presence of a local population even if frequently the related settlement(s) remain undiscovered. Burial
practice includes cremation and/or inhumation, and within these the inclusion of grave goods (either personal or functional items or more symbolic artefacts) or the lack of grave goods, can be seen. Such artefacts enable some consideration of population status, economics and contacts to be undertaken. Burial groups may belong to one or more settlements – farms and hamlets distributed over a certain area, or located within a territory.

It is conceivable that site identification will still be open to interpretation, particularly given the number of sites found and recorded by fieldwalking without further intrusive investigation taking place. Clearly, excavation and/or geophysical survey may reveal new information. However it is not always possible, or appropriate, for additional investigation to be carried out and this study is limited to the data currently accessible from the HER/SMR and related sources (see below).

1.3.1 Site Distribution

Based upon the site classification, the location of individual sites has been recorded on maps of the study area. This will produce a landscape view of the distribution of settlements and burial sites, enabling closer analysis of the distribution of late Roman and Anglo-Saxon period occupation in the East Midlands (see Chapters 3, 4 & 5).

To aid in understanding the nature of Anglo-Saxon settlement, some individual sites will be considered in detail; however, the aim is to take a step back from the minutiae of scrutinising specific sites and to try to achieve an impression of the distribution of settlement sites and then to place them as a whole into the context of the late/post-Roman landscape of Britain and its population.

The thesis will address how far, for the East Midlands study area, the current data offer a coherent or reliable distribution of late Roman and early medieval rural and other settlement: what coverage exists, what gaps remain, and what inferences can be made.

1.4 Literature Review

The early Anglo-Saxon period was very much one of an oral tradition of story-telling and the transmission of memories and events (Crossley-Holland 1982, 34). The main
narrative texts of the period that are often referred to are the works of Gildas and Bede, and Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* remains a highly valuable source of material (Welch 1992, 9). Even then it must be remembered that Gildas, a Welsh monk, wrote his *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae* around AD 547 and Bede, born in AD 673, was writing *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* some three hundred years after the ending of Roman influence and the start of the Anglo-Saxon period.

In addition to the HER/SMR data (see Section 1.8), the secondary literature under consideration takes four forms:

1. Studies of the material culture relating to Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and settlements at a national and regional level – such as synthetic studies, cemetery overviews and artefacts.

2. Published material which lies within specialist spheres - for example, archaeological society journals.

3. Published excavation reports.

4. Material not yet been brought to publication, or not due to go to a wider publication, e.g. excavation or survey reports, and archive material with units or HER/SMRs.

Material which falls into the first category tends to be general in nature, either historical in content or providing an overview while giving examples based on the well-known, key sites. The majority of the 20th century was dominated by the ‘cultural history’ approach and the works of E. T. Leeds with regard to Anglo-Saxon metalwork (Leeds, 1912, 1949) and J. N. L. Myres on Anglo-Saxon pottery (Myres 1969, 1977). These artefacts will be considered in more detail in Chapter 2. This chronological and geographical approach has long been followed, while the more social aspects - social structure and religion - have been either ignored or over-looked on the basis that they are hard to identify archaeologically, creating a ‘minimalist’ approach to the study of Anglo-Saxon society (Hawkes 1954, cited in Richards 1987, 11). This is understandable when coming from a period where the focus of studies was upon grave goods which could be used to tell much of the status and origins of people, whereas unfurnished or sparsely furnished graves were seen as being of little use in gaining such information. Research is now seeking to redress this imbalance in the use of archaeology for the
study of past societies in general (Díaz-Andreu et al. 2005) and Anglo-Saxon society and social structure in particular, with recent contributions from Sam Lucy (2000) and Helena Hamerow (2002) on burials and settlement respectively.

In the second group, articles in journals, such as Medieval Archaeology, Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society, Northamptonshire Archaeology, and the Rutland Record, tend to relate to significant sites or may be of important but possibly unique finds. At more local levels, reported sites or finds may relate to sites which have been recorded in isolation: often due to lack of available funding these sites cannot be studied in any greater detail, nor can they be placed into a broader context in their setting (Liddle, pers. comm.).

The third category comprises reports following archaeological fieldwork. These may take the form of published excavation reports of major sites, or fieldwalking programmes such as that conducted at Raunds, Northamptonshire (Parry 2006). In the case of the Anglo-Saxon period excavations are most often of cemeteries for example Sutton Hoo (Bruce-Mitford 1972; Carver 2005), but occasionally of settlements, Mucking (Hamerow 1993), West Heslerton (Haughton & Powlesland 1999) and West Stow (West 1985). For the study area, however, few such sites have been subjected to detailed examination.

Finally, there are those sites which, for whatever reason, have not yet been brought forward for publication. These may include smaller projects which have been presented to clients and lodged with the HER/SMR and in unit archives but which, being perceived as being of limited interest when looked at in isolation, do not warrant wider distribution or are not due to be more widely circulated. These may also include projects which are still on-going, or are only recently completed in terms of the fieldwork, and a prime example for the East Midlands is the fieldwork at Whittlewood, Northamptonshire (2000-2005), which has seen interim reports published both in Medieval Archaeology (Jones & Page 2003a, 53-83), and through the Medieval Settlement Research Group (e.g. Jones & Page 2001, 15-25; Dyer et al. 2002, 42); the final report is now available through Internet Archaeology (Jones et al. 2006).

Similarly, at a more local level but potentially of national significance, the excavations of the Anglo-Saxon settlement at Eye Kettleby, conducted a decade ago, have appeared as interim reports in the pages of Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeological and
Historical Society (Finn 1996, 161). It also includes fieldwork which has been completed and is in the course of preparation for publication. Examples of such work can appear in journals with a national coverage: Medieval Archaeology includes an annual summary of sites and finds relating to ‘Medieval Britain and Ireland’ on a county basis as well as a report relating to the Portable Antiquities Scheme; the Annual Report of the Medieval Settlement Research Group includes summaries of what are termed ‘Discoveries and Excavations’ in Britain, again on a county basis. Additionally there is work which arguably could be included in the second category; in other words, work which has been completed, but whose results may not have been widely disseminated. It is the aim of this thesis to provide a synthesis of the fieldwork that has been conducted in the counties of Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire, in order to give an overview of the early Anglo-Saxon period activity within these areas of the East Midlands.

From this broad introduction we can next briefly review some of the main and recent literature for my themes of study, namely (i) the transition from Roman Britain to Anglo-Saxon England, (ii) the early Anglo-Saxon period, (iii) Anglo-Saxon cemeteries, (iv) Anglo-Saxon settlements, and (v) the East Midlands in the Anglo-Saxon period.

(i) Late Roman Britain and Anglo-Saxon Transition

Due in no small part to the nature of Roman material culture, frequently with stone and brick buildings, and mass-produced, durable artefacts, easily recognised and with a high survival rate in the soil, the Roman period is well covered in terms of published material. Publications range from Roman Britain as a whole (Frere 1987; Jones & Mattingly 1990; Salway 1993; Mattingly 2006) and specific features, for example the towns (Wacher 1995), to regional and site-specific volumes, for example McCarthy’s work at Carlisle (1993 & 2002), Crummy on the excavations at Colchester (1977) and Niblett on Verulamium (2001). In addition, extensive research has been conducted into pottery, coinage, clothing, ornamentation and many other aspects of Roman life. The resulting impression is that a fairly full image of life in Roman Britain can be assembled. These data have also been used in more analytical ways to assess the impact of Rome on Britain and the British population, and a prime example of this process is Millett’s The Romanization of Britain (1990), reprinted four times since publication, and Mattingly (2006).
Transitional periods, such as that marking the end of the Roman period, are often much more problematical: it is convenient to label things and put them into specific boxes: Roman things belong in the period AD 43-410; Norman material starts with the Norman Conquest in 1066; and, by definition, the Anglo-Saxon period, together with the Saxo-Norman period, must fit between the two. Reality, however, is not this simple; just as with a change in government or monarch, there is no sudden change in the nature of life in the country, and so it was with these transitional periods: life for the majority of the population would have carried on for a time with no great change, either structurally or materially. Only in specific places and in the face of invasion, or takeovers of land, would there have been any dramatic changes.

Increasing attention is now paid to these periods. Of the final Roman centuries and the transition period following, several books have recently been published that relate well to this subject area, particularly those by Faulkner (2000), Dark and Dark (1997), and Esmonde Cleary (2000). The last, originally published in 1989, lacks both the currency of the two subsequent publications however, and appears to avoid the subject of the transition itself. As will be seen, the growth in landscape surveys has contributed much to our knowledge of the distribution of sites and has in turn led to the publication of landscape-oriented volumes (Dark & Dark 1997). Whilst these concentrate on issues relating specifically to the Romano-British landscape, for example villas, the urban landscape, and industry, consideration is also given to the end of the Romano-British period and issues of continuity and change (ibid., 135-147). Elsewhere, publications relating to the Roman period now include additional chapters addressing this ensuing period as well as period-specific volumes such as Dark's *Britain and the End of the Roman Empire* (2000) and Swift's *The End of the Western Roman Empire* (2000). Dark’s volume concentrates upon the evidence for activity on sites in the 5th and 6th centuries and considers the regional characteristics of the different parts of Britain, whereas Swift considers change in the western empire, chiefly north Gaul and The Danube, in the 4th and 5th centuries, focusing more on regional variation and change through artefacts rather than sites. Clearly there is scope for further work in these difficult transitional periods and the gradual production of fieldwork data from landscape surveys is now contributing to the preparation of regional studies, for example, Whittlewood, Northamptonshire (Jones *et al.*, 2006), Essex (Morris 2005) and Wiltshire (Draper 2006).
The main listing of Roman villa sites remains *A Gazetteer of Roman Villas in Britain* (Scott 1993; Appendix 2). While the author did not claim that all the sites were necessarily villas (ibid., iv), what she does provide is a good source of reference to produce a reliable pattern of the distribution of villas and larger rural sites across Britain. At a more site-specific level, a number of villa excavations are producing what is acknowledged as evidence for early post-Roman activity, for example major sites such as Orton Hall Farm near Peterborough (Mackreth 1996) and Frocester in Gloucestershire (Gracie & Price 1979; Price 2000) (see also Section 6.2 below). In the East Midlands, similar data have been identified at Empingham, Rutland (Cooper 2000a) (see Section 4.5.2) and at Piddington (Northants.) (Friendship-Taylor & Friendship-Taylor 2002) (see Section 5.5.4). This level of activity can amount to what is regarded as ‘occupation’: excavation at Orton Hall Farm showed continuity of a farming settlement in five phases spanning the whole of the Romano-British period, with the final phase lasting from the mid-late 4th century AD into the early 6th century (Mackreth 1996, 27-42), while at Frocester the significant evidence comprised of scatters of typically early Anglo-Saxon grass-tempered pottery (Gracie & Price 1979, 17, fig. 6). But post-Roman activity need not always equate to ‘occupation’ and in the case of the site at Empingham it takes the form of burials within the confines of the structure (Cooper 2000a, 20-21). This might suggest that while there has been a clear break in the use of the building, as a structure and as a feature in the landscape, it was not completely lost and had effectively undergone a change of use which suited the needs of the new ‘occupants’ or the nearby population. Whilst these sites represent only a small proportion of the number of villas that have been discovered to date, nonetheless they do indicate continuity of activity on villa sites, or reuse in some form, in the immediate post-Roman period. Here, the question also relates to who the occupants were – old or new, Romanised or Saxon?

(ii) *Anglo-Saxon England*

The initial impression is that there are a large number of publications relating to Anglo-Saxon England. Some of these publications are very general in their subject matter, if useful as introductions (Welch 1992), while others offer more detail (Campbell 1991). Other volumes tend to focus more on specific topics or regions, for example Davidson’s
Currency with Anglo-Saxon material also appears to be a problem: some publications first appeared in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and continued with revised editions up to the second half of the 20th century. Similarly there seem to be periods when the publication of Anglo-Saxon material has been fashionable, namely the 1920s and 1930s, the late 1960s, mid-1970s, mid-1980s and the late 1990s. The problem then is that thinking often becomes set, with little revision: Myres’ *A Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Pottery of the Pagan Period* (1977) was based on work carried out in the 1930s, while Davidson’s volume was originally published in 1962. Such works are based upon study conducted much earlier and using a methodology that may be regarded as outmoded, thus making the findings appear dated. The same can be suggested of Jessup’s *Anglo-Saxon Jewellery* (1974) in which it was suggested that excavations at the settlement at West Stow, Suffolk produced only one “very unusual iron brooch of a late fourth-century continental type” and yet the excavation report (West 1985, 122) records six brooches. While such works still have value, they now need to be looked at in relation to more recent work by Richards on cremation urns (1987), scientific analysis of fabrics (Williams & Vince 1997), the findings of major surveys such as the Raunds survey (Parry 2006), and the contributions of specialist artefact study groups.

The growth of the sub-discipline of Landscape Archaeology is contributing much new data, and the past decade has seen significant advances in the study of the landscape, notably, the interpretation of Anglo-Saxon cemeteries (Lucy 2000), and in landscapes and settlement sites through the work of Della Hooke (1995) and Helena Hamerow (2002). Many of the resulting data are coming to the fore through the publication of site reports, yet these have yet to be brought together for consideration in relation to Anglo-Saxon England as a whole, or for regional study. The start of the 21st century has seen the appearance of several publications which focus on the study area, either reviewing the current state of knowledge based upon fieldwork and key sites and finds, or setting out a multi-period research agenda. The former comprise two publications: *Leicestershire Landscapes* (Bowman and Liddle 2004) which was based upon a two day conference held in 2001 to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the LMAFG, and *The Archaeology of Northamptonshire* (Tingle 2004) providing a view of the archaeology of
the county for the new millennium. The inspiration for this latter volume was the discussion leading to the publication of *The Archaeology of the East Midlands* (Cooper 2006) which has sought to set out a co-ordinated research agenda for the archaeology of the East Midlands.

(iii) *Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries*

A large number of Anglo-Saxon cemetery excavation reports have been published, particularly since the 1970s, many within journals, and some having seen publication in their own right, for example the volumes relating to the cremation and inhumation cemeteries at Spong Hill, Norfolk (Hills *et al.* 1977; 1981; 1984; 1987; 1993; McKinley 1994; Rickett 1995) as well as more recent work at West Heslerton (Haughton & Powlesland 1999). However, just as such multi-volume publications can be of considerable use, some older discoveries can be recorded in a very scant manner, as is highlighted in Audrey Meaney’s *A Gazetteer of Early Anglo-Saxon Burial Sites* (1964). The pattern now is for sites to be given much fuller treatment as has been the case with Empingham II in Rutland (Timby 1996) and this reflects the archaeological advances that have taken place in terms of palaeopathology in particular. This, in turn, has led onto yet more detailed consideration of burial practice (Lucy 2000) and also scientific analysis of population groups (Tatham 2004).

Both the methods of burial and the study of grave goods are generally acknowledged as being good sources for dating of cemeteries and for considerations of identity. One other useful feature of cemeteries is that, if it is accepted that they existed in relatively close relation to settlements, the presence of a cemetery may be seen as being a good indicator of the area in which a settlement may be found and thereby enable some discussion on local demographics.

(iv) *Anglo-Saxon Villages*

Only a few villages or larger rural groupings – for example, Mucking (Essex) (Hamerow 1993), Chalton (Addyman *et al.* 1972) and Cowdery’s Down (Millett & James 1983) both in Hampshire, Sutton Courtney (Oxon.) (Leeds 1923), Catholme (Staffs.) (Losco-Bradley & Kinsley 2002), West Stow (Suffolk) (West 1985), Bishopstone (Sussex) and now West Heslerton (Yorks.) - have been excavated in detail and published fully, although often still appearing as papers in archaeological journals.
as opposed to monographs. The excavations of the West Heslerton project, whilst still on-going, are also available on the internet (http://intarch.ac.uk/journal/issue5/westhes_index.html; http://www.engh.gov.uk/archrev/rev96_7/whes.htm).

Anglo-Saxon settlements are examples of the problem of the lapse in time between excavation and publication, to the extent that sites excavated within the last decade often have still not been fully written up, appearing only as interim reports (including Eye Kettleby, Leics.). This, in reality, reflects the often complex nature of the archaeology of such sites (and as a consequence the need for the contributions of many specialists): a combination of multi-period occupation of the site and the fragmentary nature of the evidence for settlement which can complicate the interpretation of the data.

(v) The Early Medieval East Midlands

There are some useful general titles related to the study area, but much of the material is dated having been published in 1946 (Leicester Museum & Art Gallery), 1975 (Clough et al.), 1982 (Liddle) and 1985 (Stafford) and consequently lacks currency.

The earliest synthetic maps of Anglo-Saxon Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire were published in the *Victoria History of the Counties of England* (Page 1907, 220; 1908, 94; 1902, 222). At the time of the original publication of these volumes, very few sites had been identified: the extent of Anglo-Saxon Rutland was made up of just three sites (all burial sites) at Cottesmore, Market Overton and at North Luffenham (see Fig. 1.2).

With the gradual increase in available material came the publication of region-specific volumes. Two particular examples are *Mercian Studies* (ed. Dornier 1977) and Pauline Stafford’s work on *The East Midlands in the Early Middle Ages* (1985). Dornier concentrates upon some of the key sites of the East Midlands, notably the churches at Brixworth (Northants.) and Breedon-on-the-Hill (Leics.); there was also some unexpected currency in this volume’s content with a report on the excavations in Northampton, conducted in 1976. Stafford may now be dated in terms of the material that has since been recorded due to the increase in fieldwork, but it still offers much that is helpful as a starting-off point. Most recently, the publication *Village, Hamlet and*
Field (Lewis et al. 2001) concentrates primarily on the origins of village nucleation between AD 850 and 1200 in Central England. The preceding periods are not ignored, but they are not considered in detail - rightly so, given the subject matter of the book - and the suggestion is made that changes in settlement in the early medieval period were often local changes and responses, rather than being part of an organised move for change which came about later with the growth in influence of local lords and the church (ibid., 96).

Fig. 1.2: Anglo-Saxon sites of Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire as given by the Victoria County Histories of England. (ed. Page 1907, 1908, 1902)

A further source comprises University undergraduate and MA dissertations: these do not always reach publication and the wider audience that they deserve, a case in point being Robert Sayer’s study of Anglo-Saxon Ethnicity and Dress Variation in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries: A Case for Local Identities (2000). An exception to this is Philip Williams’ work on the Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Thurcaston, Leicester (1981), subsequently published by Leicestershire Museums (Williams 1983).
1.5 Landscapes and Field Surveys

There are a number of publications on the Anglo-Saxon landscape and countryside. Most of those relating to the Anglo-Saxon landscape tend to have a regional focus: for example, Hooke’s work in the West Midlands/West Mercia, and also Looking at the Land (Parker Pearson & Schadla-Hall 1994) and Anglo-Saxon Landscapes of the East Midlands (Bourne 1996), both of which arose from conferences held in Leicester in 1987 and 1991, respectively looking at fieldwork and research in eastern England.

Publications that concentrate on the countryside and fields more frequently adopt an historical or chronological approach, building notably on the work of W. G. Hoskins (1955). It is also noteworthy that following on from this, much of the work relating to fields and the countryside was originally published in the 1950s and 1960s; Hoskins’ work (has been much reissued) is still in print.

To build on the inspiration of Hoskins, the Society for Landscape Studies was formed in 1979 and 1999 saw its 21st annual conference with papers assessing landscape history from prehistory to the post-medieval industrial period (Hooke 2000). Significantly in 2005, to mark the 50th anniversary of the publication of Hoskins’ The Making of the English Landscape, a major conference was held to celebrate the work of landscape history that Hoskins had inspired. Papers from this conference are currently being edited for publication (Dyer, forthcoming).

At a local level, in Leicestershire, the combination of professional drive and local amateur enthusiasm, combined with the willingness to learn of local pasts, has led to the undertaking of a number of survey projects of varying size, which are contributing to the study of a not insignificant area of the landscape. Specifically, in south-east Leicestershire, the Medbourne Area Survey (Liddle 1994, 34-36) which was largely conducted between 1981 and 1987, has been added to with the archaeological survey in the parish of Stonton Wyville (Liddle et al. 1996) as well as the work of Paul Bowman in the Langtons (1996) and the Great Easton Fieldwork Group with their fieldwalking survey of the parishes of Great Easton, Bringhurst and Drayton (Great Easton & District Local History Society Fieldwork Group, unpublished). A similar situation exists in the Wreake Valley to the north-east of Leicester where a combination of surveys by the County Museums Service at Brooksby (Liddle & Knox 1991; Liddle & Knox 1997),
Leicestershire Museums and the University of Leicester at Barkby Thorpe (Liddle 1989, 109), Brooksby (Christie 2001, 100) and excavations at Eye Kettleby (Finn 1997, 1999) all contribute to a detailed study of another part of the county’s landscape.

The activities of the Leicestershire Museums Archaeological Fieldwork Group cannot be disregarded. Made up of approximately three hundred members, and organised county-wide into a number of local groups, these volunteers regularly undertake fieldwalking to record the presence, or otherwise, of archaeological material, all of which will produce data to add to the state of knowledge of the counties of Leicestershire and Rutland. This group celebrated its 25th anniversary with a conference in 2001, the findings of which were published as *Leicestershire Landscapes* (Bowman & Liddle 2004).

Northamptonshire has been subjected to similar, detailed landscape surveys at Raunds (Parry 1994, 36-42, and 2006), Brigstock (Foster 1994, 46-50) and most recently in Rockingham Forest (Foard *et al.* 2003), while survey work around Whittlewood is now complete (Jones *et al.* 2006). As with Leicestershire, a more general programme of field survey for the whole county has been conducted (Hall 1994, 50-53). Taking the form of a long-term project conducted at weekends, the initial aim of the project was to record medieval field systems, but this was expanded to encompass all archaeological remains – earthworks, crop-marks and artefacts – prior to the post-medieval period, for the whole of Northamptonshire. The information was then processed, and the data prepared for inclusion in the HER/SMR (ibid., 51).

**1.6 Urban Archaeology**

The opportunity for extensive archaeological excavation in the urban environment is limited due to the concentration of occupation and commercial pressures. As a result, the opportunity for putting together comprehensive archaeological summaries for towns is similarly restricted. Often, publications take the form of articles in journals or magazines, or possibly slim single volumes, for example those on Wroxeter (White & Barker 1998) and Carlisle (McCarthy 2002). It is rare to find large volumes, although with the instigation of the current programme of urban surveys through the work of English Heritage in conjunction with local authorities, more such volumes may become...
available. One of the most recent, and important publications in this context is that for Lincoln (Jones et al. 2003).

Only a small number of major publications relate specifically to the Leicester urban area, although interim reports have appeared in the *Transactions of the Leicester Archaeological and Historical Society*, for example the work at Sanvey Gate (Finn 1993, 93-95), Bath Lane (Cooper 1993, 83-86), Mill Lane (Finn 2002, 94-97) and Bonners Lane (Finn 1994, 165-170) - the latter since published in full (Finn 2004).

The main publication relating to recent excavations in the heart of Roman Leicester is that of the excavations at Causeway Lane which took place in 1991 (Connor & Buckley 1999). Experience has shown that while considerable Roman remains can survive, much of the medieval archaeology of Leicester has been lost as a direct result of development of the industrial town in the Victorian era and the construction of cellars and later foundations. Yet what has been shown from extensive work in the city centre in advance of the Shires Shopping Centre extension, is that pockets of early medieval and medieval archaeology do survive, as witnessed in the discovery in 2006 of Anglo-Saxon features and approximately 1330 burials associated with the lost St Peter’s church (Plate 1.1) - the largest number of burials discovered from a single site outside London, for which analysis is on-going (Gnanaratnam, pers. comm.).

![Plate 1.1: Excavation of human remains in central Leicester (ULAS)](image)

Northampton has been similarly damaged; the construction of Victorian cellars as well as earlier medieval pit-digging has contributed much to the destruction of the archaeology of the post-Norman Conquest town (Williams et al., 1985, 6). The major
publication of the Northampton urban area is the *Middle Saxon Palaces at Northampton* (ibid., 1985), which was followed by further excavation in the mid-1990s as reported in an article in *Current Archaeology* (Shaw et al. 1997) and a number of smaller urban sites have been reported upon in *Northamptonshire Archaeology*, the journal of the Northamptonshire Archaeological Society.

### 1.7 Place-names

With regard to place-names, the work of Margaret Gelling (1992), adopting a landscape approach to the interpretation of place-names, provides the main starting point for work on the interpretation and study of place-names. For a basic introduction to the use of place-names in general and as a means of getting close to their origins and meaning within the East Midland study area, the works of Field (1994) and Mills (1998) are of particular value.

The prime sources of information are the publications of the English Place-Name Society. These range from articles in the *Journal of the English Place-Name Society* to specific and most comprehensive county studies, for example that for Northamptonshire (Gover *et al.*, 1933), and the work of Barrie Cox on Leicestershire (1998, 2002) and Rutland (1994). The Society also gives general background material on the subject of geology, landscape and early settlement. More compact studies are also available for Leicestershire and Rutland (Wilshere 1986; Bourne 2003) and for Northamptonshire (Whynne-Hammond 1994). The specific value of place-name studies will be considered in Chapter 6.

### 1.8 Historic Environment Records/Sites and Monuments Record

The crucial resource for this current study is the compilation of field data and findings held in Historic Environment Records (HERs). Previously known as the Sites and Monuments Record (SMR) and hereafter referred to as the HER/SMR, this is a local authority-based resource held by individual County Councils listing the archaeological resources of their specific geographic area. The name change was introduced to reflect the broader range of data now being held in the SMR (http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.001003003005006). HER/SMRs also now hold data from the Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS), recorded to an accuracy of 1km. sq. or at
no greater than parish level where security may be an issue (http://www.finds.org.uk/her.php).

Similar data are also available on-line through the English Heritage ‘Pastscape’ site (http://www.pastscape.org.uk/Default.aspx) which is based upon the National Monuments Record, although there does seem to be greater emphasis upon major sites rather than, for example, the recording of smaller finds and sites such as those to be found in the HER/SMR. The Archaeology Data Service (http://ads.ahds.ac.uk/) too provides an on-line resource for digital data resources and services in support of archaeological research.

For the East Midlands, Leicestershire County Council, at Glenfield on the outskirts of Leicester, maintains the HER/SMR for both Leicestershire and Rutland, while Northamptonshire County Council, in Northampton, is solely responsible for the Northamptonshire SMR. Since April 1997 the City of Leicester has been established as a separate unitary authority, and has assumed responsibility for the maintenance of the HER/SMR for the City of Leicester area. These data, currently, are not accessible on-line.

The HER/SMR is the central point within the local government organisation at which all information relating to the recording of archaeological finds, sites and monuments is drawn together. The HER/SMR will be the first port of call when planning fieldwork or excavation and also when presenting the findings of fieldwork. The significant feature here is that, particularly in the case of small sites (small scatters of pot sherds with no associated excavation) or isolated finds, the information itself may not go any further than the HER/SMR.

These systems have increasingly become computerised in the last 10 to 15 years which has made it much easier to extract information from them. The introduction, too, of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) has further enhanced the service that can be offered. The intention with HER/SMRs is that not only do they have a role to play in the development process – both internally for local authority officers and externally for developers, but also they should be used as an educational resource as well as being accessed by members of the public. At present, access is typically through direct contact with the local authority, however it is intended that the data should be available on-line.
As is often the problem with any information storage and retrieval system, there are limitations:

1. How detailed or comprehensive is the information that has been stored? The system has to be manageable to be efficient therefore it has to be designed to record the key details while still retaining the minimum amount of information to be useful.

2. How accurate is the information that has been recorded? Recent finds may be recorded in appropriate detail; however details of earlier sites may have been lost resulting in only partial records being available.

3. What information is being sought from the system? To be able to make best use of the HER/SMR system, users have to be careful to ask the correct questions of it in order to avoid wasting valuable time.

One other factor has become clear in the course of this research. As to be expected with matters of technology, different systems will be devised which can carry out the same tasks, and HER/SMRs are no different in this regard. If research is being conducted within one county area, the HER/SMR system is less of an issue, however if research is being conducted into the same subject area across two or more counties, then the HER/SMR computer system can become a factor. Not all councils have adopted the same computerised information storage and retrieval systems. This may depend upon a number of factors, such as when did the Council decide to adopt a computerised system, how much funding was allocated to the new system, and what system was selected?

All these factors can impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of the HER/SMR system. Given the costs involved, it is also important to choose the correct system in the first place. What is important to recognise here, is that a system that may work well for one local authority and match that council’s needs and expectations may not be suited to those of another local authority. Thus, as is the case with Leicestershire and Northamptonshire, two neighbouring county councils may operate two different HER/SMR systems which, when asked the same question, may produce very different results.
For example, with regard to the research for this thesis and the issue of continuity, a request was made to acquire data relating specifically to ‘late Roman settlement’. The aim of this was to create the background of the landscape of the late Roman period across Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire against which Anglo-Saxon landscape activity could be compared. To achieve this aim it was decided to approach the respective County HER/SMRs, not necessarily to request a full print-out of ‘late Roman sites’ but to at least request a map showing the distribution of villas (representing typically ‘late’ settlement), other ‘late’ settlement sites and ‘late’ burials. This request was met by the provision of three maps from Northamptonshire County Council showing the relevant ‘late’ Roman data (see Fig. 1.3). In contrast, I was informed by Leicestershire County Council that it would not be possible to extract such data from their system, which listed ‘Roman’ sites, as within the recording process there was no distinction between early Roman and late Roman sites and material.

The distribution of sites in Northamptonshire can be derived from the county HER/SMR. The distribution of sites in Northamptonshire Archaeology only relates to sites that have been reported in that journal and as such cannot be regarded as being complete; the HER/SMR listing should be regarded as more comprehensive, constituting the prime record source and point of contact when reporting archaeological
finds. What is noticeable is that while the number of sites is greater, the area of
distribution remains largely the same, again concentrating upon the fringe areas of
Rockingham Forest and the Nene Valley as far as Northampton. The main reasons for
this change in site numbers appears to be the result of archaeological fieldwork
prompted by development activity, and in particular the works relating to the A14 (M1-
A1 link road) and the A45 trunk road which follows the course of the Nene Valley.
Another factor, in part related to the above road projects amongst other things, has been
the increased incidence of gravel extraction along the valley of the River Nene. A
relationship of Anglo-Saxon settlement sites to the river gravels has long been noted,
but should not be accepted without question (Hamerow 1992, 39).

1.8.1 Historic Town and City Surveys

Alongside the County HER/SMRs is the programme of Historic Town and City Surveys
jointly funded by English Heritage and by local authorities; (http://www.english-
heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.1294). The broad aim, through computer mapping and
GIS (geographical information systems), is to produce an Urban Archaeological
Database (UAD) of the historic environment to be kept within the HER/SMR and
updated accordingly (http://www.leicester.gov.uk/your -council--services/regeneration--
culture/ep/business--the-economy/the-big-build/conservation/urban). It is intended that
this initiative will assist in the decision-making process of national and local
administrative bodies which are entrusted with the care of the historic fabric of towns
and cities as well as formulating strategies, not just for the protection and management
of this threatened environment, but to enhance the urban area through growth and
regeneration.

Designed to help in the implementation of PPG 16, the scheme is now more far
reaching, encompassing issues of urban regeneration and conservation. This includes
the initial preparation and maintenance of a database of archaeological excavation and
historical research, an assessment of the archaeological and historical resource of the
relevant town, and finally the development and publication of a strategy, implemented
by the local authority, to protect and manage the archaeological and historical interest of
the town. In the case of the City of Leicester, it is understood that the UAD was
complete by late 2006, although for technical reasons the data is not yet available on-
The Historic Town Surveys occur in one of two forms. Firstly there is the *Intensive Survey*: this concentrates upon the central areas of 35 historic towns and cities, including Leicester and Northampton, under the control of the respective local authority, with emphasis on the below-ground archaeology and on standing structures up to the 17th century. The second form is the *Extensive Survey* which has a similar brief to that of the Intensive Surveys, but concentrates upon the smaller towns on a county-by-county basis, and thus will include the market towns of Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire. The findings of the Extensive Surveys are held on the relevant HER/SMRs, while the database of the Intensive Surveys is either placed on the HER/SMR or exists as a separate UAD. The Extensive Urban Survey for Northamptonshire is available (Taylor *et al.* 2002a, b, c & d), while that for Leicestershire (including Rutland) is not yet in progress.

### 1.9 Fieldwork

The HER/SMR data show up other factors of relevance, notably issues relating to fieldwork. Much of the early fieldwork in the Leicestershire and Rutland area concentrated upon Roman sites, due to the visibility of the structural material and distinctive ceramic artefacts. However, a significant move was made in the early to mid-1970s during the period of local government reorganisation; when a centralised archaeological survey team was established in Leicestershire, coinciding with the creation of the ‘Leicestershire Museums Fieldwork Group’ in April 1976 (Liddle *et al.* 1986, 5). Later that year a dedicated Survey Officer was appointed and in 1977 the ‘Community Archaeology Project’ was established to expand the fieldwork group by decentralising it and establishing local fieldwalking groups around the county (Liddle 2004, 8). This initiative was enhanced by the publication in 1985 of Liddle’s *Community Archaeology – A Fieldworker’s Handbook of Organisation and Techniques*. Through this volume, it was possible for groups of amateurs to carry out fieldwalking as competent practitioners, with the support (if necessary) of professional assistance. Importantly this means that fieldwork of this type is carried out using similar standardised methods, as outlined below. Other community-based archaeology
initiatives have developed, most notably the creation of the Leicestershire Archaeological Network in 1996, through Leicestershire County Council (http://www.leics.gov.uk/index/community/museums/community archaeology/archaeological_network.htm). Now known as the Leicestershire and Rutland Archaeological Network, this initiative aimed to encourage Parish Councils to appoint Parish Archaeological Wardens (PAWs) to act as points of contact and first alert for any archaeological activity or monitoring in parishes. By 2004, Wardens had been appointed to approximately 60% of parishes (Schadla-Hall 2004, 2).

The first major fieldwork project that was started in Leicestershire was the Medbourne Area Survey (1981-7) (Liddle 1994, 34) which also saw the introduction and development of the ‘Traverse and Stint’ method of fieldwalking (Liddle 1985, 7) which is now in use amongst the field survey groups that make up the membership of the Leicestershire Museums Archaeological Fieldwork Group (LMAFG) in both Leicestershire and Rutland. Around this same time a large-scale weekend field survey project was underway in Northamptonshire (Hall 1994, 50). Initially set up to record medieval field systems, it evolved to record all archaeological remains including earthworks, crop-marks and artefacts. This has been followed by similar, more focussed projects like Raunds (Parry 1994, 36-41) and Brigstock (Foster 1994, 46-50).

Briefly it is worthwhile commenting on the methodology of fieldwalking, because it helps to show the basic data collection process being used in the East Midlands today. The aim of fieldwalking is to collect a sample of the material from the surface of a ploughed field. This sample should be regarded as being a controlled sample of the available material which should be assumed to be fully representative of the range and distribution of all the material that is present on the field surface, and thus reflects the range of activities that have taken place in that location (Liddle 1985, 7).

In the past, fieldwalking was merely seen as a means of identifying settlement sites, however it is now acknowledged that by covering large enough areas of the landscape, it is possible to expand this objective to start to consider the organisation of the landscape in general and how it has evolved with the passage of time in order to become the palimpsest that we see it as today.
As originally practised, this method – ‘Traverse and Stint fieldwalking’ - involves a team of fieldwalkers, spread across the width of a field and walking in straight lines at intervals of 20m (see Fig. 1.4 below). This gives the setting for the ‘Traverses’. In order to locate where the material is found, the field is divided into sections or ‘Stints’ with each fieldwalker placing the finds from each ‘stint’ along their ‘traverse’ into a finds bag. Initially traverses set at 20m intervals were used in conjunction with 60m stints; however, this system has also been used with 10m traverses and 30m stints. It is important that whichever system is used, for the duration of the project the same divisions should be retained in order to maintain consistency in recording and analysis. Following initial Traverse and Stint survey, if it is thought to be necessary, additional grid-walking can be implemented on a square 15m grid and 5m intervals, which can give a 40% sample of a selected area (Liddle 1985, 9, 10).

Fig 1.4: Traverse and Stint Fieldwalking using four people

The fieldwalking method as applied in Northamptonshire was not dissimilar to that used in Leicestershire and Rutland. In Northamptonshire, fields were walked in ‘Traverses’ of 30m spacing, locating and plotting field boundaries and features. When artefact
scatters were located, these were walked at 5m spacing, recovering all finds that lay
2.5m either side of the survey line and these were then converted to a density per
hectare to enable future site comparison (Hall 1994, 51).

Limitations can exist within the data that fieldwalking generates. The effectiveness of
the system is dependent upon the experience of individual fieldwalkers and their ability
to recognise a wide range of material on the surface of a ploughed field. This material
can range from prehistoric worked stone and flint to post-medieval pottery and
metalwork. Such material can be in a wide range of shapes, sizes and colours, not all of
which are readily recognisable or noticeable and can be easily missed by those with less
experience. It is one of the strengths of fieldwalking that whilst not every find is
recovered, what is collected is a representative sample of the material that is present.
Consequently, enough material should still be recorded from each survey in order to
produce a satisfactory interpretation of the human activity that has been carried out in
specific locations.

This archaeological approach works well as a means of site identification, involving
taking a sample of the surface deposits, allowing the rapid coverage of large portions of
the landscape, and permitting quick identification of sites. In addition, it is possible to
re-visit sites to conduct more detailed grid-walking to identify more closely the spread
of material and their constituent materials.

Through such survey work the knowledge and distribution of sites of Iron Age, Roman
and Anglo-Saxon date especially has expanded significantly: within Leicestershire and
Rutland the number of recorded Roman sites doubled in a three year period (Liddle
1985, 3), and it is increasingly possible to enter into debates relating to the issues of
natural and human landscape evolution in the East Midlands, as well as looking at how
sites developed and interacted both with each other and within the landscape (ibid., 3).

Having considered the means by which artefacts and data can be recovered, it is now
proposed to consider the nature of that material and the basic characteristics of Anglo-
Saxon settlements.
CHAPTER 2

Anglo-Saxon Material Culture and Settlements

'...while the investigation of their graves furnishes a certain amount of information, slight it may be but direct, regarding the pagan peoples who mastered this outlying province of the Roman Empire'
(Northamptonshire Victoria County History 1902, 223)

'...a bit like trying to make sense of an incomplete jigsaw puzzle - a slow process of piecing together threads of information that help us build a clearer picture of a stubbornly obscure period of history'
(Watkins 2006, 42)

2.1 Introduction

It is important to outline some of the field data obtained from fieldwork in the study area in order to show how such material can relate to Anglo-Saxon settlement. Many of the artefacts typically associated with the Anglo-Saxon period were organic, either of wood or of fabric, which rarely survive deposition except under certain specific conditions. Those which do survive best, and which are thus better represented in the archaeological record, are the pottery and metalwork, following which there will be a consideration of the physical evidence of the settlements themselves.

The issue of material culture also relates to ‘identity’, in this case, the belonging of a people to an area, and how that population identify themselves as well as how others see them (Díaz –Andrieu & Lucy 2005, 1). Thus ethnic boundaries can also be defined through the incidence of material culture in the landscape, serving to define differences between population groups. Such boundaries can be natural features in the landscape, for example water-courses, or the later use of man-made features in the form of roads however, the defining feature remains the presence (or absence) of material culture. The material culture of the Anglo-Saxon period – how it was used or the way in which it was worn – may therefore indicate membership of, or an affinity towards specific family or tribal groups.
2.1.1 Early Anglo-Saxon Pottery

The fabric of early Anglo-Saxon vessels is generally locally sourced and handmade, and fired at low temperature, unlike the high technology, mass-produced fabrics of the Roman period. In consequence, Anglo-Saxon pottery does not survive well in archaeological contexts being susceptible to the effects of soil conditions and the elements when disturbed and lying on field surfaces. In addition, due to the nature of the firing process, the colour of the ceramic fabrics – generally ranging from black and dark grey to dark brown – also makes it difficult for sherds to be readily spotted and recovered during fieldwalking, again in contrast to the well studied, standard forms and characteristically distinct coloured fabrics of the Roman period (Cooper 2004, 81).

In summary, domestic vessels of the early Anglo-Saxon period were almost without exception plain, undecorated and of simple shape; in contrast with vessels from funerary contexts which bore increasingly flamboyant decoration with linear patterns, bosses, and impressed stamps (Hurst 1976, 283). The fabric - which is also similar to Iron Age fabrics - and low technology manufacturing process remained largely unchanged for approximately three hundred years, with the first key change coming with the emergence of the middle Saxon Ipswich wares c.700. This long period with little
evidence of significant change in form or fabric of vessels of the period does itself contribute to one of the main problems of the Anglo-Saxon period: the lack of firm, accurate, close range dating of material and thus sites.

Few publications relating to Anglo-Saxon pottery per se exist, as material that has been published is often to be found in excavation reports, for example West Stow (West 1985) and Thurmaston, Leics. (Williams 1983). One of the main publications relating to Anglo-Saxon pottery was J. N. L. Myres’ work on the Anglo-Saxon settlement of England (Myres 1969) and his two volume publication *A Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Pottery of the Pagan Period* (1977). Myres’ published works span a period in excess of fifty years and, apart from being dated, they are now being subjected to reconsideration and criticism, and Richards gives a good summary of the limitations (1987, 24-33). Myres’ *Corpus* is still a major catalogue of Anglo-Saxon material but problems are now acknowledged with the quality of the data; caution needs to be exercised both with vessel form and decoration, while the dating of the pottery of the period is also a problem and caution needs to be exercised when relating the archaeological evidence to a historical framework as Myres did.

Anglo-Saxon pottery derives from both funerary contexts and settlements (Plate 2.1 above). In funerary contexts ceramic vessels were used either as containers for cremated remains or as accessory containers in inhumations (Arnold 1997, 95-6) and it is the survival of intact pots from burial contexts that contributes much to what is known of these vessels (Kennett 1989, 7). Survival of complete pots in settlement contexts is much less common. In settlements, pots would have had a number of uses, primarily in conjunction with food – cooking, preparation, and storage – but not discounting the possibility of other domestic functions. Again, it is a reflection of the nature of the archaeology of the Anglo-Saxon period that much of the study conducted into the pottery is related to burial or cremation material rather than to domestic contexts.

(a) *Dating*

Anglo-Saxon pottery is difficult to date accurately and often regarded as being impossible to date at all (Kennett 1989, 20). This is primarily because there was little change in the form and fabric of the vessels that would normally be expected to take place over a substantial period of time, and in domestic settings pots remained largely
undecorated (Hurst 1976, 293). These were not mass-produced or 'industrial' uses, but mainly locally produced, handmade, and not fired in bulk in kilns. The consequence of this is that much of the pottery that is recovered is unstratified surface finds from fieldwalking; it is difficult to present a chronological sequence of change and possibly such vessels remained unchanged between the 5th and 7th centuries (ibid., 293). This has resulted in two views across the study area. In Leicestershire and Rutland, Anglo-Saxon pottery is regarded as having been only in use for the early Anglo-Saxon period, up to about the end of the 6th century. This idea is based upon an inability to differentiate the pottery of the middle Saxon period from that of the earlier period, and the interpretation of negative data has contributed to a theory that the region subsequently entered an 'aceramic' period (Knox 2004, 103). In Northamptonshire, the alternative view is that during this time the fabrics remained largely unaltered, with changes being difficult to identify accurately and thus the period during which the early-middle Anglo-Saxon wares remained in use was substantially longer, approximately AD 450 to 850, and generally they cannot be dated more closely than this broad period (Perrin 2006, 91).

The key consideration here is that communities may have become self-sufficient at this time, producing only sufficient items to meet their own needs and thus not having a surplus for trade or exchange.

Myres adopted a chronological/geographical approach to the study of Anglo-Saxon pottery to identify the archaeological spread of racial or cultural groups across a five century period. By looking at differences in ceramic tradition in continental Europe it was proposed that one could link types to the traditions of the homelands of the Angles, Saxons and Jutes (Myres 1986, 63).

With regard to Anglo-Saxon pottery, two basic types are regarded as being securely dated. These are the early handmade pottery, conventionally dated to c.AD 400-650 (Richards 1987, 21) and the wheel-turned vessels from the later period post c.AD 850; Kennett suggests that 'early' Anglo-Saxon pottery consists of those vessel types that are found in the continental homelands of those population groups that were to become the 'English', although broad dating can only be given to the accuracy of a century (1989, 20).

By identifying the source of these styles, similar styles found in England could be tentatively attributed an appropriate cultural identity, thereby offering a guide to
identifying and locating the settlers who came to England from the continent (Myres 1986, 63; James 2001, 108). Myres' work has however been challenged (Kidd 1976 and Arnold 1981, cited in Richards 1987, 25) for being selective in the choice of examples that are comparable or accurately datable.

(b) Vessel Form

Anglo-Saxon pottery occurs in two main types - bowls and jars (see Plate 2.2 below) and the shape of these vessels tends towards three basic forms but with some slight variation - the rounded profile, the carinated profile and the shouldered profile.

Plate 2.2: Examples of early Anglo-Saxon pottery
Rounded vessel on the left, shouldered on the right
(Courtesy of the Jewry Wall Museum, Leicester)

This may appear a simplistic form of classification and attempts at producing a more rigorous, systematic typology have been made in the course of doctoral research looking at other variable factors, namely the form of vessels, their dimensions, the fabric and the decoration (Richards 1987, 28-30).

All vessels are hand-made, generally having rounded, slightly sagging bases and very few have any flat exterior surfaces. These characteristics derive from the production process after the pot had been made. It was dried, allowing the fabric to stiffen, prior to being fired in a kiln (most likely a bonfire). Using this process, pots would still be
porous and would have needed to be smoothed and polished with wax, thereby generating the characteristic burnished finish (Kennett 1989, 12).

(c) Vessel Decoration

Known as ‘biconical’ or ‘Anglian’ urns, vessels with a carinated profile have a characteristic bulge at the mid-point of the vessel body; they typically concentrate in areas of Anglian/Frisian settlement. Biconical vessels are regarded as being a 5th century continental development and as they also occur in the eastern counties of England this was interpreted as suggesting an early settlement in the area (Myres 1969, 23). Another vessel form is the hollow-necked urn, which has a concave neck, with either sharp carination or a shouldered profile; this is also an early continental form of the northern tradition, which again occurs in eastern England (ibid., 26).

Plate 2.3: Anglo-Saxon pot with bossed and incised decoration
(Courtesy of Jewry Wall Museum, Leicester)

A typical typology that can be identified is a transition during the 5th century from the biconical urn to a more shouldered type of pot with a higher centre of gravity. The 6th century sees more rounded or ‘globular’ pot types known as Buckelurnen. The globular urn has a rounded profile and either a short rim or an everted, or out-turned rim. This is
regarded as a form associated with Anglian settlement and has comparable forms in Schleswig in 5th and 6th century contexts. Final forms of plain, undecorated pot include a range of bowls (typically described as having the rim diameter equal to, or greater than, the height of the vessel), small accessory vessels, and finally, low-bodied, tall-necked vessels that appear to relate to the pagan/Christian conversion period of the mid- to late 7th century (Myres 1969, 23).

The decoration that occurs on Anglo-Saxon pottery is now seen as representing more than just ethnicity. In burial contexts, it is seen as saying something about the deceased person themselves and even plain vessels are regarded as symbolic (Richards 1987, 196).

(i) **Line or grooved decoration**

This form can occur in a wide variety of forms. The simplest is the use of plain horizontal grooves cut into the surface of the vessel, mainly around the neck or the shoulders; these also occur in conjunction with vertical grooves and chevrons. Other examples include the use of shallow, impressed linear decoration and small dots. These features appear to relate to the identity of the person whose remains are in the vessel, with the decoration in this category having a link with the specific grave goods.

(ii) **Bossed decoration**

Bosses could be applied in two main ways: pieces of clay could be moulded on to the surface of the vessel or they could be pushed out from the inside (Glasswell 2002, 108). These too relate to the grave goods, rather than to the person, however the number of bosses seems to have a connection to the identity of the potter (Richards 1987, 196).

(iii) **Stamped decoration**

Some of the more complex designs on the pottery of the period were formed using stamps. Stamps ranged from simple patterns to more complex forms of runic device; often stamps were carved into the end of antler tines. Stamped decoration initially appears to have been lightly used to supplement the linear decoration on pots (Plate 2.4).

The role of stamped decoration is not wholly understood, however studies have been carried out suggesting a symbolic significance (Reynolds 1980; Hills 1983; Arnold 1983 cited in Richards 1987, 32-33), and there may be links between the use of stamps
in conjunction with the vessel and decoration and the age and sex of the deceased (Richards 1987, 196).

Plate 2.4: Anglo-Saxon pot fragment with stamped decoration
(Courtesy of Jewry Wall Museum, Leicester)

(iv) Burnishing

Burnishing involved the rubbing smooth of the surface of the vessel, prior to firing, while it was still soft. This had the dual effect of giving the pot a shiny surface, while also making it stronger by compressing the clay fabric (Glasswell 2002, 108).

(v) Vessel decoration, chronology and ethnicity

It is not possible to present a tight chronology for Anglo-Saxon pottery. Regarding decoration types, for linear or grooved patterns, this form of decoration remained dominant up to the end of the 5th century; the 6th century saw some changes in emphasis of decoration, as stamped ornamentation became more widely used, and more prominent and bosses too change with a move towards a more elongated form. Panel styles also display a degree of change. The panels of the 5th century mainly comprise vertical lines divided by either stamps or horizontal or diagonal lines that include the use of bosses. In the early 6th century, panels made up of vertical lines were delineated by bosses that were becoming more prominent. Stamped patterns too come to the fore, with rectangular panels bordered by stamps within bosses (Kennett 1989, 24). Stamped swags began to appear, together with triangular-shaped panels. The late 6th century saw
an increasingly expanding repertoire of designs, in particular in the Northamptonshire area.

Other patterns or symbols on pots of this period include the ‘swastika’ and ‘wyrm’ motifs. The ‘swastika’ represented the Scandinavian god Thor, the deity of thunder (Anglo-Saxon *Thunor*) (Reynolds 1980, 236), while the ‘wyrm’ was the dragon that would watch over the dead. In its representation on pottery, the latter evolved or transformed into a legless beast.

By the 7th century, pottery exclusively appeared to accompany inhumation burials; characteristic pottery comprised low-bodied vessels with tall necks. Comb-point decoration also became more common.

*Jutish, Saxon and Anglian ceramic types*

Myres argued that the Anglian and Jutish peoples preferred the rectangular style of decoration on their pottery, regardless of vessel type (Myres 1986, 64). It can now be seen that this assertion may indeed be flawed, with decoration now being more symbolic at a personal level rather than relating to ethnic aspects of society. In his recent study of the scientific analysis of early Anglo-Saxon ceramics (Vince 2005, 219-224) Alan Vince does point to minor differences in pottery typology and decoration between Kent, Wessex and the area to the north of the River Thames and similarly the fabrics of these areas reveal differences in the temper used in each case. These areas correspond, in turn, to the three population groups that were recognised by the Anglo-Saxons themselves – the Jutes, Saxons and Angles respectively (ibid., 225).

### 2.1.2 Middle Saxon Pottery

Preceded by the appearance of isolated rich burials in the late 6th and early 7th centuries, the later 7th and early 8th centuries saw the re-emergence of trade and a first revival in some towns as features of the landscape, together with the nucleation of rural settlements, many of which had timber buildings that were significantly larger than those of earlier settlements like West Stow, Mucking or Eye Kettleby (Reynolds 1999, 50). This period also saw the start of a move away from irregular, hand-made pottery to the more uniform wheel-made pots, of which Ipswich ware is the earliest and most widely recognised type. This pottery from the ‘post-pagan cemetery phase’ (Hodges
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1981, 52) first appeared in the 7th century and lasted until the late 9th century, although again lack of firm dating evidence is a problem (Hurst 1976, 301). Ultimately, the resurgence of towns and the re-emergence of trade, together with continental links, may have contributed to the (re-)discovery of industrial techniques, including kiln technology, for the improved production of pottery (Hodges 1981, 52), which, along with the adoption of the faster potter’s wheel in the 9th century, saw pottery develop into what is regarded as the start of medieval pottery styles (Kennett 1989, 29).

Hurst (1976, 283-348) gives a good summary of the pottery of the middle Saxon period which, apart from imported wares, comprised two main types, those made on a slow wheel – the Ipswich-type wares, and the handmade Maxey-type wares (ibid., 284). Ipswich ware - so named due to the site where it was first identified and was the only production site (Vince 2005, 227) - differs from early Anglo-Saxon wares being made using much more sophisticated technology, using a slow wheel and fired in a kiln fired to a high temperature; in addition, a range of fabrics have been identified ranging from burnished and unburnished sandy grey vessels to coarse, well-fired, grey gritty wares (Hurst 1976, 299).

Ipswich wares were much more widely traded and exchanged. They have a primary coastal distribution in Suffolk and Norfolk, which extends up to the Wash, including the rivers feeding in to the Wash (ibid., 301), suggesting a period of coastal trade with finds of Ipswich ware extending from Essex to Lincolnshire (ibid., 304).

Within the study area, one form of Middle Saxon pottery is that known as Maxey ware. First identified at Maxey, Northamptonshire in 1960 (Addyman 1964), this is a hand-made, rough, shelly fabric used in the area north of the River Welland and south of the River Humber and which occurs in two groups, the Northern Maxey-type wares and the Southern Maxey-type wares. Used between AD 650 and 850, it is markedly similar to pottery fabrics of the Iron Age, a fact that has caused some confusion in pottery and site identification in general locally (Knox 2004, 95). This point has also been considered in the course of fabric analysis by Williams and Vince (1997, 218). Having analysed the characteristics of early to mid Saxon pottery with granitic inclusions and identified the area of Mountsorrel, Leicestershire as the source, similar characteristics were recognised in prehistoric material also from the East Midlands, suggesting a longer
period for the use of this fabric than had previously been thought to be the case. This may not remove the possibility of confusion in pottery identification, but it does indicate that this could be seen as a local characteristic that was maintained over a considerable period. The granitic inclusions may have given the ‘Charnwood’ pottery a special quality which lead to it being a sought after, traded commodity until the late 7th century when the Ipswich-type and in particular the Maxey-type wares replace it in the archaeological record (ibid., 219).

2.1.3 Anglo-Saxon Metalwork

Metalwork may be said to survive ground conditions better than the ceramic fabrics and ephemeral post-holes. The most frequently encountered metalwork of the period occurs in the form of decorative items which were predominantly dress fasteners – brooches and wrist clasps, associated (usually but not exclusively) with female burials and worn in pairs at the shoulders and wrists respectively (Glasswell 2002, 80; see Appendix 3). Less frequently found are items such as knives, and martial pieces, i.e. swords, shield fittings, and, even more rarely, helmets (ibid., 145). In Britain only four helmets of the period have been found: from Sutton Hoo (Suffolk), from York, and two from the East Midlands, one found at Benty Grange, Derbyshire (1848), the other from Wollaston, Northants., found in 1997 (Meadows 1997, 391-395).

2.1.3.1 Brooches

Brooches occur in two principal forms: round and long. Round brooch types are typically associated with areas of ‘Saxon’ settlement while cruciform brooch types usually occur to the north of the River Thames (Glasswell 2002, 83) and these will be considered in more detail below.
Plate 2.5: Brooches from the Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Market Overton, Rutland
(Courtesy of Rutland County Museum, Oakham, Rutland)

In considering Anglo-Saxon brooches from burials in Leicestershire, Northamptonshire and Rutland, such dress fittings were typically made of iron or bronze, sometimes gilded and with either stamped or moulded decoration; from the grave evidence, these almost invariably appear to have been worn by women.

Whilst considerable effort early on went into the classification of these items (e.g. Åberg 1926; Leeds 1945) with additional reclassification conducted more recently (Mortimer 1990; Lucy 2000), what has largely remained unaltered is the basic dating of these items and even their ethnic interpretation. As a cautionary note, while much work has gone into the preparation of brooch chronologies, the actual dating of the brooches has often been arrived at with reference to other grave goods that were present. In this respect, the use of a more generalised system of dating is probably more effective in the overall interpretation of sites, rather than a system of classification that has produced a large number of lesser categories of artefact that remain only broadly datable.
A good summary of the classification of Anglo-Saxon brooches has been provided in the work of Sam Lucy (2000), which draws primarily on the work of Åberg (1926), Leeds (1945) and Leeds and Pocock (1971). The various studies have established a more widely accepted chronology for the brooch types. There will of course always be an element of discrepancy between the actual date of making the artefact and their deposition, and that difference will always be a problem in the dating of sites.
The main types of Anglo-Saxon brooch are the long brooch forms (the cruciform brooch, the square-headed brooch, and the small-long brooch), and the round brooch forms including the annular and penannular types, the saucer brooch, the disc brooch and the button brooch (Fig. 2.1; table 2.1). Whilst brooches occur in most areas of Anglo-Saxon settlement, the disc, saucer and button brooch forms are more frequently found in areas of ‘Saxon’ settlement, commonly in southern England (Glasswell 2002, 83) to the south of the Thames (Fig. 2.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long Brooch Form</th>
<th>Brooch Type</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Origins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Early 5th C.</td>
<td>‘Anglian’</td>
<td>Continent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Early 5th C.</td>
<td>‘Anglian’</td>
<td>Continent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6th C</td>
<td>‘Anglian’</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Mid/late 6th C.</td>
<td>‘Anglian’</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Late 6th/early 7th C.</td>
<td>‘Anglian’</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Headed</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Late 5th C.</td>
<td>‘Anglian’</td>
<td>Rhineland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6th C</td>
<td>‘Anglian’</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7th C</td>
<td>‘Anglian’</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long brooch</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th C</td>
<td>‘Anglian’</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Dating and incidence of Long Brooch forms
Long Brooch Forms

(i) The Cruciform Brooch

Åberg (1926) classified the cruciform brooch into five categories, arguing for a natural progression of design development from the simple to the ornate:

I: Having full-round knobs.

II: With half-round knobs, foot without lappets, and animal heads with half-round nostrils.

III: As II above but with animal heads having scroll-shaped nostrils.

IV: Having a foot with lappets (i.e. folds or wings/flaps).

V: Having knobs and nose parts greatly changed, together with animal ornamentation.

A revised classification appeared in 1990 in an unpublished dissertation (Mortimer) which again has five categories – A, B, C, D and Z (Lucy 2000, 27) and an attempt at placing the styles within a broad date range. These categories are similar to those of Åberg with some changes (Table 2.1 above).

Leeds and Pocock (1971) sought to attribute closer dates to these brooch types ranging from the 5th to early 6th century for their types I & II, the 6th century for type III and the mid- to late 6th century for type IV. Type V appeared in the late 6th to early 7th century in East Anglia and south Cambridgeshire and spread into the East Midlands.

Within the study area, the distribution of cruciform brooches falls into three main areas (see Fig. 2.3 below). The main concentration of brooches has been found in central Rutland, around the rivers Chater and Gwash with the majority at the Empingham II cemetery. In Leicestershire, they occupy a central area in and around Leicester to the east of the River Soar and south of the River Wreake, while in Northamptonshire these brooches generally occurred in a band lying between the Nene and Welland valleys.
(ii) The Square-Headed Brooch

The square-headed brooch has three key features: a rectangular head plate, an arched bow and a lozenge-, or diamond-shaped footplate (Lucy 2000, 29). It first occurs in England in the late 5th century, continuing into the latter part of the 6th century. Åberg saw this type as being identifiable different to the Kentish type (see below) and although the Kentish influence was strong, so too were the Anglian and Saxon influences. This brooch type was later classified by Leeds in 1949 with three main brooch forms dating up to the 7th century. A further classification was prepared by Hines (1984), which placed these brooch types into 22, and later 25 groups (Hines 1997), with the brooches in each group being linked by common characteristics.
The relative rarity of these brooches suggests that an element of status may have been attached to their use. The square-headed brooch is rare in Leicestershire with examples being found to the north and east of Leicester. In Rutland most examples come from the cemeteries at Market Overton with other examples from around the rivers Gwash and Chater, while in Northamptonshire the distribution is mainly confined to the south-west of the county, north of the River Nene (Fig. 2.4).

(iii) The Small-Long Brooch

Åberg placed this type into a single group, described as "long brooches with triangular or shovel-shaped foot." However, Leeds (1945) revised this into five categories based
mainly upon the form of the headplate, except for the final category that was identified by the lozenge-shaped foot.

This brooch type has a close 5th century chronology and a fairly tight distribution with few continental parallels; it is regarded as being typically *English* Anglo-Saxon. This appears to be exclusively a mid-Anglian design or style of brooch occurring in the area north and west of the Icknield Way. Within the study area, numerically the concentration of small-long brooches lies in Rutland around the rivers Gwash and Chater, in the south of the county. Their presence in Leicestershire is limited to finds in the Leicester area and in the Vale of Belvoir, while in Northamptonshire they are mainly found north of the River Nene and in the south-west of the county (see Fig. 2.5 above).
The Round Brooch

A number of round brooch forms exist, including penannular, annular, quoit, disc, saucer and button brooches (see Figs 2.2 and 2.3 above).

Fig. 2.6: Distribution of Annular Brooches in the study area

Penannular brooch forms are amongst the oldest and even occurred in Iron Age Britain, remaining common throughout and beyond the Roman period (Lucy 2000, 37). Annular and quoit brooches are similar in style, with the annular form occurring most frequently in Anglian areas (ibid., 37), being a simplified version of the more elaborate quoit; the decoration is viewed as Gallo-Roman. Leeds dated quoit brooches to the 4th and early 5th centuries; some examples of annular brooches have been found in late 5th century contexts in Denmark.
The disc brooch appears to be a British piece with no continental links. Dating from the mid-5th to mid-6th centuries it may be a development from Romano-British brooch styles, and the methods of production, similar to Roman metal-working traditions, would seem to confirm this (Dickinson 1979). A variant is the openwork disc brooch, a decorated style of brooch possibly linked to the Nene Valley area of Northamptonshire. Saucer brooches too, another form of round brooch have an early date of the mid-5th to mid-6th centuries, and occur mainly, but not exclusively, in Saxon areas and are associated with female dress. Some forms have been identified as having clear continental origins, notably the small ‘button’ brooch, another Saxon piece of the 5th-6th
centuries which originated in north-west Germany and is more commonly associated with male dress.

Annular brooches occur widely in Northamptonshire between the rivers Nene and Welland, and although they are less common in Rutland and Leicestershire they do occur in close proximity to watercourses (Fig. 2.6). While less numerous, penannular brooches are more widely represented in Northamptonshire and the same can be seen in the distribution of ‘Saxon’ saucer brooches (Fig. 2.7).

2.1.3.2 Wrist-clasps

Wrist-clasps were decorated ‘hook and eye’ fasteners occurring in many forms which developed over time, and for which a typology and a relative chronology has been proposed, present in coastal counties in the 5th century and seeing more widespread use in the 6th century, reflecting a common sense of identity (Hines 1993, 92). Hines does however reject the notion of strict dating of wrist-clasps on typological grounds (1984, 107).

Such items have been found in areas associated with ‘Anglian’ settlement in England, in East Anglia, the Midlands and the North-East and tend to occur only in association with female burials (Haughton & Powlesland 1999, 105); such fasteners appear to be absent from ‘Saxon’ areas, leading to the supposition that either Saxon dress with long sleeves either had no fastenings or used an alternative method, for example organic ties (Glasswell 2002, 80). The use of wrist-clasps appears to have gone out of fashion by the end of the 6th century, suggesting a change in dress style, either with organic ties as above, or open sleeves (Haughton & Powlesland 1999, 105).

Across the study area burial sites with wrist clasps are more limited in number than those with brooches, but occur throughout Northamptonshire from Marston St Lawrence in the south-west to Nassington in the north-east and northwards across the heart of Rutland (see fig. 2.8 above). In Leicestershire there are two such sites, one in the east of the county at Twyford, the other on Watling Street at Caves Inn (Meaney 1964). In contrast to brooches which are relatively easily identified and understood, wrist clasps appear less clear: in the late 18th century, work at a gravel pit near Market Harborough revealed urn fragments and ‘...some little bits of brass of an uncommon form, used we suppose about the garments of the deceased’ (ibid., 147). While wrist
clasps are sound indicators of areas with Anglian association, the scope that they offer with regard to the study of settlement in the East Midlands needs to be seen in conjunction with that of the more numerous presence of brooches in the study area, and which are themselves diagnostically more useful.

Fig. 2.8: Distribution of burials with wrist clasps in the study area

2.1.3.3 Miscellaneous metalwork

Those items discussed above are regarded as being ‘typically’ Anglo-Saxon; however other items of metalwork do occur in both burial contexts and occasionally in settlements. These may be regarded as having more personal meaning rather than reflecting any sense of belonging and are mainly found in female burials. Bead necklaces occurred in the 5th and 6th centuries before they were replaced by necklaces of
silver wire, while pendants were also worn, occurring in many forms (Glasswell 2002, 86). Other less frequently found items of personal adornment include bracelets and finger rings of wire or of metal sheet (ibid., 88).

The presence of buckles and strap ends is indicative of the wearing of belts, while a variety of items that would appear to have been worn on the belt also occur in burials, for example knives, purses and girdle hangers. Latch lifters too, appear to have been worn on the belt, suspended from rings of copper alloy or antler.

Male dress appears to have included less of the adornment described above. Belt buckles seem to be one of the few items that occur in both male and female burials. The other items of metalwork that are found in burial contexts are those that are stereotypically associated with male activities, namely ‘warfare’. These comprise (in order of frequency of find) spears, shields which are identifiable by the presence of the shield boss and associated fittings, and swords.

Swords may have been a prestige item, functional, but also acting as a symbol of rank. The numbers of swords found can vary considerably from cemetery to cemetery; in Rutland, the Empingham II cemetery with in excess of 130 burials yielded no swords (Timby 1996), while nearby the more prominently situated North Luffenham cemetery produced 10 swords (Crowther-Beynon 1904), possibly signifying a highly visible, high status population group.

### 2.2 Anglo-Saxon Settlements

While the material considered above relates to cemetery and settlement sites of the early Anglo-Saxon period, understanding the settlements of this period essentially requires excavation. The majority of sites in the study area have been found through fieldwalking (Appendix 5), while the extent of what is known is still drawn largely from data from key sites such as West Stow in Suffolk excavated in the late 1960s and early 1970s (West 1985), Chalton (Addyman et al. 1972), Cowdery’s Down (Millett & James 1983), Hampshire, excavated in the 1970s and early 1980s, Mucking in Essex (Hamerow 1993) and the more recently published work at West Heslerton, Yorkshire (Powlesland & Haughton forthcoming) and Catholme, Staffordshire (Losco-Bradley & Kinsley 2002).
2.2.1 The Timber Buildings

Plate 2.6: Reconstructed Anglo-Saxon 'Hall' with Grubenhaus, West Stow, Suffolk

The two characteristic structures associated with the Anglo-Saxon period which make up the majority of the recorded buildings are the 'Hall' or post-built structure (PBS) and the *Grubenhaus* (literally meaning 'pit dwelling') or sunken-featured building (SFB).

Halls have a straightforward rectangular form, typically identified by a series of post-holes into which timber posts would have been set and then supported by the provision of additional packing around the base of the post prior to the hole being filled in. As an alternative to post-holes, examples from the 7th century might have a sill-beam (or evidence for a beam slot in which the sill-beam would have been placed), into which the uprights would have been set, rather than being sunk into the ground. This may have been incorporated as an alternative means of construction and thus be chronologically later than the use of post-holes. A separate suggestion is that the introduction of the sill-beam may, under certain circumstances, have served as a form of repair.
The hall primarily had a domestic role, as indicated by archaeological finds and their relationship to other structures. Size too appears to have been variable: some of the smallest examples that have been recorded were at West Stow, which, it has been suggested, could be attributed to the poor supportive quality of the sandy sub-soil (Arnold 1997, 41), although this may also reflect the nature, or dimensions, of the available timber. Early PBSs seem of similar size: those at Mucking, Bishopstone and Chalton fit in to a tight length:width ratio (Marshall & Marshall 1991, 40) with the length ranging from 5m to 12m and width between 3m and 7m. Those recorded at Eye Kettleby (Leics.) match these dimension ratios, while the chronologically later
settlement at Raunds (Northants.) had structures with a length range of 5m to 15m and widths ranging from 4m to 7m.

A comprehensive list of characteristics of Anglo-Saxon buildings in England has been drawn up (James et al 1984, 186-190):

1. 'Two-square' module
2. Opposed mid-long wall doors
3. Central end wall doors
4. Off-set end wall doors
5. Single internal partition
6. Two internal partitions
7. Sub-division of partitioned area
8. Annexe, one end
9. Annexe, both ends
10. External raking timbers

A simpler means of structure classification exists, based solely upon the position of doorways and the presence of internal partitions (Arnold 1997, 41):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doorways</th>
<th>Partitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Opposed doorways</td>
<td>Yes, internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Opposed doorways</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Post-built Structures - classification based upon doorway arrangement

An alternative to the internal partition and one where the classification is not quite so clear-cut, other than dating from the 7th century, is that rather than having an internal partition, there may actually be an external annexe at one end of the PBS. This is discernable by the presence of an identifiable pattern of post-holes (often smaller than those used for the rest of the structure) outside the footprint of the main cell of the PBS. This can be identified with Building 1 at the site at Bishopstone, Sussex, at West
Heslerton, and also with several examples from Eye Kettleby (Leics.) (Finn, forthcoming).

*Grubenhäuser* were first identified in England at Sutton Courtenay, Oxfordshire during excavations by E. T. Leeds in the 1920s and 1930s. Leeds identified and excavated dark soil stains and associated artefacts beneath the topsoil at a gravel quarry. These ‘sunken features’ characterised these types of structure together with early impressions of the supposed squalid nature of Anglo-Saxon life, with Leeds suggesting that they were both dwellings and workshops (Welch 1992, 37). SFBs are generally smaller in size (typically up to 6m in length for early examples) compared with PBSs, being distinguishable by the presence of a hollow cut into the sub-soil. At either end of the hollow there is a post-hole or series of post-holes which would have supported a ridge pole for the roof structure. This arrangement of post-holes has been used to establish typological classifications for SFBs since the mid-20th century (Tipper 2004, 68). Von Guyan (1952, 180) devised such a typology and used it to consider whether it could be applied to a geographical distribution of SFBs in Europe, although no visible pattern was discernable. An alternative classification (Ahrens 1966, 207-29) was presented based upon the location of the post-holes, which lead, in turn to suggestions concerning the structural layout of the SFB and its method of construction. A variation on the basic classification by number of post-holes was derived from the excavations at West Stow (Table 2.3 below, West 1985, 113), although it was stressed that this approach did only relate to the SFBs from that site and other forms of SFB had been identified elsewhere. This practice has, however, remained in use and would seem, now, to be the generally accepted means of classification for SFBs.

The *Grubenhaus* is typically, but not exclusively, associated with the early Anglo-Saxon period in England and, due to its sunken feature, it is the most numerous building form that has been found from this period (Tipper 2004, 1). SFBs do occur on sites of the middle Anglo-Saxon period although their use seems to be in decline.

Size seems to be an indicator of date: from the study at West Stow, there is a suggestion that the 5th century SFB (as with halls) was smaller in size, and more standardised in terms of dimensions than those of the 6th and 7th centuries (West 1985, fig 300). A similar trend can be seen with the SFBs at Mucking and West Heslerton (Tipper 2004, 66), although what is becoming apparent is that as with PBSs, it is the length which
exhibits signs of an increase while the breadth largely stays the same; this may indicate limitations in terms of roof construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type A</td>
<td>Two post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type A1</td>
<td>Two post derivative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B</td>
<td>Six post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type B1</td>
<td>Six post derivative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>Four post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type D</td>
<td>No posts, pit only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Details not recovered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: West Stow Grubenhaus classification based upon post-holes observed

Despite this relative wealth of data and SFBs first being identified in the early 1920s at the excavations at Sutton Courtenay (Leeds 1923), the debate continues concerning both their structural form and their function. Related archaeological finds have led to a number of uses being suggested ranging from houses to workshops and stores. Hamerow (1993) and Dixon (1993) have considered the evidence from mainland Europe, but trying to bring some clarity to this is hampered by the combination of these structures having a relatively short life-span, and the apparent practice, upon abandonment, of using them as rubbish dumps (Jones 1979).

In terms of appearance, SFBs measure, on average, approximately 3m x 4m and can be 0.3-0.5m deep, depending upon the impact of plough damage in the topsoil. Post-holes tend to be located along the short sides of the sunken feature and occur in a wide range of combinations, although one, two or three posts at each end are the most common varieties with the posts set either on the upper or lower edges of the sunken feature (Arnold 1997, 39); these post-holes presumably served to support the roof structure (Tipper 2004, 1). Internally, other structural evidence is rare. Attempts at reconstruction of SFBs have been attempted, presenting these structures as two very different types of building, one having a sunken floor, as the name suggests, the base of which formed the working area of the structure, the second having a suspended timber plank floor over the sunken feature in order to create a void. Most notably in England reconstructions have been constructed at the West Stow Anglo-Saxon village in Suffolk using the post-holes of the original structures. Using only the materials and tools available from the period,
the site is being used to test a number of different ideas relating to the construction and use of both SFBs and PBSs. At present the project is very much in its early days and any firm conclusions based upon the performance of the structures would be premature. What this does serve to emphasise is the extent to which we are still reliant upon a limited number of settlement sites that have been subject to detailed and careful excavation and recording, rather than now being able to more fully draw upon ‘local’ or ‘regional’ settlement data.

![Diagram of Anglo-Saxon sunken-feature buildings](image)

**Fig. 2.10: Anglo-Saxon sunken-feature buildings**

### 2.3 Discussion

Despite the increase in field survey, which has certainly enhanced our knowledge of the distribution of sites across the landscape, without further excavation, it is difficult to assess the nature of the settlements themselves, and in this respect, even at a national level, we are limited to data from the excavation of a few ‘large’ sites together with excavation, or partial excavation, of individual buildings. Even then, the fragile nature
of the physical remains of these sites limits what we can learn from them unless they are particularly well preserved; in a rural landscape subjected to regular deep ploughing, survivability is always going to be a problem. In this regard, our knowledge and understanding of Anglo-Saxon settlements is still far from complete.

In spite of these changes in approach in archaeology, it remains the case that far more is known about burials of the Anglo-Saxon period than is known about settlements, as has been the case since the first burial sites were recorded and dated by the antiquarians of the 18th and 19th centuries. Consequently much of the research relating to Anglo-Saxon England has concentrated upon defining ethnic groups although it is, more accurately, a study of the adoption of Anglo-Saxon burial rites (Richards 1987, 10), material culture and characteristics. The focus of research is now moving towards a new area, that of social structure and religion, which has previously been held to be difficult to identify archaeologically (Hawkes 1954, cited in Richards 1987, 11). Additionally, through advances in science, we are continuing to learn more about the Anglo-Saxon population, but these are expensive and time-consuming processes.

The data that we have can create a distorted image of life in the Anglo-Saxon period and make it difficult to trace any links back to the Roman period. From material recovered from burial contexts, it is easy to envisage a warrior race (spears, swords, shields, helmets and knives) with strong continental links (brooches). From that premise, it is a short step to adding terms such as 'fierce' or 'ruthless' and 'invaders' or 'conquerors'. The evidence from settlements - highlighted in later chapters - appears to present a very different image: small groups of undefended timber buildings, with a population engaged in agricultural activities raising livestock, cultivating crops and carrying out highly skilled crafts. Furthermore, what we must be careful not to do is imply that sites with such material can only be linked to Anglo-Saxon newcomers, colonists or invaders, for the related question which also tends to remain unanswered is whether it is possible to identify what happened to the Romano-British population, and are we seeing evidence of the adoption of Anglo-Saxon characteristics by a native British population?

The next chapters will consider the evidence for Anglo-Saxon presence and material culture in the East Midlands landscapes of Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire.
CHAPTER 3

Anglo-Saxon Leicestershire

'Between Ratae of the Romans and Leicester of the English lies a gap in our knowledge that may some day be filled by archaeological research and discovery'
(Leicestershire Victoria County History 1907, 221)

3.1 Introduction

Geographically, Leicestershire lies in the heart of the English Midlands, bounded by Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire to the north, Rutland to the east, Northamptonshire to the south and Warwickshire and Staffordshire to the west; the extent of the county in this research is the area enclosed by the present-day boundary and overseen by Leicestershire County Council. The district and borough councils that constitute Leicestershire are Blaby, Charnwood, Harborough, Hinckley and Bosworth, Melton, Northwest Leicestershire and Oadby and Wigston; in addition there is the unitary authority of Leicester City.

The county has two distinct halves separated by the course of the River Soar: the western half, dominated by Charnwood Forest and the rock outcrops of Bradgate, and the more rural eastern half with its pastoral landscape of rolling claylands. Situated in the centre of the county and straddling the banks of the Soar is the city of Leicester, which for nearly 2000 years has been the main focus of activity in the county.

Approximately equidistant from Leicester are the market towns of the county: the industrial towns of Loughborough, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, and Hinckley lie to the west of the Soar, together with the 19th century mining town of Coalville, while to the east are the more typically rural towns of Melton Mowbray, Market Harborough and Lutterworth.

With regard to the settlement of the county from the 5th century AD onwards, the physical landscape and the remains of the Roman period activity would have been the key defining influences. The appearance of Anglo-Saxon Leicestershire, in both settlement and burial sites, will be considered, based primarily upon the data from the
Leicestershire HER/SMR; a number of case studies will then be detailed. In Leicestershire, most fieldwork in the past 25 years has comprised fieldwalking surveys which provide some of the clearer images for reviewing settlement change and evolution. The main surveys that will be considered are:

1. Medbourne Survey (Liddle 1994, 34-36)
2. The Langtons Survey (Bowman 1996, 121-146)
3. Mill Farm, Stenton Wyville (Liddle et al. 1996)
4. Stoughton Survey (Liddle & Hartley 1994)
5. The Great Easton, Bringhurst and Drayton Survey (Great Easton & District Local History Society Fieldwork Group 1996)
7. Brooksby (Liddle & Knox 1991; Liddle & Knox 1997)

Fig. 3.1: Leicestershure key survey areas

In order to avoid repetition, these surveys will be placed together into geographical groupings. Surveys 1-5 will be collectively referred to as the South-Eastern Leicestershire Survey, and 6 and 7 as the Wreake Valley Survey. This will make it possible to draw comparisons between the sequences or patterns of individual schemes and easier to identify any similarities or apparent differences, between the separate
areas. Also to be considered under the ‘Wreake Survey’ heading will be the field survey, evaluation and excavations that were carried out at Eye Kettleby, near Melton Mowbray in the early and mid-1990s (Finn 1996, 1999, and forthcoming). The Eye Kettleby project is a rare example, in central England, of an Anglo-Saxon settlement site where, in addition to fieldwalking, large scale excavation has been conducted.

Consideration will also be given to urban data since one of the main features that sets the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods of the county of Leicestershire apart from those of Rutland and Northamptonshire, is the presence of the major Roman urban centre of Leicester and recent evidence enables some discussion of aspects of continuity. In this respect, the nature of settlement and occupation in the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods will be examined in the light of data produced through archaeological investigation.

3.1.1 Geology and Topography

The natural features that have long contributed to the delineation and layout of the county of Leicestershire, influenced by the underlying geology and soil conditions, are the rivers or watercourses, and the woodland. Of the man-made features, probably the most influential in terms of settlement pattern are the roads and, more specifically, the major Roman roads that crossed and surrounded the county.

Key when considering the character and use of the landscape is the surface, or drift, geology (see Fig.3.2 below). The surface geology of Leicestershire is dominated by glacial till and predominantly the boulder clays of the lower and upper Lias. These dominate in the south-west and to the south and east of the River Soar with small patches of glacial sands and gravels. To the west the geology is more varied, comprising interspersed patches of clays, glacial deposits and Triassic formations which occur particularly in the Charnwood area. Typically, the valleys of the rivers Soar and Wreake are of alluvium with larger areas of valley gravels.

The solid geology is more varied than the surface geology, but still contributes to the character of the landscape of the county, together with helping to explain the modes of landscape exploitation in the manner to which it has been subjected.
The solid geology divides the county into two parts; the oldest rocks are in the west and the younger rocks in the east. The western zone, equating approximately to the area to the west of the River Soar, is of mudstone and sandstone with seams or outcrops of coal and shale in the north-west which join the coalfield of south Derbyshire; in the Charnwood area there are outcrops of older slate and granite. The area to the east of the River Soar is predominantly of clay, mudstone and limestone, with an area of ironstone, clay and limestone in the north-east in the Vale of Belvoir.

Central Leicestershire comprises a band of clay, mudstone and limestone, while further to the east and north, in ‘High’ Leicestershire and the Vale of Belvoir, the geology is of clay and ironstone. This clay and ironstone also characterise the landscape of the western part of Rutland, while further to the east, also extending into the Vale of Belvoir, limestone becomes the dominant geological component.

Much of Leicestershire lies between 60m and 120m OD (Fig. 3.3). The lowest lying area is along the course of the River Soar which flows from south to north through the middle of the county. The highest areas, in excess of 183m OD, lie to the west, around Charnwood, and to the east around Tilton-on-the-Hill and Houghton on the Hill, an area often referred to as ‘High’ Leicestershire.
The city of Leicester lies in the heart of the county on the banks of the Soar, approximately equidistant from the other main centres of population – the market towns of Loughborough, Melton Mowbray, Market Harborough, Lutterworth, Hinckley, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, and the more modern, appropriately named, Coalville.

### 3.1.2 Watercourses

The boundary of the southern half of the country is made up of two major elements: a Roman road (Watling Street) which will be considered below (Section 3.2.1), and two rivers, the Avon and the Welland. Watling Street, which forms the county boundary between Leicestershire and Northamptonshire to the east and Warwickshire to the west, crosses the River Avon approximately one kilometre west of Catthorpe. It is here that the county boundary between Leicestershire and Northamptonshire turns eastwards, following the course of the Avon as far as Welford. Just north of Welford, the boundary joins up with the course of the River Welland and follows this eastward as far as Caldecott (Rutland). At this point, the Eye Brook, which forms the south-eastern part of the Leicestershire county boundary with Rutland, joins the Welland and continues as the
county boundary between Rutland and Northamptonshire as far as Stamford (Lincs.). It is noticeable that the county boundary preserves the original or earlier course of the River Welland, for there are clearly places where the meander of the river has diverged away from the county boundary, although the line of the boundary is now established in print and thus preserved.

Rivers also feature in the northern part of the county boundary - for example major rivers such as the Soar and the Trent, together with smaller watercourses, namely the River Devon and King’s Brook. The River Trent takes on the line of the Leicestershire county boundary with Derbyshire to the west of Castle Donington and continues to the point where the Trent is joined by the River Soar. The Soar then forms the boundary between Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire down to Stanford on Soar (Notts.) to the north of Loughborough. From here, the boundary follows King’s Brook for a short distance eastwards before following an unnamed stream, possibly a tributary of the River Smite and then going cross-country until it follows the River Devon to the north of Bottesford in the Vale of Belvoir. From here the boundary turns southwards
following the route of an old roadway, Sewstern Lane, as far as the boundary with Rutland.

On the western side of the county, present-day watercourses feature less strongly in the definition of the county boundary; only in a small area west of Ashby-de-la-Zouch does the boundary follow the course of the River Mease and a tributary, Hooborough Brook. A short distance further west lie the Rivers Trent and Dove, which still form the boundary between Derbyshire and Staffordshire and the preservation of this river boundary may suggest that, historically, it formed a tribal/territorial boundary predating the creation of the shire counties in the later Saxon period. Further south, the boundary follows the River Anker around the northern side of Atherstone (Warwickshire) until the boundary rejoins the Watling Street at the Roman settlement of Mancettter.

The two main rivers that run through the county are the Rivers Soar and Wreake. The Soar rises in south-west Leicestershire near to Hinckley, in the form of the Soar Brook, and remains a small river until it merges with the River Sence on the southern outskirts of the modern city between the villages of Whetstone and Narborough. The Soar continues to flow in a northerly direction and is then joined by the River Wreake which meanders down from the north-east of the county. This confluence occurs between the settlements of Syston and Rothley. From this point, the River Soar carries on in a north-westerly direction, and flows into the Trent at Lockington on the Leicestershire/Derbyshire border.

The River Soar, too, may have formed a territorial boundary within the county. As will be seen, the majority of Anglo-Saxon settlement sites lie in an area to the east of the Soar - although there are one or two exceptions - and the same comment can be said of the location of burial sites.

The name of the River Soar was first recorded in AD 1211 as the ‘Sore’ and may be derived from the Celtic word *ser* which means ‘to flow’ (Bourne 2003, 115). The possible retention of the Celtic name of the river contrasts with all the other rivers in the area which feature names that are Old English in origin. This could emphasise the significance of the river as a key feature of the area. Significantly, the one other river that has possibly retained elements of the Celtic name, is the River Welland (*vesu* -
good; *luaid* – to move) which, under Scandinavian influence, became ‘Weolud’ by AD 921 (ibid., 116).

The River Wreake rises in north-east Leicestershire at Waltham-on-the-Wolds in the form of the River Eye, which itself is an Old English name *ea* meaning ‘river’; this is one of the few rivers in England that changes its name along the route that it takes, with Wreake coming from the Old Scandinavian *wreithk* being ‘twisted’ or ‘crooked’ (ibid., 114, 116). This change takes place at Melton Mowbray, possibly reflecting a change in authority over the area. Certainly, documentary evidence shows that in 1224, the name of the river was written as ‘Wreithk’, which reflects its course from Melton Mowbray to the Soar. It also coincides with the density of settlements that have Scandinavian roots to their names in this area of Leicestershire (ibid., 116) (see also discussion below).

### 3.1.3 Woodland

A study of the suggested extent of Domesday woodland reveals an interesting contrast (Holly 1939, 180-183, fig. 7) (see Fig. 3.5 below): the western half of the county, to the west of the River Soar, appears predominantly wooded with one major gap in the extreme west of the county and a smaller area of patchy cover around the Charnwood and Bradgate areas. One other area of open land lies to the south west of Leicester between Kirby Muxloe and Earl Shilton.

The landscape of east Leicestershire was dominated by the ancient forest of Leighfield which spanned the border with Rutland and conceivably joined with Rockingham Forest in the Welland Valley in north Northamptonshire. This woodland area dominated what is referred to as ‘High’ Leicestershire (Holly 1971, 355), from Knossington in the north down to Kibworth and Medbourne in the south. It also covered much of south-west Rutland and spread up in to the north of the county beyond the Gwash Valley.

In contrast, the Wolds of north-east Leicestershire around Melton Mowbray and into the Vale of Belvoir appear largely devoid of recorded woodland (ibid. 355), and this open landscape seems to continue along the course of the Wreake Valley and onto the claylands to the east of Leicester.
3.2 The Roman Influence

Whilst the major Roman influence on settlement in the county of Leicestershire would have been the road network, the focal point of the Roman road layout itself would have been the town of Leicester, a centre of late Iron Age origin, and since then a regional economic magnet.

3.2.1 Roman Roads

The majority of the pre-Roman and early Roman routeways in the county would have been little more than tracks suitable for horses or mules, requiring little by way of preparation other than regular use by the local population. Such means of communication leave little trace in the archaeological context, and it is only within the past hundred years that most routes have been made permanent by the use of tarmac. The network of major Roman roads within the county, as identified by Margary (Margary 1973, figs 7a & 12), clearly converges on the civitas capital of Ratae (Leicester) (Fig. 3.6 below) and while our knowledge of this network still incomplete, it is gradually being added to through on-going fieldwork (Liddle 2004b, 72, fig. 1).
Best known is the Fosse Way. This road represents the extent of the initial Roman expansion in Britain, extending from Exeter in the south-west up to Lincoln. The Fosse Way crosses the Watling Street at High Cross or Venonae and approaches Leicester from the south-west, entering the town through the west gate. It leaves Leicester from the east gate and continues in a north-easterly direction to the colonia of Lincoln.

![Fig. 3.6: Known network of Roman Roads](image-url)

Two other roads approach the town from the south and south-west: from Caves Inn (Tripontium) and Mancetter (Manduessedum) respectively, both of which lie on the route of Watling Street. The road from Caves Inn entered Leicester from the south, while that from Mancetter entered via the west or north gate (McWhirr 1967, 2).

From the south east, the Gartree Road comes from Corby, entering Leicester via the south gate; it is suggested that this road continued from the west gate to the small town site at Ravenstone and beyond. Although its exact or full route has not yet been defined, fieldwork is adding to our knowledge in this respect. Elements of a straight road alignment can also be identified from the study of the landscape and from maps (Liddle 2004b, 72, fig. 1).
The wider area of Leicestershire is bounded by two major roads: Watling Street, which forms the county boundary to the south-west, and Ermine Street, which passes through the eastern part of Rutland and close to the Leicestershire border.

3.2.2 The Small Towns

Related to the road network are the ‘small towns’ identified from fieldwork (Fig. 3.7 and Table 3.1). A number of these are situated on the routes offering direct communication with Leicester (Liddle 2004a, 63, fig. 1).

In the case of the towns on roads that connect directly with Leicester, they all lie approximately equidistant from Leicester, between 12 and 15 miles, which should signify a relationship to the town in terms of markets and travel distance, or in terms of the town territory. Other small-town sites have been identified which do not connect directly with Leicester and this may indicate a possible variation in status or role for these towns.
It could be suggested from this road network that the sphere of influence of Leicester lies to the west of the county. It is in this direction, to the west of the Fosse Way, that the majority of the roads spread out, while only one road actually enters/exits Leicester to the east of the Fosse Way (Gartree Road approaching from the south-east) and no roads, as yet, have been identified which lead due east across ‘High’ Leicestershire, however, a large scatter of Roman material from this area between Leicester and Uppingham (Rutland) is presently being studied (P. Liddle, pers. comm.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Roman name</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Defences</th>
<th>Anglo-Saxon presence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barrow-on-Soar/Quorndon</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Salt Way</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caves Inn</td>
<td>Tripontium</td>
<td>Watling Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frisby/Kirby Bellars</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goadby Marwood</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Salt Way</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cross</td>
<td>Venonae</td>
<td>Watling Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Harborough</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medbourne</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Gartree Road</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenstone/Ibstock</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby on the Wolds/Wymeswold</td>
<td>Vernememetum</td>
<td>Fosse Way</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witherley/Mancetter</td>
<td>Manduessedum</td>
<td>Watling Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.1: Leicestershire Roman small towns*

### 3.2.3 The Villa Landscape

The distribution of villas in the mid- and late Roman period would not only reflect the organisation of the landscape, but would also have had a major impact upon it. In the most comprehensive compilation of villa sites (Scott 1993), Leicestershire was recorded as having approximately 80 villa sites, some of which are multiple entries related to a single location, others of which are now discounted (see Fig. 3.8 & Appendix 2). While being distributed across much of the county, it is possible to identify three main areas of villa concentration. Firstly, in the area to the west of the River Soar, the majority of villas lie within five miles of the Soar Valley and are situated within (later?) woodland. Secondly, there is a more widespread group of villa sites to the north-east of Melton
Mowbray. The third area lies to the east and south-east of Leicester, in open claylands and set within the area of Leighfield Forest.

A study of the location of villas around Leicester may indicate a relationship between the civitas capital and the villas, the majority of which lie approximately four miles from the town; this may reflect the delineation of a civic territory or, for work purposes, a day's travel. It is tempting to suggest that the location of Anglo-Saxon settlements that are a similar distance from the town would denote a similar territorial arrangement, and that this relationship of major town to local centres of production was still in existence in the post-Roman/early Anglo-Saxon period.

3.3 Anglo-Saxon Burial Sites

The Anglo-Saxon burials of Leicestershire concentrate predominantly in the central area to the east of Leicester between the River Soar and the fringes of Leighfield Forest. Additional, small concentrations of burial sites lie around Melton Mowbray and into the Vale of Belvoir in the north-east and in the south at Market Harborough and along the banks of the River Welland (Fig. 3.9 & Appendix 4).
In east Leicestershire and crossing into Rutland, the Leighfield Forest area appears largely devoid of burials, in sharp contrast to the density of settlement sites that have generally been identified and recorded on the HER/SMR; however, a number of burial sites have been located around the likely fringes of the forest as suggested from the assessment of woodland from Domesday Book (Holly 1971, 341-344). The location of these burials would seem to confirm the extent of the woodland area of Leighfield Forest in the post-Roman period, with sites at Twyford and Burrough-on-the-Hill along the northern edge, Lowesby, Cold Newton and Tugby on the western side, and a single site at Medbourne on the southern edge.

The burial locations around Melton Mowbray follow the course of the River Eye/Wreake, and in the south of the county burial sites have been located at Market Harborough. This town lies on the River Welland and although it has no clear evidence for Anglo-Saxon settlement, when looked at in conjunction with the broad alignment of burial and settlement sites in north Northamptonshire, the likelihood is that in the Anglo-Saxon period this may have been a river crossing on a major route from Leicester to Northampton.
3.4 Anglo-Saxon Settlement

As recorded in the Leicestershire HER/SMR, the majority of settlement sites occur as pot scatters that have been found through fieldwalking (see Appendix 5). Settlement sites of the Anglo-Saxon period so far appear concentrated in the eastern half of the county, and specifically settlement is in two areas (Fig. 3.10 below):

1. In the south-eastern part of the county around Medbourne;
2. In the north-east along the valley of the River Wreake between Leicester and Melton Mowbray.

Elsewhere, settlement is more dispersed across the claylands of 'High' Leicestershire in the east, and to the north of the Wreake Valley, extending into the Wolds and the Vale of Belvoir. More isolated settlement also occurs in the western half of the county. In terms of the landscape of the county, with the exception of the settlement around Medbourne in the south-east, settlement gathers in the woodland fringes or on land well away from the main wooded areas.

Around Medbourne, seemingly concentrated settlement can be described as following a linear course which may have bounded the southern fringes of Leighfield Forest in the earlier Anglo-Saxon period. The fact that settlement now appears within the forest area may be attributable to subsequent woodland regeneration between the late Roman period and at least the time of Domesday Book.

At a more 'site specific' level, Roman settlement in the Medbourne survey area is quite dense, comprising one small town site, three villa sites and a non-villa farmstead. All of these sites appear to have remained in use at least until the late 4th century, by which time four other sites had already been abandoned (Liddle 1996, 2). Fieldwalking within this area has produced Anglo-Saxon pottery from a number of the sites, including the small town and the villas and it has been suggested (ibid., 2) that this may indicate that in the 5th century the native British population remained in situ but as the Roman system failed, they adopted elements of the Anglo-Saxon way of expression, for example, pottery manufacture. It is also possible that, at this time, the failure of the Roman system may have contributed to the break-up of the larger settlement sites, for example the small towns. Numerically there are more sites datable to the Anglo-Saxon period within the Medbourne area than there are of the Roman period, although there
are no Anglo-Saxon pottery scatters comparable in size to that of the Roman small town. This may then indicate a reversion towards smaller scattered or dispersed settlements, reflecting a shrunken market, settlement/living at largely self-sufficient level, and population shrinkage overall.

Against this notion of settlement fragmentation, however, is the suggested continued role for the old Roman town of Leicester, evidenced by finds of Anglo-Saxon data within the town and its suburbs, and its likely role as a royal centre in the 7th century (Courtney 1998). On the basis of this scenario, it is possible that change, of necessity, affected rural settlement, and the established status of the old Roman town was strong enough for it to retain its place in the local hierarchy while also being able to support itself physically. (See below, 3.5 Case Studies).

Structural evidence of Anglo-Saxon settlement is still scarce, and where identified is often severely truncated. The key site is that at Eye Kettleby, situated in the Wreake Valley on the outskirts of Melton Mowbray; excavation revealed 45 structures, comprising 20 post-built structures (PBSs) and 25 sunken feature buildings (SFBs).
This will be considered in greater detail in Section 6.5.3. Elsewhere, evidence of two SFBs was found at Harston in the Vale of Belvoir in the course of ironstone quarrying (Dunning 1952, 53) in 1935 and 1936. These comprised two pits dug into the ironstone to a depth of 0.75m, in association with a number of artefacts including pottery, loom weights, spindle whorls, two blades and bone combs, one of which was dated to the 6th or early 7th century (ibid., 50). In 1981, a Romano-British settlement was excavated at Ravenstone in the north-west of the county (Lucas 1982, 104-107) which dated to the 3rd and 4th century; additionally some Anglo-Saxon pottery was identified together with evidence for a timber PBS.

In Leicester, a structure, possibly a hybrid form resembling both PBS and SFB, measuring 5.54m by 3.50m, was recorded at Bonner’s Lane (Finn 2004, 19), while a more conventional SFB was discovered in 1997 during excavations at Oxford Street, some 30m from Bonner’s Lane (Gossip 1999). Both of these lie outside the Roman town. Between 2003 and 2005, investigation in advance of the Shires West development, within the walled area revealed evidence for early Anglo-Saxon settlement including a number of small finds and pottery, and a possible truncated SFB (Gnanaratnam 2006, 6).

3.5 Case Studies

In this section we will consider a set of key case studies drawing together fieldwork from both urban and rural settings.

3.5.1 Late Roman Leicester (see Fig. 3.11)

The format of the Roman town of Leicester is relatively well recorded and documented, being a planned, walled town and a significant range of civic buildings that focus on the forum. However, what contributed to the town achieving this position of power in the landscape? A key factor was its position at a crossing point on the River Soar, but as rivers can be forded or crossed at any number of places, other factors were at work, not least of which must be the element of control. This control must be exerted over people: a place can be prominent in the landscape, but it cannot make people come to it. People can always have a choice about whether they go somewhere or not – they may choose a place that is convenient, but that in itself is no guarantee of ensuring success, there will
always be other options. A town such as Leicester, therefore, needed to be established as a seat of power, a place which people recognised as being their ‘tribal’ focal point, as well as being a central market place and a river crossing point, either a ford or an early bridge.

Fig. 3.11: Leicester - Roman and Anglo-Saxon cemeteries (after Connor & Buckley 1999, fig. 3)

With the exception of the excavations conducted by Kenyon in the heart of the Roman town around Jewry Wall, much of what has been learnt has stemmed from small scale projects. By way of contrast, the past ten to fifteen years have seen the undertaking of major, large scale excavations starting with the site at Causeway Lane (Connor & Buckley 1999), St Nicholas Place (Kipling 2004) and culminating with the Highcross Quarter extension to the Shires Shopping Centre, the data from which are currently undergoing evaluation.

From the recent excavations at St Nicholas Place (Kipling 2004) it is of value to note the size of the external walls of buildings identified, in the area surrounding the forum. Substantial masonry walls on several alignments have been recorded, as have narrower
walls faced with wattle (external) and baked clay or tile (internal) with a clay brick or mud/rubble infill. As part of the same excavation, a Norman undercroft opposite the Guildhall was recorded (ibid., 4, 5), which incorporated Roman tiles into its masonry walls, which may indicate that as late as the 12th century Roman buildings and their materials were still identifiable and available for re-use. The majority of robber trenches within the central area of Leicester that are dateable indeed appear to be from the 12th century (N. Finn, pers. comm.). The size of the masonry walls may support the view of Connor and Buckley (1999, 59) that while the evidence for new structures in 4th century in Leicester is sparse, this may be explained by the combination of the extant substantial masonry of the 2nd century buildings together with the recovered evidence of floor refurbishment and new wall paintings (Clay and Mellor 1985; Clay and Pollard 1994).

The final stage in the defence of many late Romano-British towns was the construction of projecting masonry towers or bastions in the 4th century (Hobley 1983, 82). Wacher considers that there is only very slight evidence for this at Leicester (1995, 361), while Esmonde Cleary (2000, 63) argued that the provision of bastions was not universal practice and that Leicester, together with Silchester, managed without such additions. Bastions provoke a degree of discussion, for their construction has certain implications about town life: if their use is military and defensive, interpreted as relating to the provision of ‘artillery’, this requires specialist manpower to operate it, which would, in turn, require either a permanent military presence in towns, or a trained civilian militia, possibly comprising former legionaries.

It is relatively easy to give what may appear to be a definitive view of the town defences of Roman Leicester, but there is still only limited archaeological evidence. Wacher (1995, 356) sums up the problem when he points out that on the north, south and east sides of the town the line of the Roman defences coincided with that of the medieval town walls; these walls were themselves severely damaged in the later Middle Ages and to make way for further town expansion they were robbed out to foundation level and below to provide building material. As for the western defences, depending upon their position in relation to the river, gradual changes in the river line may have contributed much to their destruction. Buckley and Lucas (1987, 8) stated that there were no surviving remains of any of Leicester’s defences above ground as the four gates were
demolished in 1774 and it was likely that any other remains of the walls had largely been removed by that same time, although the ground plan of the medieval town (and thus the Roman town) is still identifiable.

Since 2004, in advance of re-development work in central Leicester, excavations have been carried out in the Sanvey Gate and Vine Street areas of Leicester. In Sanvey Gate, the Roman and medieval town ditches were excavated, revealing sections 15m long and 3.75m in depth; inside the walls, extensive Roman features were recorded, including a stone-founded building, a road, a track, timber structures and ditches. There is also evidence of Saxon period activity in the form of a post-hole with well-stratified, associated pottery (Jarvis & Meek 2005, 6, 7). At Vine Street, early excavation revealed evidence for the remodelling of the buildings in the Roman period. Subsequent work has revealed the crossing of two streets and the presence of a substantial Roman townhouse of the 2nd-3rd century with portico, hypocaust and tessellated pavement (Higgins & Buckley 2005, 6).

Probably as a direct result of Victorian town growth, clear evidence for extramural Roman settlement is scarce, despite traces of suburban occupation to the north, south and west of both timber and masonry buildings (Connor and Buckley 1999, 6). To the south, at Bonners Lane (Finn 2004) excavations have identified the route of a road originating in the 2nd century: initially defined by parallel gullies, the surrounding land was then divided into plots by ditches which exhibit signs of having been re-cut at various times; in the late 3rd or early 4th century, a substantial timber building was constructed by the roadside. There is also evidence of a hearth, cereal drying oven and pits. This late Roman building was in turn replaced in the 5th or 6th century by a semi-sunken building accompanied by materials associated with textile making – a plausible indicator of continuity in land use from the Roman period into the early Anglo-Saxon period.

West of the town and across the river Soar, possibly on the Iron Age site, an industrial zone was established with evidence for the presence of kilns and an abattoir (Cooper & Buckley 2004, 57). In addition, approximately 700m to the west of the town, lies the site of the Norfolk Street villa (ibid., 57) which dates from the 3rd century with additions in the late 3rd and early 4th centuries. All these data help in presenting an image of a well
established, prosperous town set at a strategically and economically important river crossing, with some late imperial signs of activity.

The Roman cemeteries of Leicester that have been identified to date all conform to the practice of the time, being situated outside the walled town alongside a main road (Fig. 3.11):

1. Great Holme Street (McWhirr 1975, 57-58)
2. Haymarket (Higgins & Cooper 1997, 93)
3. Clarence Street (Crank 2001)
4. Newarke Street (Cooper 1996, 1-90)
5. Oxford Street (Gossip 1998, 159-160)
6. York Road (Gossip 1998, 159-160)
7. West Humberstone (Clark 1998, 161)

The site at Great Holme Street lies to the west of the town on the Fosse Way; the burials at Haymarket and Clarence Street are outside the east gate, while outside the south gate are the sites at Newarke Street, Oxford Street and York Road. These cemeteries range in size from two or three burials to the Clarence Street site with 95 inhumations aligned west-east. In all cases, the limit of the cemetery was not defined through excavation, nor were chronologies or dating altogether clear.

The evaluation of a site in Bath Lane in 1992 showed further evidence for the evolution of Leicester as a Roman town with the change from timber to stone buildings in the late 1st century, the creation of a Roman street grid and the development of the area until the buildings eventually fell into disrepair, subsequently being partially demolished early in the 4th century (Cooper 1993). Later in the 4th century the forum, basilica and market hall appear to have been destroyed by fire, without being replaced (Wacher 1995, 362). However, there is also a suggestion of some 'urban regeneration' with shops being rebuilt (ibid., 361), indicating a continued high level of activity in the town towards the end of the period.

3.5.1.1 Post-Roman Leicester

A common conclusion from a number of excavations is that there was an apparent and significant gap in activity in the town between the end of the Roman period in the 5th
century AD and an upsurge in building activity in the 11th and 12th centuries. The gap shows itself in terms of a lack of new buildings, as confirmed by the Bath Lane evaluation and more recent work on Guildhall Lane and St Nicholas Place (Kipling 2004).

The minimal archaeological evidence means that little can be said with any certainty concerning settlement in Leicester in the second half of the first millennium AD (Buckley & Lucas 1987, 56). This can be contrasted with three fragments of historical evidence. In, or shortly after AD 670 a Middle Anglian diocese was formed from the see of Lichfield which was based at Leicester from 737 and possibly earlier (Ellis 1976, 27-28; Courtney 1998, 110); two centuries later it was established as one of the Five Boroughs of the Danelaw, but was recaptured in 918. What this means as regards the status of the town and the condition of its defences can only be speculation (Buckley & Lucas 1987, 57), but texts at least suggest a town of some continued local or regional importance, both as a religious centre and as a centre of administration, and it retained that status at least until the 11th century. In this respect, it is not so unlikely that the fabric of the town — both the defences and the internal structure — would have survived and even been maintained in some form.

At Bath Lane, to the west of the city centre, there was an apparent occupation gap of 800 to 900 years, from the last phases of Roman activity until the late 12th or early 13th centuries when some of the Roman walls were robbed of their stone, most likely for use in the redevelopment of the medieval town. But perhaps this ‘gap’ simply means no new construction, rather than total abandonment. The presence of standing Roman structures is further emphasised in the case of the Norman undercroft on Guildhall Lane/St Nicholas Place (Kipling 2004, 4, 5): situated close to the old forum site, this structure has been exposed and recorded several times since it was first discovered in 1844 (Hagar & Buckley 1990, 99). It forms the ground floor of a structure which probably had a timber first floor and was built in about the 12th century. It was principally constructed of granite, but also included Roman brick and tile which is used in such a manner as to be considered a decorative feature and not just a practical infill: on its west elevation, the undercroft had four splayed, round-headed windows, the arches of which were formed of re-used Roman brick and tile. This shows material as readily available and in a sound enough condition to be reused in construction in the
heart of medieval Leicester. The undercroft was no insignificant unit: it occupies a prominent position close to the town’s commercial heart. Undercrofts are typically associated with trading or mercantile activity and this may have been the storeroom of a wealthy merchant’s house (Clarke 2003, 7).

Thus it can be inferred that substantial structural elements of the Roman town, including the town walls and walls of ruined buildings were still in evidence for the whole of the Anglo-Saxon period and into the post-Conquest period. Only in the 12th century during the expansion or regeneration of the town was much of the existing Roman masonry taken down and re-used for new buildings. Indeed, in the case of Leicester, substantial elements of the Roman baths complex at the Jewry Wall, close to St Nicholas Church, are still standing nearly two thousand years after they were built. The presence of standing structures, however, is not sufficient evidence on its own to suggest continuity of activity beyond the end of the Roman period.

Fig. 3.12: Anglo-Saxon Leicester
In Leicester, as elsewhere, identifying secure and consistent traces of settlement activity in the ‘gap centuries’ is extremely problematic except where significant urban archaeology projects have been carried out (as at Lincoln, Winchester and London). Leicester, at present, lacks comparable large scale investigations, although The Shires Development Phase II is now in progress. A series of lesser projects, however, serves to open the window to evidence of Anglo-Saxon activity within the town: this has included pottery and a range of small finds. It is the nature of Anglo-Saxon finds, and specifically the lack of quantity in which they are found, that creates problems in the identification of sites. When coupled with the characteristic problem of urban archaeology – that of the inter-cutting of seemingly unrelated features and the presence of residual material – then identification and interpretation becomes increasingly difficult (Ottaway 1992, 19-24).

Excavated sites where Anglo-Saxon material has been identified (Fig. 3.12):

1. Oxford Street: truncated evidence for the presence of structures in association with a few sherds of pottery of the fifth or sixth centuries (Gossip 1998, 159-60).

2. Bonners Lane: an Anglo-Saxon sunken-featured building situated close to the above site (Finn 1994, 165-70; Finn 2004, 15-19).

3. St Peter’s Lane: excavated as part of the Shires Development in 1988, the site produced 55 sherds of pottery and a bone comb (Connor & Buckley 1999, 83).

4. Little Lane: excavated at the same time as St Peters Lane being part of the same development scheme, this site produced 29 sherds of Anglo-Saxon pottery (ibid., 83).

5. Causeway Lane: excavations carried out during 1991 produced a total of 28 sherds of pottery of the Anglo-Saxon period (Blinkhorn 1999, 165).


7. Churchgate/East Gate: a collection of Anglo-Saxon burials outside the East Gate of the town walls suggested from two urns found between 1866 and 1907 (Cottrill 1946, 12).
8. St Peter’s Lane, including St Margaret’s Baths and Freeschool Lane: in 2006, excavations in advance of the new Shires Shopping Centre development revealed a Roman quarry, sealed beneath a gravel surface with possible faint structural remains. Also identified were early traces of Anglo-Saxon settlement in the form of a likely truncated Grubenhaus, some associated small finds and pottery (Gnanaratnam 2006, 6).

What has to be attempted, based on the data produced by these sites, is the preparation of an overview of the urban area as a whole, rather than looking at these sites in isolation. Whilst the levels of finds from the urban area of Leicester may appear low, an interesting comparison can be made between the finds from the Causeway Lane excavation and excavations carried out on a major rural Anglo-Saxon site at Eye Kettleby, near Melton Mowbray, in north-east Leicestershire, both carried out by ULAS (see 3.5.4 & Chapter 7). When considering the density of finds at both sites, the 4.5ha site at Eye Kettleby, with 20 ‘halls’ or post-built structures and 25 sunken-featured buildings, produced approximately 3000 sherds of pottery, which equates to 666.6 sherds per hectare. Causeway Lane and the Shires site produced 112 sherds from a site area of 0.27ha, which represents a density of 411 sherds per ha. Arguably, therefore, the level of activity within the town can be regarded as being comparable to that on a rural site (Connor & Buckley 1999, 83).
When looked at in isolation in terms of the excavations in Leicester, the evidence for an Anglo-Saxon presence may seem sparse. However, when considered together, the presence of structures (both standing Roman buildings and Anglo-Saxon timber buildings), and Anglo-Saxon ceramics and burials all come together to suggest the presence of people of the post-Roman period. The problem is that the nature of urban archaeology is such that it is difficult to establish firm chronologies to date this activity more accurately and to assess the character of that activity (see Plate 3.1 above).

3.5.2 South-Eastern Leicestershire Survey

The 'South-Eastern Survey' incorporates a series of parish fieldwalking surveys that extends from Stoughton on the southern outskirts of Leicester as far as the Northamptonshire county boundary.

While comprising several individual projects, mainly conducted by Leicestershire Museums around Medbourne (Liddle 1994, 34-36) and Stonton Wyville (Liddle et al., 1996) amateur fieldwalking groups have also been involved within the area, notably.
around Great Easton and Bringhurst (Great Easton & District Local History Society Fieldwork Group. 1996), together with a parish survey in the Langtons (Bowman 1996, 121-146), the same survey methods have been used, and while the aims of the projects may have differed, the data produced can be used to generate an overview of landscape development and change in the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods.

Fig. 3.14a: Medbourne – Roman sites (top), 3.14b: Anglo-Saxon (bottom) (Liddle, unpub.)
Within the survey area, approximately 50% of the fields have been subjected to investigation, with the remainder being under pasture and thus not available. The Roman Gartree Road runs through the area from north-west to south-east, crossing the Northamptonshire border to the south-west of the village of Drayton, between Medbourne (Leics.) and Middleton and Cottingham (Northants.). This road formed a focus for settlement during the Roman period with five villa sites and seven farmsteads lying within a 1km corridor along its route. In addition there is the 'small town' at Medbourne and two further sites which may be farmsteads (Figs 3.14a & b).

Fieldwalking has continued to show settlements up to 4km either side of the road line. This dispersed settlement 'pattern' corresponds with the areas of fieldwalking, which would suggest a fairly even pattern of settlement distribution across the Roman landscape. Very few of the sites correspond with later villages, however, which may be due to the fact that being largely a fieldwalking survey, little intrusive investigation in the form of test-pitting or larger scale excavation has been conducted within the local villages.

Based upon the same survey data, the Anglo-Saxon settlement pattern exhibits some differences in concentrations of distribution. The main axis of settlement in the Anglo-Saxon period appears to be the course of the River Welland and its tributaries, with the majority of the settlement sites lying within 500m of a watercourse. Distribution of Anglo-Saxon finds from fieldwalking suggests four main groupings of dispersed settlement (see Fig. 3.15 below):

1. To the west of Church Langton. This may be two separate settlement groups, the more southerly of which centres on the site of a Roman villa and a major tributary of the River Welland, including two cemetery sites and what can be seen as two pairs of 'twinned' settlements.

2. Along the course of The Lipping, between Stonton Wyville and Welham.

3. Around the Roman 'small-town' site at Medbourne.

4. The area around Great Easton and Brinhurst.

The fieldwalking data from Stoughton, close to the outskirts of Leicester, suggest a strong correlation between settlement locations in the Roman period and settlement activity in the Anglo-Saxon period (Liddle & Hartley 1994). The closeness of the dating
of ceramic material is a problem in this respect. The Roman material is recorded only as being ‘Roman’, covering a period of approximately 400 years while the ‘Anglo-Saxon’ material potentially covers a similar period. What can be suggested is that whether there was immediate continuity of settlement or there was a lapse in occupation, the evidence of earlier settlement must have been distinct enough for that place to be recognised as a point of activity. Additionally it must have been sufficiently attractive, in the case of the native population, for its occupants to remain there but adopting a change in their material culture, or, in the case of a new or incoming population, to choose to settle there.

The area around Great Easton has been subjected to two phases of investigation. The local fieldwork group has a long standing and on-going project which started with the formation of the group in 1982, which involves recording the archaeology of the three parishes of Great Easton, Bringhurst and Drayton (Great Easton & District Local History Society Fieldwork Group, Unpub.). The resulting report, which won the 1996 ‘Miss Linford Award’ organised by the Leicestershire Museums Fieldwork Group, unfortunately remains unpublished. This landscape fieldwork has since been supplemented by the visit of Channel 4’s ‘Time Team’ as part of the televised ‘Big Dig’ in 2003 (Priest & Cooper 2004). The ‘Big Dig’ sought to investigate the origins of the village of Great Easton through the excavation of 42 test-pits each of a metre square together with two machine-excavated trenches. This latter investigation provided a rare opportunity to carry out large-scale, intrusive (yet scattered) investigation within a village area.

The landscape survey by the Great Easton fieldwork group suggests that settlement sites typically are situated above the flood plain of the Welland Valley but close to a natural water supply. Interestingly, fieldwalking produced no evidence for settlement on higher ground (rising to 150m OD) and this area is still largely devoid of settlement.

Several assemblages of Anglo-Saxon pottery have been located, and such sites often have quantities of slag present as well, suggesting some form of relationship in terms of activity. On the outskirts of Great Easton Anglo-Saxon material was found in fields north-east and north-west of the village, while within the villages of Great Easton and Bringhurst, quantities of both Roman and Anglo-Saxon pottery have been recovered from the cemeteries lying close to their respective churches, suggesting settlement
within what was to become the village area. At Great Easton this area produced the largest assemblage of Roman material and it was in this area that the main concentration of early Anglo-Saxon material was found. This relationship would seem to have been confirmed by the Time Team ‘Big Dig’ (ibid., figs. 9, 10, 12).

Test-pitting confirmed the presence of the Roman settlement in the north-eastern part of the village around the church. This site may have developed from an Iron Age settlement, but examples of Anglo-Saxon pottery were recovered, thereby strengthening the notion of Roman settlement continuing into the Anglo-Saxon period of AD 450-650 (Priest & Cooper 2004, 1). Test-pitting further revealed a cobbled surface of the late Roman or early Anglo-Saxon period. Further evidence from the ‘Big Dig’ suggested that some form of 'settlement shift' occurred between the early Anglo-Saxon period and the Norman Conquest with a move away from the higher ground around the church to lower ground in the heart of the present village and closer to the brook that runs through it. Two significant concentrations of pottery were found - one of Roman material, the other Saxo-Norman. A further assemblage of pottery with material from the Roman period to the early medieval period was located to the south of the brook and south of the village outskirts (ibid., fig. 12). This could represent an element of dispersed settlement with continuity of occupation.
3.5.3 The Wreake Valley

The Wreake Valley Survey comprises a study of part of north-east Leicestershire between Leicester and the town of Melton Mowbray, along the course of the River Wreake (Fig: 3.16). This brings together fieldwork from the late 1980s and the 1990s that was carried out by the University of Leicester and the Leicestershire Museums Service. The projects involved a detailed fieldwalking survey of the parish of Barkby Thorpe and a series of archaeological assessments, largely through fieldwalking, of the Brooksby College estate (Fig. 3.17a & b below). This latter work was supplemented by an excavation field school at the hamlet and estate of Brooksby for undergraduate archaeology students also organised by the University of Leicester.

Both fieldwalking projects produced significant quantities of Roman material (pottery, brick and tile) across the survey areas. At Brooksby, only five of the 32 fields that were surveyed failed to produce any Roman material (Liddle & Knox 1991, 13) while at Barkby Thorpe most of the fields produced material at least at a density of around five sherds per hectare.

Fig. 3.16: The Wreake Valley
Fig. 3.17a: Brooksby Roman sites (top), 3.17b: Anglo-Saxon sites (bottom)
(Liddle & Knox 1997, fig. 13)
Early Anglo-Saxon Settlement in the East Midlands AD 450-850

Fig 3.18a: Barkby Thorpe Roman (top), 3.18b: Anglo-Saxon (bottom)
Crop-marks from aerial photographs indicated (University of Leicester)
In addition to this widespread presence of material, interpreted as being mainly attributable to manuring activity on pasture and reflecting a high level of exploitation of the land, Brooksby and Barkby Thorpe also produced sites with greater densities of material. At Brooksby three larger scatters of Roman material (A, B, C) were identified (Fig. 3.17a below), all of which stand on high ground: the two larger sites (A, B) being on a ridge above the 76m contour and overlooking the River Wreake, and the smaller site (C) standing further back from the river on a second ridge above the 91m contour. Sites A and B included sherds of Iron Age material which might suggest continuity of activity from the Iron Age into the Roman period. Significantly, the larger of the two sites (A) also produced a quantity of Anglo-Saxon material. One other scatter (D) lay on the western side of the survey area and south of the main road on the north bank of the stream.

Alongside the villa site at Hamilton in the Barkby Thorpe parish, there are two significant scatters of Roman material in field BT5 (south-west of Barkby Thorpe) and in BT31 immediately south of Barkby Thorpe (see Fig. 3.18a). The main scatters of tile, however, are in BT5 and BT17, as well as the neighbouring BT22. The distribution of Anglo-Saxon material, while being typically less dense, is similar to that of the Roman material, with the main sites being in BT5 and BT31 together with lesser concentrations to the south and west of Barkby Thorpe (3.18b). Anglo-Saxon material also was identified in BT22 (east of the villa site) and elsewhere to the east of Hamilton deserted medieval village (DMV).

3.5.4 Eye Kettleby

The site at Eye Kettleby lies in the Wreake Valley to the north-east of Leicester on the outskirts of the market town of Melton Mowbray. While the project was not a landscape survey, it did provide a unique opportunity with regard to the archaeology of Leicestershire, representing the first large-scale excavation of an Anglo-Saxon settlement in the county.

The surface geology of the area is typical of that of much of Leicestershire, being predominantly covered with superficial deposits of heavy boulder clay and surface patches of alluvium and of sand and gravel (Wilkinson 1996, 68). Absent from this area are the solid rock outcrops which elsewhere along the Wreake Valley were favoured for
settlement. As a result the areas of sand and gravel were favoured as places for the establishment of settlements. This is the case with the location of Eye Kettleby, as well as Sysonby which lies just to the north of the River Wreake, Melton Mowbray itself, and Burton Lazars to the south-east (ibid. 68, fig. 10).

In advance of an application for industrial development, the development site was fieldwalked in 1993 by the Archaeological Survey Team from Leicestershire Museums (Liddle & Knox 1993). As a result of this survey, a pottery scatter was identified which extended 500m from east to west and 150-200m southwards from the northern boundary as defined by the Leicester-Melton Mowbray railway line. The pottery scatter included 141 sherds of Anglo-Saxon material, of which five sherds were stamped and assigned to the late 5th century. Loomweight fragments were also recovered which reinforced the notion of this being a settlement site. Following further evaluation, excavation took place in 1996 and 1997 (Finn 1999). The results of this investigation demonstrate evidence for activity from the Mesolithic period up to the present day (Finn 1996, 1999 & forthcoming).

Plate 3.2: Excavation of post-built structure and over-lying sunken-feature building at Eye Kettleby, Leicestershire
The earliest signs of activity take the form of Mesolithic and early Neolithic flint material, Neolithic Grooved Ware pottery and 76 Bronze Age cremations, two ring ditches, and some structural features of the late Bronze Age or early Iron Age. Of the Roman period, no associated features were identified although a number of Roman artefacts were recovered.

In contrast, Anglo-Saxon features on the site account for 40% of the total number of features that were excavated. The remains of 45 identifiable structures were recorded comprising 20 post-built structures (PBSs) or halls, and 25 sunken-featured buildings (SFBs), or *Grubenhauser*, and, in addition to the occupation structures, a number of other features including hearths, pits and ditches were also excavated.

Taking into consideration the damage that has already been done to parts of the site due to gravel extraction and as a result of deep ploughing, the settlement appears to fall into two distinct sections. The central area still shows evidence of prehistoric activity, which would indicate that this area is genuinely devoid of concentrated Anglo-Saxon settlement. The western half comprises a greater number of PBSs (16) than SFBs (12). In the eastern half, there are 4 PBSs and 13 SFBs. In both cases the PBSs concentrate on the northern edge of the excavated area. This may indicate that settlement activity extends beyond the boundary of the site to the north. As yet, no records have been
found relating to the construction of the railway line in the mid-19th century that lies adjacent to the site, nor has it been possible to conduct further fieldwork in the field beyond the railway line to establish whether there is evidence for an Anglo-Saxon presence.

3.6 Discussion

It is representative of the varied nature of the archaeology of Anglo-Saxon activity and its survival that the distribution of Anglo-Saxon material across Leicestershire is far from even and this is as true for rural as for urban settings. Across the eastern half of the county there is a much greater incidence of Anglo-Saxon material than there is in the west. Similarly the nature of the finds varies, with the evidence from the eastern half of the county - most typically pot sherds - being more indicative of settlement activity, and finds from the west are more suggestive of isolated finds (or casual losses) together with much less evidence of settlement or burial activity.

It could be suggested that this distribution of Anglo-Saxon material in the eastern half of Leicestershire may be due to the directed emphasis of the fieldwork undertaken: a combination of the results of the fieldwork that has been conducted by the Melton Fieldworkers in the north-east of the county, the various projects along the Wreake Valley, and the extensive, concentrated work around Medbourne and the Langtons in the south-east. Therefore, when looked at across the whole county, there may be a bias built into the results, indicating more concentrated settlement in the east in comparison with the west; however, there are also active fieldwork groups in the west of the county.

Ground conditions too can have an impact on artefact preservation. Plough damage combined with exposure to the elements (rain, frost, wind) while lying on a field surface can be sufficient to break down hand-made pottery that is fired at low temperatures. Pottery of the Roman period was typically well made on an industrial scale by experienced potters and fired at high temperatures, producing a hard, robust pot; the firing process was conducted at significantly higher temperatures than those achieved with the hand-made, clamp kiln fired wares of the Anglo-Saxon period. In addition to this, the acidic nature of soils can serve to exacerbate the deterioration of ceramic material and this is particularly the case with the soils of the west of the county. However, this need not be confined to hand-made wares; the impact of this type of soil
can be just as great on some Roman material as it is on Anglo-Saxon material (R. Pollard, pers. comm.).

Comparisons can be made between the distribution of Roman sites across Leicestershire and Rutland and the similar distribution of Anglo-Saxon sites. The recording and plotting of these sites throughout the 20th century reflects the progress of archaeology and public involvement, and this can be seen for Roman Leicestershire and Rutland in 1907, 1972 and 2001 (Liddle 2004, 72, fig. 1) and for the Anglo-Saxon period in 1946, 1975 and 2002 (Knox 2004, 96, fig. 1). In the case of the Anglo-Saxon materials, distribution maps consistently reflect this east-west bias, with the majority of sites being located in the eastern half of the county. Sites do occur in the western half but these are more commonly described as ‘findspots’. There is a cluster of sites which could represent associated settlement in the extreme north-west tip in the Trent valley (and again on the fringe of Domesday woodland), comprising two settlement sites and two inhumation cemetery sites, and elsewhere in the west there are isolated sites that are recorded as ‘occupation sites’.

A case in point relating to the sporadic nature of the occurrence of Anglo-Saxon finds from field-walking is the work of the Lutterworth Fieldwork Group in south Leicestershire. Over a 20 year period, since their formation in 1981, despite the group’s acknowledged success at locating lithic material and other artefacts, minimal Anglo-Saxon material had been found in their area. It was only in 2000 that they located an Anglo-Saxon site to the south of Lutterworth, and recovered more sherds from two fields during that short period than they had previously done in 20 years (Burningham 2004, 11).

Some areas of the county demonstrate greater evidence of what can be interpreted as settlement activity, while other areas clearly show stronger signs of burial or cremation activity. Only in a few places can it be suggested that the settlement activity and burial activity relate to each other. In the south-east of the county it seems unlikely that fieldwalking should reveal such a concentrated area of settlement activity without identifying associated burial sites. This is particularly the case given the fact that this area, extending from Stoughton through the Langtons to Medbourne and beyond to Great Easton and Bringhamst, has been subjected to such a systematic programme of intensive fieldwalking. With this in mind, one can highlight the relationship of the
settlement sites in this area to the suggested extent of the ancient woodland. Across the rest of the county, Anglo-Saxon settlement respects what has been suggested as being the extent of the woodland, possibly encroaching on the woodland fringes, but not extending into the more densely wooded areas.

The reason behind the concentration of settlement in south-east Leicestershire as opposed to a more dispersed settlement pattern elsewhere in the county may relate to the underlying geology. Links can be identified between this area of the southern part of Leighfield Forest and the neighbouring Rockingham Forest in Northamptonshire. Many scatters of pottery, interpreted as evidence of settlement, occur in close proximity to slag from iron working, although it has been noted that the slag has a tendency to occur amongst the less dense scatters around occupation sites (Knox 2004, 100) presumably denoting a preventative step to avoid the spread of fire from industrial areas to residential areas. As yet, no excavation has been carried out on any of these sites to clarify the relationship between iron working and settlement.

In light of this putative relationship between settlement and industrial activity, and the apparent density of settlement, the next point to be considered is the location of burial sites.

Medbourne, which lies at the heart of this industrial area, has produced material from the Iron Age through to the Anglo-Saxon period. This includes both early Anglo-Saxon material and inhumations. In the Roman period this was a small town site of not insignificant size (60 acres) which lay on the route of the Gartree Road to the west of Medbourne. However, excavation does not suggest a settlement of any great status, with the exception of a possible villa or high status building which lies in the valley of the Medbourne Brook, beneath the present village. Of the Roman site, excavated evidence suggests a largely low status settlement of stone and timber structures with iron working hearths, wells and ditched enclosures. The lack of any higher status structures would support the ideas of a working or ‘industrial’ character to the town. This scenario of the town being a location where the population did not settle on a permanent basis may be reinforced by the relative lack of associated burial sites within the area.

The intensive fieldwalking programme which has been conducted over the past 25 years in the area around Medbourne, extending westwards to the Langton villages and to
Bringhurst and Great Easton in the east has revealed a significant number of Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlement sites. What is conspicuous by its absence from the fieldwalking data is burial evidence. No burials of the Roman period have been recorded (Liddle 2004b, 79, fig. 19) and only three sites from the Anglo-Saxon period – one at Medbourne and two sites near Church Langton, some 5km to the west. While it is possible that despite the intensity of the fieldwalking programme burial sites have been missed, other possibilities could exist, such as robbing out or plough damage.

The accepted methods of disposal of the dead from the first half of the first millennium AD include cremation and inhumation, but it is also conceivable that other methods may have existed which left no trace in the archaeological record.

An alternative suggestion is that the nature of the settlement in this area of Leicestershire was not of a permanent nature, and was a seasonal activity of iron extraction or the manufacture of charcoal. This form of transhumance, the seasonal movement of people (but in this case without livestock), would have the effect of leaving evidence in the landscape which can be interpreted as ‘settlement’, but without other signs of permanent settlement - for example the disposal of the dead from what would appear to have been a sizeable resident population.

The combination of these two characteristics of settlement in the south-east of the county may suggest that the actual settlement activity was of an identifiably different character and possibly reflected an alternative form of use or exploitation of the land.
CHAPTER 4

Anglo-Saxon Rutland

'At present only three burial sites are known that must have been close to habitations of the newcomers who were destined to change the name of Britain'
(Rutland Victoria County History 1908, 95-96)

4.1 Introduction

The small county of Rutland lies on the eastern side of Leicestershire, with Northamptonshire to the south with the border formed by the River Welland. To the east lies the low-lying fenland of Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire. Having been administered by Leicestershire since the 1974 Local Government Reorganisation, Rutland has regained the status of a single unitary authority although some services are still provided by neighbouring Leicestershire County Council, of which the Museums Service including the HER/SMR is one.

The area of Rutland comprises the county boundaries that are in use at present. The county town is Oakham, situated on the A606/A6003, which leads northwards from Kettering in Northamptonshire to Melton Mowbray (Leics.) and on to Nottingham. Uppingham, the next largest town in the county, lies some 10km to the south of Oakham on the main A47 Leicester to Peterborough road at its crossing point with the A606/A6003. Major urban influences on the county are the surrounding cities of Leicester, Nottingham and Peterborough, the county town of Northampton, and the market towns of Melton Mowbray and Stamford. Rutland’s size enables a close detailed study of a self-contained geographical area which demonstrates significant variety of geology and topography. Rutland was, for a number of years, part of Leicestershire, administered by Leicestershire County Council. During this time, the Leicestershire Museums Archaeological Fieldwork Group developed its fieldwalking programme and this spread to Rutland. While there are a number of individual Roman and Anglo-Saxon sites recorded on the HER/SMR which will be considered as part of a general overview of Rutland’s archaeology, in this chapter particular attention will be given to two specific areas:
What appears particularly apparent with settlement in Rutland is how the natural environment has a greater impact on the population distribution, with the geology and the topography of the landscape contributing most to this process. As will be described below, much of the western and southern boundaries of the county are defined by watercourses, while the same area also is recorded as being wooded at the time of Domesday, as is the central northern part of the county. The southern woodland can probably be regarded as an extension of the wooded area of Rockingham Forest to the south of the River Welland.

**4.1.1 Geology and Topography**

The geology of Rutland is slightly more varied than neighbouring Leicestershire, but is dominated by clays - the boulder clays of the Middle and Upper Lias of the Jurassic. Its southern half features a number of patches of glacial and valley gravels, while within the northern part there occurs an area of Marlestone. Separating the west of the county from the east are sporadic areas of Northampton sands. The east of the county again includes patches of clays, however, the dominant geology here is the limestone of the
Jurassic. The southern boundary of Rutland is formed by the course of the river Welland with its associated alluvial deposits (See also section 4.6). Alluvium, as a geological feature, could be influential in the location of settlements. Occurring as a fine, black silty loam, it is recognised for its fertility in terms of crop growth and especially in conjunction with grazing lands for livestock. Accordingly, the location of settlements close to such an area would be a likely choice.

Fig. 4.2: Rutland drift geology

Surface outcrops of rock are of the Jurassic and Pleistocene periods and these contribute strongly to the character of the Rutland soils (Fig. 4.2). Western Rutland is predominantly covered with clays of the upper Lias and patches of Pleistocene boulder clay that are also common across eastern Leicestershire. The other dominant features of the western half of Rutland are the patches of Northampton Sand Ironstone, especially around Uppingham on an east-west axis and, in a lesser concentration, extending through Cottesmore and Glaston on a north-south axis. The town of Oakham is located on an outcrop of Marlstone Rock and similar outcrops extend north from the Vale of Catmose.

To the east lie the Jurassic rocks of the Lias and lower Oolitic groups which incline downwards in an easterly direction where they pass under the higher Jurassic beds of the fens. As the landscape falls away to the east, boulder clay diminishes and the Lincolnshire Limestone becomes dominant as far as a line from Wansford to Uffington. Beyond lie the fenland gravels, preceded by significant patches of Pleistocene sand and gravel in close association with Jurassic Oxford Clay and Kellaways Sand and Clay.
The solid geology of Rutland contrasts with that of neighbouring Leicestershire by being predominantly of younger deposits of ironstone and clay in the west and limestone in the east. These deposits extend up into the Vale of Belvoir in north-east Leicestershire.

The Rutland landscape forms the undulating uplands that lie between the rolling hills and clay soils of Leicestershire to the west and the low-lying fenland plain of Lincolnshire and Cambridgeshire to the east; at its highest point in the west, the landscape of Rutland rises to approximately 200m above sea level around Barleythorpe and Knossington on the border with Leicestershire, while in the extreme east of the county around Ryhall and Essendine it is only 15-30m OD, with the average elevation being c.100m OD (Fig. 4.3).
Oakham, the county town of Rutland, lies in the Vale of Catmose at the west end of the northern arm of Rutland Water, a reservoir created in the mid-1970s, while Uppingham, the other major county town, lies some 10km south of Oakham.

4.1.2 Watercourses

Probably the best-known watercourse in this area of the east Midlands is the River Welland, which forms much of the southern boundary of both Leicestershire and Rutland with Northamptonshire. The Welland flows in a north-easterly direction to Stamford before taking a route across the fens to the Wash, and in the Middle Ages this latter stretch was navigable (Jones 2000, fig 1), facilitating the export of wool and contributing to the growth of Stamford. In turn, this may help to explain why Rutland in general appears to present more of an easterly bias in its outlook, rather than having closer links with the major multi-period centre of Leicester to the west.

Fig. 4.4: Main watercourses
The two main watercourses of Rutland, the rivers Chater and Gwash, follow the topography of the landscape, rising in the higher ground in the west of the county. The Chater is the more southerly of the two and has its origins in 'High' Leicestershire near Tilton-on-the-Hill and Marefield; from there, it passes between Oakham in the north and Uppingham in the south before joining the Welland at Tinwell, 3km to the west of Stamford. The Gwash has its origins in two tributaries that rise at Braunston and at Oakham; these join some 7km to the east of Oakham before circling to the north of Stamford and merging with the Welland 2km east of Stamford.

South west of Uppingham, the Eye Brook, which also rises near Tilton-on-the-Hill, forms the Leicestershire-Rutland county boundary and flows in a southerly direction between the villages of Belton (Rutland) and Allexton (Leics.), Wardley, Stockerston and Stoke Dry. Wardley occupies an area of clay adjacent to a patch of sand and gravel while the latter two settlements lie on areas of boulder clay overlooking the brook. The Eye Brook flows into the River Welland between the villages of Caldecott (Rutland) and Gretton (Northants.).

### 4.1.3 Woodland

The earliest available record of the extent of the ancient woodland of the county of Rutland is in Domesday Book (Terrett 1971, 377-8), which can be read in conjunction with forest perambulations of the 13th century (Cantor 1980, 15). These documents present a picture of a county which, in the late 11th century, was quite densely wooded. In the early 12th century this area was formally designated a Royal Forest by Henry I (ibid., 14). Leighfield Forest to the west crossed into the claylands of High Leicestershire and to the south lay Rockingham Forest which appears to have straddled the course of the River Welland. South-west Lincolnshire too was wooded at the time of the Domesday survey with this area spreading into the northern half of Rutland. The density of the woodland, however, is hard to determine. By the mid-13th century, probably as a result of deforestation due to urban and rural settlement growth, Rutland was forested only across parts of its southern half as is shown by a later but undated perambulation, published in 1684 and reprinted in the Rutland Victoria County History 1908, 257 (ibid., 15). By the 15th century the forested area had become confined to the south-western corner in the form of Leighfield Forest.
While these descriptions may seem imprecise, recent surveys of replanted 'ancient' woodland and ancient and semi-natural woodland conducted by the Woodland Trust suggest that these distributions are largely correct (www.woodland-trust.org.uk/campaigns/eastmids/emidsribs.pdf).

4.2 The Roman Influence

For Rutland there are approximately 163 entries now recorded on the county HER/SMR for the Roman period. The significant area of Roman settlement is the eastern half of the county along a broad corridor centred on the route of Ermine Street which enters Rutland in the south-east near Stamford and exits on the north side near a small town site at Thistleton. Near Greetham the road forks with Sewestern Lane branching off and continuing in a north-westerly direction while Ermine Street adopts a more northerly route (Margary 1973, 190, 223).
Table 4.1: Rutland Roman small towns

There are two recognised ‘small town’ sites (see Table 4.1): one, Great Casterton, is a walled town lying on the Ermine Street (Burnham & Wacher 1990, 130-5). Excavation here points to the establishment of a military fort in the mid-first century AD followed by the growth of a walled *vicus* and the presence of a nearby villa (Corder 1951, 1954, 1961). Further investigation has shown evidence of Anglo-Saxons in a nearby cemetery and in close proximity to Romano-British burials (see Section 4.5.1 below, and Granger & Mahany 1985). The second ‘small town’ lies between Thistleton and Market Overton, and straddles Sewestern Lane to the west of Ermine Street. Excavation in the 1950s revealed considerable evidence for use in the Iron Age and Roman period, notably in terms of iron smelting (Liddle 2004, 66). It may also be significant that a substantial quantity of Anglo-Saxon burials lay in the immediate vicinity at Market Overton (Crowther-Beynon 1908, 218-9 and 1909, 129-136, 186-190).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Roman name</th>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Defences</th>
<th>Anglo-Saxon presence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Casterton</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Ermine Street</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistleton/Market Overton</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 4.6: Villa sites in Roman Rutland*
More widely, villas and farmsteads are located mainly around the edge of present-day Rutland, in three main groups (see Fig. 4.6 above; Appendix 2):

1. Around Stamford a group of sites lies on either side of the Ermine Street along the Welland Valley.

2. In the middle part of the county a cluster of sites was identified in the course of survey and excavation in advance of the construction of the dam wall of Empingham Reservoir/Rutland Water.

3. On the northern boundary, further villa sites were identified around Thistleton and Market Overton.

Two more isolated villa sites are at Clipsham near to Ermine Street in the east and at Whissendine to the west in the Vale of Belvoir.

### 4.3 Anglo-Saxon Burial Sites

The *Victoria County History* (Page 1908, 95) recorded only three Anglo-Saxon sites in Rutland - Market Overton and Cottesmore in the north of the county, and North Luffenham in the south-east, all of which were identified as burials all cemetery/burials. By the time of Audrey Meaney's *Gazetteer of Early Anglo-Saxon Burial Sites* (Meaney 1964), the figure had risen to seven burial sites, whereas now the HER/SMR for Rutland lists 11 cemeteries or burial sites (Fig. 4.7 below; Appendix 4). All but one of the burial sites, lie within or on the fringes of areas of the county that have been identified as being ancient woodland and which were probably wooded at the time of the Domesday Survey. The one exception is the high status burial site at North Luffenham (Crowther-Beynon 1904, 87, 116, 152), consisting of mixed burials and occupying an exposed, highly visible position on a plateau above the valleys of the rivers Chater and Gwash, close to the 100m contour.

Apart from the most southerly burial/cemetery sites at Glaston (Leeds & Barber 1950) and Seaton, a close correlation exists between the location of Anglo-Saxon burials in Rutland and the location of Roman settlement sites - for example at Empingham Roman villa (Cooper 2000a, 20-22), Great Casterton small town (Granger & Mahany 1985), and at Market Overton, where two large cemeteries - Market Overton I and II - were found in the course of survey and excavation around the Roman industrial 'small-town'
at Thistleton in the early 20th century (Crowther-Beynon 1910). These cemeteries are not of the same status of the North Luffenham burials, but they did provide a significant number of brooches. The lack of associated Anglo-Saxon settlement evidence may be significant in the interpretation of the use of the contemporary landscape. This relationship of burial to settlement is not a correlation that appears to exist in relation to the location of Anglo-Saxon burial sites and Anglo-Saxon settlements as recorded on the HER/SMR. A similar relationship of Roman villa sites to Anglo-Saxon burials has been noted elsewhere as in Wiltshire and in Kent (Hawkes 1982, 74).

An exception is the area around Empingham (Cooper 2000, 2; fig. 2) where there is a concentrated cluster of sites of Iron Age, Roman and Anglo-Saxon date, all in close proximity. These comprise the Empingham II Anglo-Saxon cemetery of the early 5th to 7th centuries (Timby 1996) and Anglo-Saxon settlements either side of Sykes Lane (late 5th to 6th centuries), the more southerly of which coincides with a settlement of the Iron Age.
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Age (Cooper 2000b, 48-49); on the other side of the River Gwash is another settlement and cemetery site of the late 5th to 6th century, which lies very close to a Roman farmstead (Liddle et al. 2000, 24-45).

4.4 Anglo-Saxon Settlement

As discussed above, the archaeology of the Rutland area has experienced considerable advances since the publication of the *Victoria County History*, when only three known Anglo-Saxon sites had been recorded (Page 1908, 96) - all cemeteries. The impact of archaeology in the 20th century, and in particular the start of fieldwalking in the 1970s had the result that by 2000, the HER/SMR listed almost 50 entries relating to the Anglo-Saxon period, including 11 cemeteries or burial sites.

The distribution of Anglo-Saxon settlement sites in Rutland appears to follow two main lines (Fig. 4.8 and see also Appendix 5):

1. A north-south route from Oakham to Uppingham.
2. An east-west route from Stamford/Great Casterton to Oakham.

![Fig. 4.8: Anglo-Saxon Rutland (i)](image)

Alternatively these can be seen as comprising four loose geographical groups (Fig. 4.9 below):

---
1. Around Oakham in the north-west.
2. At Empingham.
3. In the east, to the north of Stamford, around Great Casterton.
4. In the south, around Uppingham.

What emerges from their location is that, when plotted against the extent of the woodland as recorded in Domesday Book (Terrett 1971, 378), Anglo-Saxon settlement sites appear to be situated on the woodland fringes.

The majority of these sites derive from pottery scatters, however there is limited evidence for structures: this comprises three Grubenhäuser at Empingham (Clough et al. 1975, 80) - the only site where contemporary settlement and cemetery evidence exists in such close proximity (Cooper 2000c, 150) - and two seriously truncated Grubenhäuser at Tickencote, (Sharman & Mackie 1991, 98; Buckley 2000, 53-54) (Fig. 4.8 above) and at South Street, Oakham (Jones 1995, 118), both of which produced Anglo-Saxon hand-made pottery.
4.5 Case Studies

4.5.1 Great Casterton: the mixed burials

Introduction

The report on the Roman and Anglo-Saxon burials which were excavated at Great Casterton on the Rutland/Lincolnshire border in 1966 was written by Guy Grainger and Christine Mahany; although parts were written in about 1985, as yet, it remains unpublished. A copy of the report has been deposited with Leicestershire County Council HER/SMR where it was made available for inspection by the author. The report includes a section on the Anglo-Saxon pottery written by Helena Hamerow.

The burials came to light in the course of road-widening works carried out along the northern side of Ryhall Road which runs on an approximately east-west axis across the north side of the walled Roman town. An emergency excavation revealed some 79 burials cut into the bank of the town defences; in addition, a Roman pottery kiln was excavated.
Background

Great Casterton comprises a Roman military fort that has been dated to the period AD 50-80. Excavations at Great Casterton were previously carried out by the University of Nottingham in the 1940s and 1950s (Fig. 4.11).

Fig. 4.11: Plan of Roman Great Casterton
(Courtesy of Stamford Museum)
To the south west of the fort lay an extra-mural settlement which in time became urban in character. The defences of the town were reorganised in the mid-4th century, post-AD 354 but before AD 370, and coins found on the site indicate that activity continued within the walled area up to at least AD 394.

To the north east of the town, about 800 meters distant, was a suburban villa. On the evidence of coins, this included a barn dated to c.AD 290 and 310, which remained in use until between AD 350 and 365. The villa, with bath house, was built at about the same time as the barn appears to have gone out of use and was enlarged between AD 370 and 380. Whilst it is stated that the villa was occupied up to the end of the 4th century, evidence of extensive repairs was also noted. The villa was destroyed by fire some time after AD 388 although parts of it remained in use for storage. This implies that settlement continued in the immediate vicinity despite the fire damage. A corn-drying oven was subsequently constructed in the ruins of the villa which should imply activity continuing into the 5th century.

Prior to the 1966 excavations, two other sets of burials had been discovered at Great Casterton. The bodies, located close to the 1966 site, were described as being “very densely packed in rows, some with coins”. It is unclear whether these were Roman or Anglo-Saxon, but they were situated some 30m to the north of the main group of Anglo-Saxon burials and 50m to the north east of the Roman burials. A second group was discovered in 1959, c.40m north of the north gate of the Roman town and 50m to the south west of the 1966 Roman burials. Comprising numerous burials in rows, the bodies were aligned with their feet to the east, some being simple interments, others being stone slab-lined. No grave goods were present and a suggested 3rd or 4th century chronology was proposed. What arises from both of the above is whether they are discrete burial sites or are parts of a single larger cemetery.

**The 1966 Burials**

In 1966 further burials came to light in the course of road works made close to the ditch defences of the Roman town beyond the north gate. These lay about 100m distant and 50m from the Roman burials discovered in 1959. On examination, they were assigned to three groups:
• Group I: late Roman inhumations
• Group II: Anglo-Saxon cremations
• Group III: Anglo-Saxon inhumations

Numerically, Group I comprised 29 inhumations, of which only five were listed as being definitely Roman. The Anglo-Saxon burials were more positively categorised with Group II consisting of 35 cremations, of which all but one were identified as being “definitely” Anglo-Saxon, and the Group III inhumations which totalled 15 in number of which ten were “undoubtedly” Anglo-Saxon. Where there was a degree of doubt over the interpretation of the burial, the body was assigned firstly on the basis of proximity to other burials and secondly whether they were fully extended and supine (therefore Roman) or flexed (Anglo-Saxon). These criteria seem somewhat haphazard and probably reflect the nature of the project, the urgency of the excavation and the lack of artefacts for dating purposes.

In terms of stratigraphy and disturbance, the following was noted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents disturbed</th>
<th>Disturbed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I burials</td>
<td>Later Group I burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II burials</td>
<td>Group III burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III burials</td>
<td>Later Group III burials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.2: Great Casterton Burials: stratigraphy*

Whilst it was not easy to give a breakdown of the population - presumably due to the state of preservation - where identification of sex was possible, Group I included 15 female and ten male burials. Twenty-one burials were aged 15 or over and two were aged 6-7 years. The comment was made that a greater number of younger children might be expected to be present suggesting that this does comprise part of a larger burial group, possibly members of family groups.

Of the Anglo-Saxon burials from Group II, of eleven that were examined, six were adults, two adolescents or young adults, one an adolescent and one an infant. The Group III inhumations included four adult males, four adult females and five children. This was a small sample but certainly not atypical: the low number of infants is not
unusual compared to other cemeteries of the period (Lucy 2005a, 44), and these more readily resemble family groups.

Finds

Finds appear to have been limited, amounting to a blade fragment, two knives, a spearhead and two wrist clasps. Unstratified finds included a Roman brooch, a copper alloy cruciform brooch with enamel insert (Åberg/Leeds IVb), and two spearheads (Swanton type E2 and type C2 or C3). The wrist clasps are said to go out of fashion at the end of the ‘Migration Period’ (c. AD 560-570), while the type IVb brooch can be dated to the period AD 525-575; however, as an example in an ‘advanced stage of development’, suggesting a date of manufacture from the latter part of the period; as it was also well worn and damaged, which is perhaps indicative of a long period of use, and a later 6th or 7th century burial.

Eleven examples of the pottery recovered from the burials at Great Casterton have been published (Myres 1977) (see Table 4.3 and Fig. 4.12 below). Myres argued that at Great Casterton these were examples of late Roman wheel-made pottery decorated in ways that appear to indicate a level of Germanic influence, possibly the adoption of Germanic fashion in style or design (Myres 1969, 66). The initial distribution of these ‘Romano-Saxon’ wares of the later 4th century appeared to be concentrated on eastern coastal regions in and around the sites of the Saxon Shore forts, which, in turn, suggested that they were themselves subject to a degree of Germanic influence or even occupation. Other examples of ‘Romano-Saxon’ wares were identified down the eastern side of England, with a pattern of distribution that correlated to that of the early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries. It is now suggested that the distribution of these 4th century ‘Romano-Saxon’ wares actually relates to Roman pottery production centres and that rather than being Romano-British in fabric, designed to appeal to Anglo-Saxon taste, they should be regarded as being standard late Roman provincial wares with no other links (Gillam 1979). The Anglo-Saxon decorative styles that were identified—supposedly a common feature—can actually be dated to the late 5th and 6th centuries and are thus too late to have been an influence on 4th century production (Esmonde Cleary 2000, 191).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawing</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4004</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Biconical urn, wide mouth, hollow neck, short everted rim. Fabric: friable, sandy black, burnished. Decorated.</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>C.5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4005 GC2</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Bosshed biconical urn, rim missing. Fabric: hard, coarse and black. Decorated.</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>C.5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tall sub-biconical urn, narrow mouth, short upright rim, base missing. Fabric: hard and black. Decorated.</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>C.5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4007 GC66.6</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>Shouldered urn, everted rim. Fabric: hard, coarse, black. Decorated. Similar to vessel from North Elmham (Norfolk).</td>
<td>C.5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-6th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4009 GC8</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>Bosshed sub-biconical urn, rounded base, rim missing. Fabric: friable, gritty, black. Decorated. Stamped.</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>C.5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010 GC66.9a</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>Bosshed biconical urn, missing base and rim. Fabric: smoothed, fine, soft, brown, pitted. Decorated. Stamped.</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>eC.5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4011 16, 17</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>Biconical urn, wide mouth, everted rim, body and base missing. Fabric: smooth soft, soapy brown/black. Burnished lines, decorated. Stamped.</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>C.5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/e 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4012 GC20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Biconical bowl, wide mouth, everted rim (cut down?). Fabric: coarse red-brown/black.</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>C.5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4013 GC16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Straight-sided cup, everted rim. Fabric: friable, sandy, brown.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4014 GC66.15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Small sub-biconical urn, everted rim. Fabric: rough, dark grey, burnished.</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>C.5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4015 GC17b</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Hemispherical bowl, inturned rim. Fabric: not recorded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Great Casterton Anglo-Saxon pottery from the 1966 burials
Figure in bold is drawing number from Myres (1977), figure below is museum reference.
Fig. 4.12: Anglo-Saxon pottery from Great Casterton (Myres 1977)
Myres draws similarities between the setting of the mixed burials at Great Casterton and the cemetery at Thurmaston, near Leicester. Two other sites are also comparable, namely those at Heworth, on the outskirts of York, and Girton near Cambridge. The cremation urns are similar to those from Thurmaston (Leics.), which are consistent with accompanying metalwork styles and datable to the first half of the 6th century. Two urns are possibly of 5th century date.

**Dating**

The dating of the burials is acknowledged as being both loose and imprecise (Granger & Mahany 1985). For the Group I Roman burials, a span of approximately 60 years has been proposed being at the earliest AD 360-425. Clearly these extend into the 5th century, but the unanswered question is for how long; a period of AD 400-460 is a possibility, and both of these spans are interesting in relation to the arrival of any Anglo-Saxon groups.

The Group II cremations seem to belong to the first half of the 6th century, although two of them (cremations 1 & 2) may date to the 5th century - thus giving a possible range is AD 475-550. The Group III inhumations can be dated to after AD 500, post-dating the cremations of Group II. On the basis of the wrist clasps and the brooch, a period in the late 6th century may be likely.

**4.5.2 Empingham**

The details of the cemeteries and sites around Empingham have been fully covered (Timby 1996; Cooper 2000) (see also Fig. 4.13 below). The excavations in this area were carried out in the late 1960s and early 1970s during the construction of Empingham Reservoir, later re-named Rutland Water. A series of sites was identified which included Iron Age settlement, a Roman farmstead, villa and burials, and Anglo-Saxon settlement and cemetery sites. The proximity of these sites to each other is interesting as is the incidence of cross-period use. From the dating of material there is a strong suggestion that the Anglo-Saxon settlement at Sykes Lane, to the west of the area, relates to the 'Empingham II' cemetery, both being of the 5th-6th century (Timby 1996, 97; Cooper 2000b, 49). This dating compares with the material from the 'Empingham I' settlement and cemetery on the south side of the River Gwash (Liddle et al. 2000, 24). The relationship of this site with the nearby Romano-British farmstead is
unclear; however, 4th century Roman pottery was recovered from the ‘Empingham I’ site, while some early Anglo-Saxon material was found on the Roman site; none of this material was securely stratified (Cooper 2000, 5) and with no identifiable features being present this may merely relate to waste disposal.

The Roman villa site lies on the north side of the Gwash valley, on a south-facing slope and in close proximity to two areas of Roman burials (ibid., 17-22). The villa itself is of a rectangular, aisled plan and has been dated to the late 3rd or mid-4th century. In the Middle Anglo-Saxon period the burial of four individuals took place within the walls of the villa with a fifth body being buried on the south side adjacent to the well. With the exception of Burial 5, no grave goods were present; a number of items were associated with Burial 5, most of which subsequently went missing with the exception of a copper alloy pin, which has been dated to the late pagan or early Christian period of the mid-7th century or later (Fraser 2000, 107).

Fig. 4.13: The Empingham/Rutland Water landscape

4.6 Discussion

The reasons behind the establishment of settlements tend to concentrate on two questions: first, who settled there and, second, why? In seeking to provide the answers to these questions, clearly the geography is important (Finberg 1998, 24). Factors such
as the nature of the soil - heavy, waterlogged clay or light and easily worked soil -, basic access to water sources, the layout of the road/track network and whether the water courses are navigable, all contribute to the decision-making process in establishing settlements. The relationship between the surface geology of an area and the settlement pattern that develops within it is also worthy of consideration, particularly in an area where an established road network and navigable rivers appear to be lacking. Why does much settlement appear to occur on gravel outcrops?

With regard to human settlement, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon period, deposits of glacial sand and gravel feature significantly in relation to the choice of location. Such deposits are largely associated with boulder clay and often include reddish sand. In the western half of Rutland, geologically there are few significant patches of glacial sand and gravel, but such deposits do occur in four main locations:

- A 2km patch near to Stoke Dry on a hill slope, to the south of Uppingham
- Near to Belton, north of Oakham, there are five isolated patches on Upper Lias
- To the south of Oakham on Brook Mill Ridge there are four small patches overlying the boulder clay
- Near to Holywell (Lincs.) there are several patches, some of which lie in Rutland

With particular regard to the area of Brook Mill Ridge, two of the noted four small patches of gravel referred to above, were certainly the subject of Anglo-Saxon settlement in the form of Gunthorpe and Martinsthorpe, both of which are now deserted medieval villages, and a third is followed for its length by the road/track from Egleton to Brooke and Braunston. Given this apparent close relationship between the location of settlements and patches of gravel, it is tempting to suggest that this area too may have at one time been the location for a settlement, either Roman or Anglo-Saxon, and hence provided the reason for the route followed by the road/track along the gravel.

There are further small areas of post-glacial gravel deposits, which tend to concentrate along the courses of rivers, for example the Chater and the Gwash, and in particular the Welland near Thorpe Mill, Caldecott and Easton Mill and the Eye Brook from Stockerston to Caldecott. Similar deposits occur on one area of high ground close to Tilton on the Hill in the west of the county; a similar relationship with nucleated
settlement sites on elevated sites of gravel deposits can be seen in the eastern half of Leicestershire, as at Houghton-on-the-Hill.

The lack of significant patches of sand and gravel clearly did not and does not limit the spread of settlement across Rutland. In its absence, settlement appears to concentrate on outcrops of the Northampton Sand Ironstone and the Marlestone Rock. For example, to the south of the River Chater, the present day market town of Uppingham and the villages of Ayston, Ridlington, Preston, Morcott and Wing all lie on Northampton Sand Ironstone, while Bisbrooke, Glaston, Pilton, South Luffenham, Seaton and Barrowden lie on the initial outcrops of Lincolnshire Limestone. North of the Chater, a similar pattern can be identified. Oakham, Barleythorpe, Langham and Ashwell all occupy outcrops of Marlestone Rock (that on which Oakham is situated being the largest), as does Braunston. The north-south alignment of Northampton Sand Ironstone outcrops may have been a similar attraction for the location of settlements at Manton, Upper Hambleton, Burley, Cottesmore and Barrow. Two other villages, Empingham and Exton, both occupy sites on Lincolnshire Limestone; this may also be true of the initial siting of Langham, the growth of which actually follows the line of an outcrop of Lincolnshire Limestone.

Surface geology similarly plays a role, not only in the initial location of settlements, but also in their subsequent growth and thus in determining the routes that roads would follow. The villages of Greetham and Langham lie on narrow spits of Northamptonshire Ironstone and Lincolnshire Limestone respectively and both have expanded in similar elongated forms. Oakham and Braunston occupy more rounded areas of Marlestone Rock and have developed in a similarly shaped form, while Uppingham, which sits on an area of east-west aligned Northamptonshire Ironstone, has followed that alignment and appears to respect the boundary of clay to the south as the limit of its expansion in that particular direction.

The distribution of Anglo-Saxon cemetery and burial sites in this county is significantly different to that of the settlement sites. Two main areas can be seen:

1. East of the county around Great Casterton, to the east of Ermine Street or within the wooded area around Ryhall.
2. A band running north-south from Market Overton through the wooded area to Empingham and down to Seaton.

Only at two of these do settlement sites recorded on the HER/SMR and burials occur in the same location: Empingham (Cooper 2000), and Seaton. Elsewhere there is a closer relationship between Anglo-Saxon burial sites and Roman occupation sites. A prime example of this is in the north of the county around the Roman ‘small-town’ at Thistleton. Archaeological excavations at Thistleton, together with its three nearby villa sites, started in the 1950s under the direction of Ernest Greenfield, although Camden (1586) and William Stukeley (1733) had both noted it as a site of interest, and some investigation was undertaken into the Roman site in the latter part of the 19th century. While Greenfield’s excavation report is in preparation (Taylor et al., forthcoming), what can be deduced from the available material is that the excavations produced little or no identifiable material from the Anglo-Saxon period. On this basis, the Thistleton site appears to represent a Roman settlement with no evidence of continuity beyond the Roman period.

Yet a study of the evidence for Anglo-Saxon activity around Thistleton and neighbouring Market Overton reveals how Market Overton has two Anglo-Saxon cemetery sites (Market Overton I & II – both found in the early 20th century), one an inhumation cemetery, the other of mixed burials. What has not been identified to date is the location of a related Anglo-Saxon settlement. Two possibilities exist:

1. The ‘small-town’ at Thistleton continued to act as a settlement beyond the end of the Roman period, as may be the case at Great Casterton, with the occupants leaving little or no trace of their own Anglo-Saxon material culture, other than the burials nearby.

2. The village of Market Overton overlies the relevant Anglo-Saxon settlement.

To support the latter proposal, there are a number of examples in Northamptonshire of early Anglo-Saxon material (namely pottery) being found within village contexts and recent excavations at Great Easton as part of the televised Time Team ‘Big Dig’ produced similar findings (Priest & Cooper 2004).

In contrast to the burial sites, Anglo-Saxon settlements in Rutland are almost exclusively situated in the middle of the county along the valleys of the rivers Chater
and Gwash, and lie on the woodland fringes when plotted in relation to the Domesday woodland. This suggests that it was the combination of flowing water and the environment of the woodland fringe, as opposed to the denser forest, that was key in terms of settlement, providing materials for fire and for house construction, water and suitable land for the grazing of livestock and arable cultivation. The settlement distribution would indicate that the larger tracts of woodland were in fact barriers to settlement rather than being an attraction. The one area of woodland where settlement does occur is the narrow ‘neck’ between Leighfield Forest to the south-west of Oakham and the woodland in central north Rutland which extends into Lincolnshire. The presence of settlements in this area and extending into Langham in the Vale of Catmose may be indicative of a communication route to the north-west of Oakham in the direction of Melton Mowbray and the Wreake Valley.

The next issue then relates to the local populations – Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon – with regard to their presence and visibility; possibly the key factor in Rutland is the limited quantity of the data available. As suggested by Cooper (2000, 150), if the bottom tiers of the Romano-British population remained in situ, they may themselves have formed some of the occupants of the post-Roman/Anglo-Saxon period cemeteries. At present there are insufficient data to be able to pursue this issue however, a programme of isotope analysis (strontium and oxygen) which involved the study of the skeletal remains of the Empingham II cemetery indicated that this was a mainly local population with no immigrant component (Tatham 2004, 236). As a word of caution with regard to this study, it should be noted that second generation immigrants who were raised locally would be indistinguishable from the true local population and therefore to identify first generation immigrants it is necessary to locate the cemeteries in which they, themselves were buried (ibid., 235)

Overall, Rutland, for a relatively small area with seemingly few Anglo-Saxon sites, is well served by the quality of the material available for study. The Empingham area in particular gives a concentrated landscape of multi-period activity which appears to demonstrate strong evidence for continuity of activity within a confined area, while bringing the issue of proximity into question. The evidence of the ceramic material from the late Roman period and the early Anglo-Saxon period, while being stratigraphically insecure, suggests that the actual time period between the two settlements was very
short. The most secure and consistent dating information comes from the cemeteries of ‘Empingham I’ (Liddle et al. 2000, 44) and ‘Empingham II’ (Timby 1996, 97).

‘Empingham I’ is in two distinct sections, the first being of the late 5th or early 6th century, with the second group being more ‘Christianised’ with few grave goods, and the graves being cut in a different manner to those of group one. Finds indicate that Empingham I did not continue beyond the middle of the 6th century (Liddle et al. 2000, 45). That the second group of burials may suggest a gap in the chronology of the burials should be looked at in relation to the comment that, at Empingham II, it was not known whether the unaccompanied burials were contemporary with the furnished burials, or whether they could be dated to either end of the time period (Timby 1996, 97). The possibility exists that they could be either late Roman or mid-Anglo-Saxon and the scope for further research in this area has been clearly demonstrated (Tatham 2004).

The dating of Empingham II, again based upon the burial material, is broader and ranges from the late 5th century to the early 7th century (Timby 1996, 97); similar 5th century start dates can be derived from the sites at North Luffenham and Market Overton I.

Burials clearly respect the locations of earlier burials, and the presence of 5th-6th century interments in close proximity to Roman sites, as at Market Overton, Great Casterton and the Empingham villa, is a common characteristic of the Rutland landscape. In the example of the villa, the burials are viewed as being of middle Anglo-Saxon date, and this in turn raises the question of the re-use of villas as potential places of ‘worship’ (Cooper 2000a, 22). Reasons for burials inside villas may denote the reuse of surrounding land and the villa remains as a landmark; alternatively there is the possibility that if the villa was ‘colonised’ and was used as a place of worship, it could form a new or revised focus in the mid-Saxon period with the burials being the first move in that direction. Certainly in Gaul Christian-owned villas of the 4th century did evolve into places of worship and early medieval churches, although often a significant break in continuity of activity occurred before the formal establishment of a church on the Roman site (Blair 2005, 11). The theory is attractive but locally has no strong material support as yet; on a national level, nearly two hundred churches and chapels in England overlie or adjoin Roman villas, while the pattern of 6th-8th century burials in
villas is suggestive of the presence of family shrines, which itself may indicate a continued population presence in the landscape (Bell 2005).
CHAPTER 5

Anglo-Saxon Northamptonshire

'The meagre entries of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle that describe the over-running of Britain by the English afford no clue to the early history of Northamptonshire'

(Northamptonshire Victoria County History 1902, 223)

5.1 Introduction

By way of introduction to the county of Northamptonshire, initial attention will be given to the geology and topography. These are the underlying characteristics that influence how the inhabitants interact with the landscape of any area.

Northamptonshire is the southernmost of the three counties under consideration. The county town, Northampton, lies in the heart of the county on the north side of the River Nene, with several smaller market towns situated along the course of the Nene Valley (Wellingborough, Irchester, Thrapston and Oundle) and up into the Rockingham Forest area with Kettering and Corby, the latter reflecting the industry of the area with iron and steel working. The dominant natural feature of the county is the River Nene which rises in the west and flows in a north-easterly direction through the south-eastern half of the county to Peterborough and from there into the low-lying fens and thence to the Wash. The other major water course is the Welland which flows parallel to the Nene along the northern county boundary, through Stamford, also coming out into the Wash.

In considering a map of late Roman and early medieval Northamptonshire, as well as the two main watercourses discussed above, the other dominating natural feature is the woodland. The two main areas of woodland are Rockingham Forest in the north-east of the county which lies between the rivers Welland and Nene, and the forests of Whittlewood and Salcey in the south, between the Nene and the River Great Ouse in Bedfordshire.

A general overview of the settlement patterns of the Roman and the Anglo-Saxon periods will be given. This will be followed by area specific case studies. In Northamptonshire as well as small-scale fieldwork including fieldwalking and limited
excavation, three major area surveys have been conducted and recently published. These comprise:

1. The Raunds Area Survey (Parry 2006);
2. The Rockingham Forest landscape mapping project (Foard et al. 2003);
3. The Whittlewood medieval settlement and landscape project (Jones et al. 2006).

Additionally, fieldwork at Piddington Roman villa, Brixworth and at Brigstock will also be reviewed which reveal more about settlement from more detailed, small-scale study.

In contrast to Leicestershire, the Northamptonshire of the early first millennium AD lacked the commercial focus of a major Roman town; similarly the road pattern differs, with the three major roads - Watling Street, Gartree Road and Ermine Street - demonstrating a tendency to cross the county, rather than converge on any one major centre (Section 5.2 below & Fig. 5.6).
5.1.1 Geology and Topography

The rocks of Northamptonshire are typically sedimentary in character. The north-western half of the county (the Northamptonshire Heights, or uplands) forms part of a ridge of limestone hills running from Dorset to Yorkshire dating to the Jurassic period. Much of the county is also covered by quantities of rock debris which was deposited during the Ice Age, including the glacial gravels, particularly along the Nene valley.

![Northamptonshire Surface Geology](image)

**Fig. 5.2: Northamptonshire surface geology**

The soils of Northamptonshire are dominated by a variety of clays, namely Boulder Clay, Oxford Clay, Blisworth Clay and the clays of the Lower, Middle and Upper Lias. The Lias Clays dominate the landscape of the north-western half of the county, interspersed by outcrops of Oolitic Sandstone and Ironstone. The south-eastern half of the county is dominated by Oolitic Limestone and outcrops of Oxford Clay, particularly along the eastern edge of the county. These major geological features are interspersed by deposits of alluvium and valley gravels of the main water courses, together with areas of glacial sands and gravels. The alluvium and valley gravels are particularly evident in the north and east, along the courses of the Rivers Welland and Nene respectively, together with their tributaries.
The boulder clays generally produced poor draining, intractable soils (Foard 2001, 42), resulting in marginal agricultural land best suited for woodland. This is supported by evidence from archaeology and place-name studies for the Anglo-Saxon period, while early- to mid- Anglo-Saxon settlement, nucleated villages and open fields occur mainly on the permeable and mixed geologies (ibid., 43).

Fig. 5.3: Northamptonshire topography, showing contours, water courses and woodland (shaded dark green).

The topography of Northamptonshire is dominated by the River Nene (Fig. 5.3). Along with the Welland and the Ouse, the River Nene rises in the clay uplands of the west of the county and flows north-eastwards to the Wash and the North Sea. Its major tributaries all rise in the Northamptonshire claylands and the majority of the main centres of population lie either on the course of the Nene itself, or on the course of one of its main tributaries. The exceptions to this are Daventry on the Roman Watling Street, and Towcester and Brackley; Brackley lies on the River Great Ouse and Towcester, besides being on the Watling Street, is situated on the River Tove, itself a tributary of the Great Ouse.
The highest parts of the county are the uplands of the western side which comprise a range of hills generally over 150m OD. Arbury Hill, south-west of Daventry, is the highest point being approximately 225m, with Borough Hill (also near Daventry) at 194m and Honey Hill (further to the north near Cold Ashby) being over 200m. The eastern half of the county is around 100m OD, intersected by the Nene Valley and the valleys of its tributaries which are 30m to 90m OD. From the eastern fringes of Rockingham Forest the landscape falls towards the low-lying fenlands of Cambridgeshire and south Lincolnshire. Along the southern edge of Northamptonshire a low-lying ridge separates the valleys of the Nene and the Ouse.

### 5.1.2 Watercourses

The Rivers Welland and Nene flow in a north-easterly direction, with the Welland forming part of the county boundary with Leicestershire from a point to the west of Market Harborough to Tinwell, west of Stamford. Stamford was the extent to which the Welland was navigable from the Wash in the medieval period (Jones 2000). The remainder of this northern boundary is formed by the River Avon from a point between the villages of Welford (Northants.) and North Kilworth (Leics.) until it is crossed by the Watling Street to the south of the Roman settlement at Tripontium, near Rugby (Warks.) (see Fig. 5.4 below).

The River Nene lies almost parallel to the Welland and flows through central Northamptonshire, rising to the west of Northampton on the clay uplands near Daventry and flowing through Northamptonshire as far as Wansford (Cambs.). It is possible that the River Nene formed the dividing line between two Iron Age tribes, the Corieltauvi to the north and the Catuvellauni to the south. This is based on the distribution of coinage of the respective tribes, with Catuvellaunian coinage rarely occurring to the north of the Nene Valley. This physical boundary seemingly persisted into the Roman period, for the study of the late Roman pottery from the Piddington villa site has shown that, given its location on the edge of the Nene Valley, while it would be expected that the pottery should be of late Nene Valley production, they are in fact predominately Oxford region products (Friendship-Taylor, pers. comm.). A similar situation prevails in the case of the mortaria from Piddington, where in the later phases of occupation (i.e. 4th century AD), vessels from the Oxfordshire area of manufacture and from Mancetter/Hartshill
clearly outnumber those from the geographically closer Lower Nene Valley. Even in earlier phases, for example the late 1st century and the 2nd century, *mortaria* from the Verulamium region still outnumbered those from the Upper Nene Valley area (Rollo 1994, 8).

The River Welland too may have become a defined boundary at some time, since along much of its course it appears to be devoid of settlements which would otherwise be expected to develop around crossing points. Most settlements are located at some distance away from the river, perhaps reflecting recognition of problems associated with flooding. Even then, such recognition is in itself unusual as such a risk has not prevented settlement elsewhere in Britain in Iron Age and Roman times.

Other noteworthy watercourses are the rivers Tove and Ise. The Tove rises in the southwest of the county and passes through Towcester before turning south-eastwards and flowing through Whittlewood Forest (where it forms part of the county boundary) to enter the River Great Ouse to the east of Cosgrove. The Ise originates between Brixworth and Market Harborough, and flows eastwards between Corby and Kettering before turning south and passing close to Wellingborough to join the Nene.
Willow Brook and Harper’s Brook, both tributaries of the Nene, flow through Rockingham Forest. Willow Brook takes a more northerly and circuitous route flowing from Corby, eastwards through the villages of Deene, Bulwick and Blatherwycke towards King’s Cliffe and then turns southeast to Apethorpe, Woodnewton and Elton, where it joins the Nene. Harper’s Brook rises west of Corby and flows eastwards, through Stanion, Brigstock, Sudborough and Lowick before joining the River Nene to the north of Thrapston.

5.1.3 Woodland
Based upon the recordings of the Domesday Survey, Northamptonshire featured two major areas of woodland identified as Whittlewood and Salcey Forest in the south, and Rockingham Forest in the north-east (Terrett 1971a, 404-407).

Whittlewood straddles the county boundary to the south, crossing into Buckinghamshire, and to a large extent its boundary is defined by the course of the river Ouse. To the west it extends as far as Brackley while to the east it joins with what is
known as Salcey Forest and Yardley Chase and reaches as far as Bozeat. The northern tip of Whittlewood extends almost as far as Brixworth (to the north of Northampton) and is bounded on its eastern side by the northern arm of the River Nene.

Rockingham Forest is bounded by the rivers Nene to the south and Welland to the north, where it may have joined up with Leighfield Forest in south-east Leicestershire and south-west Rutland. To the south-west, Rockingham Forest extended as far as Kettering and possibly as far as Wellingborough, although by 1286 it is recorded as extending from ‘the walls of Northampton to the south bridge at Stamford’ (Foard 2001, 49).

5.2 Roman Influence

In addition to the natural setting, we need to examine patterns of Roman land use for Northamptonshire to consider later how far these influenced the settlement patterns of the early to middle Anglo-Saxon periods.

It could be suggested, when looking back at the distribution pattern of Roman period sites, that the Roman road network was key in influencing locations of settlements. Three known major Roman roads cross the county from south-east to north-west (see Fig. 5.6 below):

1. Watling Street, which passes through the west of the county;
2. Ermine Street, which touches on the eastern edge of the county and contributes significantly to the route of the modern A1 trunk road;
3. Gartree Road, which runs from Colchester to Leicester.

The latter passes through the Roman small town site at Titchmarsh and which can later be identified beyond Corby, crossing the River Welland at Cottingham - also a site of Anglo-Saxon settlement - and continuing to Medbourne (Leicestershire) and thence Leicester. From this we can infer that this road passes through the heart of Rockingham Forest, a route which coincides with the course taken by Harper’s Brook. The orientation of such roads, certainly in the cases of Ermine Street and Watling Street, could reflect the early movement of the Roman legions, fanning out north and west.
from the south-east corner of Britain in the mid-first century AD and setting the pattern or framework for future urban and rural economic development.

One other main Roman road crosses Northamptonshire. This leaves Ermine Street at Water Newton and follows the Nene Valley towards the Roman site at Duston, west of Northampton. In doing so, it passes through the small towns of Ashton, Titchmarsh, Higham Ferrars, Irchester and Little Houghton; this would appear to emphasise the importance of the River Nene as a focus for settlement in central Northamptonshire.

From Duston, a road links up with Watling Street at the settlement site at Norton, near Daventry, although it would be surprising if there was not another road between Duston and the small town at Towcester, also on Watling Street. This suggestion is reinforced by the presence of a villa between Towcester and Northampton and two Anglo-Saxon settlement sites in close proximity to it.
Table 5.1: Northamptonshire Roman small towns

Whilst the distribution of Roman settlement in general for Northamptonshire is countywide (this would suggest that in terms of fieldwork, a thorough coverage of the county has been achieved and the distribution of sites is a genuine one), three areas of less intense occupation can be identified:

1. Along the northern edge of Rockingham Forest;
2. Central Northamptonshire between the northern arm of the River Nene and the River Ise;
3. In the south-west of the county south of the River Nene and to the west of Watling Street.

On closer inspection, some clusters of settlement can be discerned with notable foci being the small towns and villa sites. The most apparent cluster is along the Nene Valley between Northampton and Thrapston; further clusters lie around Towcester and Daventry, both on the Ermine Street, and in the south-west of the county between Banbury and Brackley where sites cluster around a small town site near Marston St Lawrence.

The pattern of distribution of villas of the late Roman period bears some similarity to these clusters of settlement (Scott 1993; Appendix 2). In particular, villa sites tend to
concentrate on the lowland soils of the southern side of the county between 0 and 100m OD, particularly along the Nene Valley and along the valleys of tributaries that feed into the Nene on the north side (Fig. 5.7 below). Large farms or villa sites have been identified at Towcester and Daventry and in between, which would suggest that in those cases, towns and Watling Street acted as magnets for settlement. This may indicate that the activity that took place on these sites differed in some respect from the activities conducted along the Nene Valley.

Fig. 5.7: The villa landscape of Northamptonshire

It is particularly noticeable that the clay uplands of the western half of Northamptonshire are devoid of villa sites, although evidence of other late Roman settlement has been recorded.

The pattern of distribution of late Roman burial sites in the county resembles that of the villas, clustering along the Nene Valley and - with the exception of a small group of sites in the extreme south-west, again between Brackley and Banbury - all lie to the east.
of Watling Street. In this respect, there is a difference between the villa landscape of Northamptonshire and the overall pattern of late Roman settlement.

This variation in distribution pattern may be the result of seasonal movement from the lowland to the upland zones, but the distances that could be involved tend to rule this out as an option. An alternative proposal would be that this suggests a different burial tradition prevailing in the ‘lowland’ villa zone compared with the western ‘upland’ zone.

As a characteristic of the population, this may be indicative of the degree of Romanisation that can be discerned in the county - in this case, the lighter, richer, more productive alluvial soils of the river valleys attracted investment by wealthier Roman landowners, especially in the late Roman period. Such people carried with them the developed trappings of Roman life, typically in villa or large rural estates (e.g. at Piddington and Stanwick). By way of contrast, in the poorer, less productive ‘upland’ zone, the population may have retained more of what might be called a ‘traditional’ identity, occupying sites that were identifiably Roman in terms of their material culture, but in other ways – for example building construction and possibly burial traditions – were still firmly British. In this case, the means of disposal of the dead of the native ‘British’ population may have involved practices that left little or no physical trace of the deceased, in contrast with the very different traditions of Roman burial that can still be identified archaeologically.

5.3 Anglo-Saxon Burial Sites

In Northamptonshire, based on the data in the HER/SMR and Meaney’s Gazetteer (1964), Anglo-Saxon burial and settlement sites tend to occur in close proximity to each other; furthermore the distribution of Anglo-Saxon burial sites compares very closely with that of the late Roman burials. Two possibilities exist: either there was continuity of burial practice in related sites, or the pattern of Anglo-Saxon settlement corresponded closely with that of later Roman villa and farm settlement (Fig. 5.8 below; Appendix 4).

In the Rockingham Forest area, burial sites (predominantly inhumation or mixed) form a well defined ring around the forest. This suggests a pattern of permanent, dispersed settlement along the woodland fringes, to which these burial sites related directly, while
within the heart of Rockingham Forest settlement activity was chiefly in the form of temporary, or short-term industrial sites.

The Whittlewood area provides an interesting contrast to Rockingham Forest, with a cluster of fringe settlement and burial sites on the eastern side (see below), and very few sites, either burials or settlements, within the forest. Those that have been located appear to have some form of spatial relationship with Roman sites, particularly the small town site of Towcester on Watling Street, and the three villa sites at Easton Neston and Gayton (both of which have produced 4th century material) and at Stoke Bruerne. The sites at Easton Neston and Stoke Bruerne have also both produced pottery from the late Iron Age. The woodland interior of Whittlewood does not, however, appear to have been exploited in the same industrial manner as that of Rockingham.

A number of burial sites have been recorded along the valley of the River Nene, with a tendency to gather in the vicinity of the Roman settlement of Duston and the Iron Age hillfort at Hunsbury, and thus in close proximity to present-day Northampton. Northampton itself has demonstrated evidence of early and particularly middle Anglo-
Saxon settlement, suggesting that that area was a focal point for settlement in the county, while the actual emphasis moved from site to site.

Immediately to the north of Northampton, a strong concentration of Anglo-Saxon activity exists around Brixworth, which includes both settlement activity and burials. Another area of Anglo-Saxon burial activity is around Daventry in the clay uplands, although there is only very limited evidence of settlement. This compares with data from the south-west of the county between Brackley and Banbury, which has only very limited evidence of Anglo-Saxon settlement in an area of substantial Roman activity, yet features a significant number of Anglo-Saxon burial sites. While no immediate conclusions can be drawn from this apparently conflicting evidence, there are specific examples of Anglo-Saxon burials in close proximity to Roman sites: in particular, the last phase of the Piddington villa included three (and possibly five) Anglo-Saxon graves in the north wing (Friendship-Taylor & Friendship-Taylor 2003, 161) (see Fig. 5.13). On the fringe of the study area, at Longthorpe, Peterborough on the River Nene, excavations in the late 1960s on a Roman fortress site close to the Roman town of Durobrivae revealed an Anglo-Saxon cemetery with 22 cremations and two inhumations (Dakin 1969, 15-16).

Thus, it is possible that Anglo-Saxon settlement concentrated along the Nene valley and the woodland fringes of Northamptonshire, while encroaching further into the bounds of Rockingham Forest. It may be significant in the case of the latter, that settlement does not appear to have moved far away from the course of the Gartree Road as a number of sites have been recorded between Thrapston and Corby where the course of the Roman road has been lost.

5.4 Anglo-Saxon Settlement

A study of Anglo-Saxon period sites shows a distribution which focuses on the central area of the county between Corby and Kettering and Northampton (Appendix 5). In the Rockingham Forest area, settlement appears mainly around the edges of the forest, including the valleys of the Welland and the Nene, with a small number of sites situated in the heart of the woodland. Presumably, these were involved in charcoal production and iron working, whether in the form of the extraction of iron ore from the naturally occurring ironstone of the area, or in iron smelting.
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Even allowing for a degree of woodland regeneration following the Roman period, the majority of these settlement sites would still be situated around the fringes of the forest. Further west, in central north Northamptonshire, the landscape opens out, becoming less wooded; here only a small number of settlement sites have been recorded as a result of fieldwork.

Further south and west, in the open landscape between Wellingborough and Northampton, settlement appears to cluster along the Nene Valley, whilst also respecting the boundaries presented by the suggested extent of Whittlewood Forest, more so than around Rockingham Forest. The only reported early Anglo-Saxon sites that lie within the Whittlewood area are those around the Roman small town of Towcester and another very close to the route of the Roman Watling Street, while to the west, beyond the line of Watling Street only two sites have been recorded, near Greatworth and between King’s Sutton and Aynho.

Evidence of Anglo-Saxon structures is similarly scarce to that in the neighbouring counties. One of the better known sites which has produced evidence for PBSs of post-hole construction, together with associated pottery is that at Maxey, on the River Welland (Addyman 1964, 20-73); excavations in 1959 and 1960 revealed a number of Anglo-Saxon features and seven rectangular structures, which, based upon the artefacts have been dated to the middle Saxon period. At the time of its discovery, Maxey was in Northamptonshire although following local government reorganisation it now lies in Cambridgeshire, on the outskirts of Peterborough.

An Anglo-Saxon settlement was also excavated at Brixworth in 1994; this produced post-hole evidence for at least five PBSs and four SFBs (Ford 1995, 79-108). The SFBs were truncated, ranging in depth from 0.17m to 0.32m and none of them conformed in layout to the typical post-hole arrangements typically associated with such features (ibid., 85-88). Ceramic material has dated the site to the 5th century, although radiocarbon dating has provided conflicting possibilities of a narrow middle Saxon life for the settlement, or alternatively two periods of occupation – 5th to 7th century, and 8th to 9th century with a small break (ibid., 105). Also present was a quantity of slag which, while not reliable for dating the site, is typical of any settlement as opposed to industrial iron working and production (ibid., 95). Better defined examples of SFBs were excavated at Grendon in the 1970s, typically comprising varieties with a single post-
hole at each end of the sunken feature (Jackson 1995, 3-32). As at Brixworth, traces of iron working were recorded, as well as pottery of the early and middle Saxon periods.

5.5 Case Studies

A consideration of the distribution of Anglo-Saxon sites across Northamptonshire is instructive of general settlement patterns, but can more specific comments be made relating to activity of the period? This requires a closer inspection of the landscape and site distribution. In this respect, we can draw upon data from the intensive field surveys conducted at Brigstock in the heart of Rockingham Forest, at Raunds in the Nene Valley and at Whittlewood, each particularly valuable, and each having been published recently.

5.5.1 Brigstock Survey

within Rockingham Forest, that had been fenced and as such was largely unaffected by medieval settlement activity.

Initial inspection suggested that it contained a high level of preserved archaeological deposits and as a consequence a comprehensive programme of landscape survey was initiated which included aerial photography, fieldwalking, test pitting, excavation, coring, soil analysis, hedgerow dating and archive research (ibid., 46).

The survey revealed two main Roman settlements, one in the north of the park, the other in the south-west corner, and a series of smaller settlements in the eastern half. The main manuring scatter in the survey area has been indicated as being in the south-west corner in close proximity to the main settlement and associated cropmarks or earthworks. It is probably significant that this is the higher part of the survey zone, above the 100m contour, coincides also with the location of the source, possibly a
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spring, of a tributary of Harper's Brook that lies further to the east between Brigstock and Sudborough. Other cropmarks or earthworks lie in the eastern half of the park.

The distribution of Anglo-Saxon pottery shows an interesting contrast. Little pottery was recovered in the eastern half of the park, but in the north of the site quantities of pottery have been found on Iron Age sites, while in the south-west, greater quantities have been found in association with Roman material (Fig. 5.10 above). It is also probably significant that the distribution of iron-working sites very closely matches that of the Anglo-Saxon pottery finds (or that the distribution of Anglo-Saxon pottery very closely matches that of iron working sites). This would appear to reinforce the
proposition that the main activity of the Anglo-Saxon period in the Rockingham Forest area was that of iron working or iron-related industrial activity.

5.5.2 Raunds Area Project Survey

The Raunds Survey was part of an overall Raunds Area Project that was undertaken between 1976 and 1990. The key aim of the Raunds Area Project was to study the evolution of the landscape from the late glacial period up to the post-medieval period (Parry 1994, 36 & Parry et al. 2006). The study zone lay in the Nene Valley to the east of Kettering and Wellingborough, bounded by the county boundary on the east side and the River Nene on the west. Covering approximately 40km² and focussing on the small town of Raunds, it measured approximately 8km from east to west and 5km from north to south (Parry 1994, 36-42) with fieldwork involving the fieldwalking of as much of the land as possible.

Plate 5.2: The modern Raunds landscape – survey area edged red (Google Earth 2007)
In addition to the medieval parish of Raunds, the survey area comprised the parishes of Ringstead to the north, Hargrave to the east and Stanwick to the southwest; these it has been argued, may have formed what was a unified Anglo-Saxon estate until the 11th century (Cadman & Foard 1988) (see Fig. 5.11). Parts of neighbouring parishes were also included where there was evidence for the encroachment of settlement or land-use activity across the borders, and one site to the west of the Nene was included: namely the Iron Age hillfort of Crow Hill at Irthlingborough.

(i) The Roman Period

The twin elements of settlement and land use of the early Roman era were closely linked to the preceding landscape of the late Iron Age, with evidence for continuity of activity and settlement at many sites (ibid., 75). One such example is the villa at Stanwick, where fieldwalking followed by excavation revealed considerable Iron Age settlement in the form of an enclosure, several round-houses and other smaller features (Parry 1994, 39). This would suggest that, certainly initially, the local population remained in possession of its own property and readily adopted ‘Roman’ characteristics. Similarly for such a situation to come about, it is worthwhile to question just how distinctly different the late Iron Age was from the early Roman period.

Fig. 5.11: The Raunds Area Project survey area showing early Anglo-Saxon settlement (oval areas)
From the fieldwalking data, the distribution of pottery of the middle Roman period is very similar to the early imperial period, although some intensification of settlement occurred along the course of the River Nene can be seen. This may represent settlement drift away from the boulder clay 'uplands' in the east of the study area, and gravitation towards more fertile soils of the Nene valley, possibly suggestive of later Roman 'decline'.

This changing patterning of late Roman pottery across the Raunds study area may be the product of landscape reorganisation in the 2nd and 3rd centuries, which shows a concentration of settlements continuing to develop in the west of the survey area, possibly suggesting some form of nucleation taking place. Clearly there is an incidence of villas and large settlements along the valley bottom, as certainly four, and possibly six, concentrations of pottery can be identified, all within a kilometre of the Nene; three smaller concentrations can be seen in the middle of the Raunds area, and there is one large concentration in the east of the area, which is unrelated to any earlier activity.

Roman settlement can be placed into four categories in the Raunds area: these comprise villas, farms, groups of farms with villas, and groups of farms without villas (Parry et al. 2006, 73). Thus, what appears evident is that size does not necessarily relate to status (ibid., 73). The Romano-British villa at Piddington (see Appendix 2) occupies a small site, yet some of those occupying larger areas seem to be of less importance. In the Raunds Survey area, there are four villa sites: Redlands Farms, Stanwick, Ringstead and South Woodford. The term 'villa' here can be open to question: all four examples are stone-built, but only one, that at Ringstead, certainly had a tiled roof; thus other factors, for example the presence of mosaics, are needed to distinguish between those that are the more traditional 'villa' and those that are more accurately to be described as developed farms (ibid., 75).

Farms or groups of farms can link in with the notion of 'enclosures':

1. **Compact enclosures**: usually rectangular or ‘D’-shaped ditched features, less than 2ha in area. Pot scatters respect the boundary of the enclosure.

2. **Joined enclosures**: slightly larger, being between 2.5ha and 6.9ha in area, these comprise plots connected by linear ditches which may indicate the existence of kinship groups.
3. *Collected enclosures*: these comprise a series of plots that are connected and create a nucleated form or plan. Examples have been noted at Ringstead villa, Mallows Cotton and Laundes. They are typically in excess of 6ha in area, though in the case of Stanwick, this may be as much as 28ha.

An unusual feature of the Raunds landscape is that, geologically, all the known villas are constructed on gravels (ibid., 82). Roman structures, typically of masonry construction, were less vulnerable to the ground conditions, which may be a greater indication of the continuity of settlement location from the Iron Age, where the drainage via the gravel soils would have been more suited to timber structures. This notion of continuity is reinforced by the presence of Iron Age material on virtually all Roman sites. Collected enclosures especially have Iron Age antecedents, suggesting not only continuity of location, but also continuity of function.

There are problems with interpretation. At Crow Hill where prolonged occupation has been suggested (Parry *et al.* 2006, 272-3), Iron Age and Roman material coincides, yet there is not sufficient evidence to suggest that occupation is continuous. It is quite possible that on some sites occupation was either episodic and was not conducted by generations of the same people, or it may have been short-lived activity.

Geologically, on the boulder clays, seven settlements have Iron Age origins, while three possibly have even earlier origins. The large settlements of the Roman period tend to be situated adjacent to the River Nene, while the smaller dispersed farmsteads are to be found on the boulder clay, occupying prominent locations along the watershed with extensive views across the landscape, generally overlooking shallow tributary valleys that feed into the rivers Nene or Great Ouse, of themselves not located close to running water (ibid., 82). This would appear to imply that proximity to a ready source of water was not of utmost importance, and that there was the ability to construct a well or create a dew pond. Conversely, it would indicate that, in terms of location, the ability to see and be seen was more important to the land owners.

The smaller farms on the claylands could have existed as independent holdings or been parts of larger estates under direct control of villas such as Stanwick. For mainland Europe, the mechanics of Roman estates and their organisation are fairly well understood from written sources, however the estate boundaries themselves are almost
impossible to identify in the archaeological record. It is possible that natural features, for example the River Nene and its tributaries in the Raunds area, will have served as estate boundaries, being natural, well-established and unchanging elements of the landscape. It is, however, just as conceivable that they would be important enough as a natural resource to be core to each estate territory. Present-day boundaries, in particular parish boundaries and field boundaries could have originated as earlier (and possibly Roman) estate boundaries, although excavation has not been able to resolve this claim (ibid., 89). More recent fieldwork in Northamptonshire and Cambridgeshire has in fact addressed this issue, suggesting that the fossilization of Roman fields, and thus boundaries, can be identified (Upex 2002, 77-108).

Evidence for communication routes is available: along the western side of the Nene valley lay the Roman road from Irchester to Durobrivae, which crosses the Godmanchester to Leicester road at Titchmarsh; in the parishes of Great and Little Addington, its route can be discerned as an earthwork. Into the boulder clay uplands, cropmarks of Roman sites appear to have an alignment which may reflect the line of former smaller roads or trackways. The other possible communication route is the River Nene, but to what extent it was navigable is open to question – there is no evidence for the construction of wharves or staging for larger vessels, although the use of smaller barges may have removed the need for such features, thus its sole uses may have been for meadowland for livestock, and for fishing.

(ii) The Anglo-Saxon Period

Fieldwalking at Raunds has produced some 3704 Anglo-Saxon period sherds from 1166 locations, representing 22 main locations of Anglo-Saxon date (Parry 2006, 97). Typically the pottery dates from the period AD 450-850, with only very small quantities of St. Neots ware, which may suggest abandonment (or settlement shift) by the mid-10th century (ibid., 99). This may further coincide with what may be interpreted as being the period of village formation in the area, starting in the 9th century.

The settlement pattern of the early/middle Anglo-Saxon period as revealed by the distribution of pottery indicates a density of settlement of 0.5 sites per km². In this, the dominant factor is the proximity of the settlements to water, either the River Nene or its tributaries, since only three sites lie further than 300m away from a watercourse. The
link with water is further stressed by the presence, in six locations, of so-called ‘twinned’ settlements, where settlements were established on both sides of a tributary valley and lie only 360-650m apart (ibid., 102). Dating is based on the chronology of early Anglo-Saxon pottery, though this covers a period of 400 years, which, in the absence of any other dating evidence, leaves full interpretation open to question: are these adjacent sites contemporary, or do they merely represent shifting foci while remaining in the same locality?

In terms of the geology of the area, the lighter, better draining soils (and gravels in particular) have themselves long been seen as being a prime site for settlement in the Anglo-Saxon period. There is a clear preference from the archaeological evidence for the permeable geologies, which include gravel terraces, the Northamptonshire sand and ironstone, the Great Oolite Limestone, and combrash. What is illustrated is that the need for water may have overridden the need to settle on the lighter soils, for to the east of Raunds and in Hargrave in the south-east corner, settlement clearly occurred on the Oxford Clay, which is often seen as being heavy and intractable, and a deterrent to settlement. Similarly, Boulder Clay is regarded as offering only intermittent drainage, yet scatters of Anglo-Saxon pottery do occur here, thereby giving further doubt to the suggestion that such land was generally wooded and not occupied.

The distribution of early to middle Anglo-Saxon sites appears to contrast with the preceding Roman pattern, with a move both away from the Boulder Clay plateau and from the watershed to waterside locations. In addition, it is apparent that a significant lack of continuity between the Roman sites and Anglo-Saxon sites, with there being no real major concentrations of Anglo-Saxon pottery present on any of the Roman sites. Of the sites on the boulder clay uplands, only three provided between six and ten sherds of Anglo-Saxon pottery: at Pratt’s Pasture, Nether Close and Red House (east). On the more favoured permeable geology, only three of the 12 sites produced material that coincided with later Roman material, at Crow Hill, Stanwick and Mallows Cotton. At Stanwick there were also two buildings of the 5th and 6th centuries in date, together with a late Roman/Anglo-Saxon burial; however, at Mallows Cotton no Anglo-Saxon features were noted at all. It is suggested, therefore, that no simple line of development can be seen from the Roman villa to the medieval manor house (ibid., 103).
In terms of burials, at Stanwick, a small group of inhumations was cut into the main villa buildings, which identifies that they post-date the villa main phase, but these are difficult to date as the metalwork could be either late Roman or early Anglo-Saxon (ibid., 104) - although this in itself may point to a very early Anglo-Saxon date in the transition period from Roman to Anglo-Saxon activity. Similar Anglo-Saxon burial activity has been noted on the villa site at Piddington, to the south of Northampton, and at Empingham, in Rutland (Cooper 2000a, 17-22). Raunds, too, has evidence for an early Anglo-Saxon cemetery situated some 100m to the south of St. Peter’s Church. Further Anglo-Saxon burials came to light in the course of quarrying in the 19th century on the west side of the River Nene in the parish of Great Addington: set 450-800m from the river, these belonged to a 6th century cremation cemetery and an inhumation cemetery of ten burials including some grave goods.

The material collected from the fieldwalking raised the issue of settlement hierarchy. The type of pottery scatter can vary, dependent upon two factors: firstly, the length of occupation, and, secondly, the size or density of occupation. Across the survey area, six locations (seven, if the Raunds excavations are included) produced in excess of 100 sherds with a density of 30 sherds per hectare or more. These scatters occur between 1.00km and 1.75km apart and they demonstrate a pattern of distribution comparable to that of the Norfolk marshlands of the middle Anglo-Saxon period. In terms of location or siting, these sites lie away from the Nene and are situated below the boulder plateau of the area. These may denote a chronological shift from the initial small settlements that were situated along the course of the river to the establishment of more permanent sites below the boulder clay plateau. The generally accepted view has been that the heavy clays of the Midlands are not ideal soils for productive agricultural activity; however, with careful farming, clay uplands can provide high yields of crops (ibid., 106). This notion of transition could help to explain the presence of early Anglo-Saxon settlements close to sizeable Roman farm sites such as at Redlands Farm, Stanwick Villa and Mallows Cotton.

5.5.3 Whittlewood

The Whittlewood Project initially ran from 2000 to 2005 as a programme of interdisciplinary research to help in the identification of the factors that contributed to
the transition from scattered or dispersed settlement to the nucleation of villages (Jones et al. 2006). This is not regarded as being a sudden change, rather a transformation that took place over several centuries after about AD 850.

The Whittlewood study area covers an area of approximately 100 sq. km straddling the county boundary of Northamptonshire and Buckinghamshire. The project incorporated a group of twelve parishes (see maps below), six in Northamptonshire - Silverstone, Whittlebury, Potterspury, Passenham, Deanshanger and Wicken – and six - Luffield Abbey, Lillingstone Dayrell, Lillingstone Lovell, Stowe, Akeley and Leckhampstead - in Buckinghamshire which, in terms of fieldwork, have been subjected not only to historical research, but also to intrusive and non-intrusive archaeological investigation with test-pitting and field-walking, with sites plotted using GIS (Figs. 5.12 & 5.13).
Whittlewood itself was a royal forest, created shortly after the Norman Conquest, with Domesday Book indicating an already heavily wooded landscape. The area was selected because it offers a landscape that includes both dispersed and nucleated forms of settlement which have developed in close proximity to each other. Additionally, the settlements themselves are diverse in their character and history, ranging in type from deserted medieval village sites (DMVs) to shrunken and surviving villages (Page & Jones 2003, 55).

The geology of the area is the oolitic limestone typical of central Northamptonshire. The limestone is overlain by glacial boulder clay which is fertile but can be heavy and difficult to work (Lewis et al. 2001, 40). This underlying geology has been revealed in places by the action of the tributary streams of the Rivers Tove and Great Ouse which flow through the area. Additionally, the flood plains of the two main watercourses have formed fertile and easily worked soils, while there are also water meadows within the main valleys and those of secondary streams (ibid., 55). The environment of the Whittlewood area is thus typical of the wider Northamptonshire/Leicestershire area of boulder clay overlying Middle Lias and Cornbrash geology.
This study area has identified a number of settlement sites and large isolated farmsteads from the Roman period, for example at Potterspury, Wicken and Silverstone; some of these have produced Iron Age and early Roman period materials, suggesting a degree of continuity of occupation and exploitation between those two periods (Jones & Page 2003, 59-61). This was followed during the Roman period by a phase of settlement intensification and expansion. Fieldwalking has shown there to be a fair distribution of occupation sites, identified by concentrations of pottery, across the survey area.

However, the level of occupation in Whittlewood was not as concentrated as elsewhere in Northamptonshire or in Leicestershire, perhaps due to local economic factors (ibid., ...
63), since Whittlewood had been marginal in terms of tribal territorial location and settlement activity in the Iron Age and this situation of being in a fringe location persisted into the Roman period. Indeed, Whittlewood was not within the sphere of influence of any major urban centre and the one town – Towcester – remained a small town without any significant growth to impact upon the surrounding area. Similarly, the close proximity of Watling Street appears not to have had a major impact on the surrounding landscape.

Further evidence for the fragile nature of the economy and the nature of occupation in the area has been revealed from the data relating to the final centuries of Roman activity, since there is a clear break in land use and settlement (ibid., 63), particularly evident at Towcester where nothing from the early medieval period has been recovered despite its reasonable level of prosperity until the end of the Roman period. As a cautionary note, much of the later Roman material has been lost as a direct result of later development and occupation, but not to the extent that it has been lost in its entirety.

In contrast, surrounding villa sites seem to have entered into decline much earlier, being abandoned in the early 4th century, as at Cosgrove and The Gullet, or had undergone a change of use even earlier as at Deanshanger. This would suggest that already at that time, something significant was happening within the upper strata of Roman organisation or society, since conversely many lesser Romanised farmsteads seem to have continued functioning right up to the end of the Roman period (ibid., 64).

An impression of activity around Silverstone is derived from a combination of the test-pitting (72 pits by the end of the 2003 season), and archaeological investigation in the course of the construction of the A43 road. From the test-pitting, most material appears deposited as a result of manuring of fields (Jones & Page 2003a, 37) suggesting a predominantly arable landscape in this area during the Roman period.

Another question that was addressed relates to the nature of settlement: can this be regarded as small-scale, isolated activity, or is it a product of something more widespread and (possibly) organised? The interpretation that the project directors favour is that settlement of the former type would appear as identifiably discrete concentrations of pottery which represent areas of occupation and agricultural activity, separated by
areas where there was no pottery present. However, within the limitations of the area survey, there are large parts of the landscape where the scatters of pottery are uninterrupted (Jones & Page 2003b, 61 and fig.3), indicating that rather than agriculture being conducted within small, woodland clearings, the landscape was substantially arable.

(ii) The Anglo-Saxon Period

In contrast to other parts of Northamptonshire and Leicestershire, despite the recent high level of archaeological fieldwork activity, within the Whittlewood area in general and on late Roman sites in particular there is still an almost total lack of evidence for early Anglo-Saxon activity. Three early burial sites are known, at Passenham on the River Ouse just to the north-west of Milton Keynes, further to the west at Marston St Lawrence, between Brackley and Banbury, and at Poulspury on the Watling Street, south-east of Towcester (Jones & Page 2003b, 64). All of these sites lie on the fringes of the Whittlewood Forest area (at its greatest extent in the medieval period) which suggest two things: firstly, being located on the outskirts of the woodland, rather than within it, compares with the settlement pattern in the area around Rockingham Forest, where early Anglo-Saxon activity is apparent on the edges of the woodland; this may also be indicative of woodland regeneration around the forest fringe. Secondly, with regard to dating evidence from the cemeteries, at Passenham a significant number of burials ['thought by competent judges to more than 1,000 years old' Page 1902, cited in Meaney 1964, 194]) were found in the late 19th century in close proximity to the church, many of which were found in close association to early Anglo-Saxon pottery (Page 1902, 236; Meaney 1964, 194). This fits in well with further evidence from fieldwalking and test-pitting which has produced pottery finds, which, while numerically low in numbers, is significantly of the early to mid- Anglo-Saxon handmade form of AD 450-800. In addition, such early material occurs in close proximity to later settlement sites - within the scope of the Whittlewood Project, these include sites at Akeley, Lillingstone Dayrell and Leckhampstead. One interpretation provided is that it is the settlement pattern of the early Anglo-Saxon period which perhaps served to influence settlement into the medieval period and beyond (ibid., 64).
5.5.4 Piddington Roman Villa

The excavations of the Roman Villa at Piddington are part of a long-term research project, organised by the Upper Nene Archaeological Society, which started in 1979. Evidence has been uncovered for almost continuous occupation from the late Iron Age through to the mid-5th century (Rollo 1994, 2).

Fig. 5.15a (top): Piddington villa 'squatter' occupation phase
Fig. 5.15b (bottom): Final phase Anglo-Saxon burials (edged red)
(R. M. & E. Friendship-Taylor 1996, 60)
Piddington lies six miles south-east of Northampton, and the villa was originally discovered in 1781 during limestone quarrying. The villa lies adjacent to a stream on a gentle north facing slope to the east of the village of Piddington. The excavated area measures approximately 120m wide and 70m in depth, with the main villa building having a floor area of 532m².

The original building - a cottage type villa of the 1st or 2nd century - developed into a winged corridor floor-plan, only to be lost in a fire late in the 2nd century. The 3rd century saw a programme of planned rebuilding which was itself interrupted in the late 3rd century (Frere 1989, 292). The site was re-occupied in the early 4th century although this new phase of occupation appears to have been significantly different to that of earlier phases, taking the form of seven 'small, independent family units' (Friendship-Taylor & Friendship-Taylor 2002, 8). Finds from this period of occupation suggest a date range of AD 330-400. This has been supplemented by evidence from the site comprising coins of Arcadius (AD 395-408) and Honorius (AD 395-423) (ibid., 8). The last phase of activity has been described as a 'later Roman/Anglo-Saxon community' and while the evidence is limited, at least four Anglo-Saxon burials have been identified cut into the walls of the north end of the main villa building and the north wing (ibid., 8). There is also the possibility of a sunken-featured building erected over the top of the in-filled well (Friendship-Taylor, pers. comm.).

Plate 5.3: Burial within Piddington Roman villa site
5.6 Discussion

Overall, the evidence from fieldwalking, in conjunction with the HER/SMR and scattered excavations, indicates that good coverage of the Northamptonshire landscape has been achieved. This would suggest, therefore, that the conclusions that can be presented concerning the distribution of Roman and Anglo-Saxon sites are fairly accurate and that any gaps in the pattern of distribution are genuine, rather than being attributable to gaps in the fieldwork carried out across the county.

One would normally expect that burials and settlement sites would occur in close proximity to each other; however, Anglo-Saxon sites in the county do not reflect this relationship quite so closely. An overview of both settlement and burial activity across Northamptonshire during the Anglo-Saxon period reveals three main areas of settlement:

1. Rockingham Forest;
2. The River Nene around the confluence of the two arms of the river in the region of present day Northampton;
3. The south-west corner of the county between Brackley and Banbury (Oxon.).

Rockingham Forest shows considerable evidence for what has been interpreted as 'settlement' activity within the forest area, based upon the proposed extent of the Domesday woodland. Much of this is along the course of Harper's Brook which coincides with the line of the Roman Gartree Road between Corby and Thrapston. The remainder of the activity could be interpreted as being on the forest fringes.

Burial activity adopts a much tighter distribution around the forest fringes with only a handful of isolated sites being within the forest. There are locations where the relationship between burial and settlement can be identified, for example between Wakerley and Harringworth on the north edge of Rockingham Forest along the Welland valley, where three settlement sites are recorded on the HER/SMR together with two burial sites; elsewhere in the forest, settlement is sparse. This close relationship would suggest that settlement and burial should occur within the same area. In light of this, it is possible that activity elsewhere within the forest area was not 'settlement' *per se* but may be representative of temporary or seasonal impact. Thus permanent settlement and
associated burial grounds were to be found around the forest fringes with only temporary activity within the forest.

Plate 5.4: The Welland Valley looking towards Wakerley and Rockingham Forest

Whittlewood and Salcey Forest appear to demonstrate a much closer relationship between settlement sites and burial grounds. In contrast to Rockingham Forest, Whittlewood is almost devoid of Anglo-Saxon settlement activity within the forest area itself. This would imply that whatever activity was carried on in Rockingham could not be replicated within Whittlewood. The common factor here is ironworking and it is probable that the underlying geology of Whittlewood is not iron ore-bearing, meaning that without an incentive (beyond woodcutting and hunting) to go into the forest, settlement remained on its fringes.

Comparison of settlement activity in the Whittlewood area, when viewed with other areas of Northamptonshire, reveals significant differences. There seems to be a much lower level of settlement density around Whittlewood in the early and middle Anglo-Saxon periods than elsewhere: the individual parishes of Maidwell and Brixworth, which lie to the north of Northampton, respectively include five and eight settlement
sites; Brixworth has two cemetery sites, both of which lie to the north-west of the present village and are in close proximity to the site of a Roman villa, and a significant number of early to middle Anglo-Saxon findspots have also been recorded on the HER/SMR around the western edge of the village, with two settlement sites, one at the villa site and the other to the south-east of the village where a series of post-built structures and sunken-featured buildings were excavated (Ford 1995, 79-108). Further research by the RCHM(E) showed that within an area of central Northamptonshire, equivalent in size to Whittlewood, there were approximately 20 Anglo-Saxon burial sites.

The findings from the Whittlewood project, which might seem at first sight to be frustrating in terms of the lack of early Anglo-Saxon material, are of particular use when compared to the findings from other areas nearby. A suggested model of population movement in the post-Roman period is from the claylands onto the lighter soils. The supporting evidence for this scenario is the presence of artefactual evidence from the early Anglo-Saxon period on the lighter soils and its general absence on the heavier clay soils (ibid., 66). A similar pattern of movement, based on the findings of the Raunds Area Survey (Parry 1994, 36), saw the location of pottery scatters as indicating a move away from the boulder clay plateau of the Nene valley. Furthermore, the locations of the early- to mid-Anglo-Saxon pottery scatters tend to be in close proximity or relation to the locations of medieval villages (ibid., Figure 10.3).

The consequence of this ‘retreat’ of the population from claylands, at least in the case of the Whittlewood area, was woodland regeneration. Even if the farming population did not withdraw in its entirety, it seems to have become sufficiently reduced in number that nature was again able to reassert itself on the landscape. As is identified by Jones and Page (2003a, 66), the factor that contributes to the idea of woodland regeneration is the combination of the extensive areas of woodland recorded in Domesday Book, together with the extensive incidence of Roman material, and in particular Romano-British pottery (from manuring), within areas that were recorded as being medieval woodland, and would thus have typically been cultivated. The difficult question to answer is whether the regeneration of woodland was a natural consequence of the abandonment and neglect of the landscape in the late Roman period and early Anglo-Saxon period, or the product of deliberate action?
As considered above, around Silverstone and in the parishes of Leckhampstead and Wicken, large scatters of Romano-British pottery suggest a predominantly arable landscape. This contrasts with the woodland that was recorded in Domesday Book for Silverstone - approximately 1,500 acres, which is approximately 80% of the area of the modern parish (ibid., 37). Population levels for Silverstone also appear to have fallen by 1086.

The fragile nature of the material evidence of Anglo-Saxon activity is a constant problem. Test-pitting around Silverstone has produced Anglo-Saxon pottery within Romano-British features (e.g. Test-pit 63), which may suggest that some activity within the landscape - population and farming - continued beyond the end of the 4th century. Elsewhere, the Anglo-Saxon pottery could be said to reveal a pattern of dispersed farmsteads around Silverstone, while the lack of any similar material finds from the work on the A 43 is similarly instructive as regards the limited characteristics of settlement (ibid., 37).

The practice of test-pitting within the built area of a village is informative, for it helps to strengthen the notion of continuity of settlement activity. This may not directly relate to the issue of ‘settlement nucleation’, but it does show that there has been an extended period of activity within the area, even if it might not necessarily be regarded as being ‘settlement’, nor ‘continuous’.

The third area, lying to the west of Watling Street, is unusual, for while there are a number of Anglo-Saxon burial or cemetery sites, very few Anglo-Saxon settlement sites are known. Nonetheless the burial sites do occur in areas that can be described as having seen substantial Roman activity, for example around Towcester and Daventry and in close proximity to villa sites also in the south-west corner of the county. Such a relationship may be indicative of the continuity of use of Roman sites and structures into the post-Roman period.

At a more site-specific level, in the case of Brigstock, the pattern of Roman settlement differs significantly from that of the preceding Iron Age. While the landscape appears to have retained much of its open format, the Roman sites demonstrate evidence of the establishment of ‘in-field’ arable cultivation close to the centres of settlement. Soilmark evidence can be discerned by the presence of a rectilinear field system; finds also
featured the fragments of a millstone, suggesting that grain production was a key activity in the Roman period, as opposed to the apparent emphasis on livestock (sheep in particular) which derived from the evidence of the Iron Age settlement (Foster 1994, 48).

The evidence of the Roman pottery from Brigstock reveals a reduction in settlement activity from the late 2nd century onwards, and how, if not totally abandoned, the nature of the occupation of the landscape changed to that of the establishment of smaller, dispersed settlements. Anglo-Saxon settlements occur as small, scattered pottery assemblages on both Iron Age and Roman sites. This may be indicative of the re-use of abandoned sites, rather than representing any form of continuity of settlement. Scant as this evidence may seem, similarities can be seen between this limited Anglo-Saxon presence on abandoned late prehistoric and Roman sites, and the evidence from the Piddington villa, which, while demonstrating almost continuous occupation from the pre-Roman Iron Age to the early 5th century also has evidence of an Anglo-Saxon presence on a site which itself may have been either abandoned, or was being occupied in a manner (i.e. so-called ‘squatter’ occupation) not typically associated with the late Roman period (Friendship-Taylor & Friendship-Taylor 2002, 8).

In the case of many of the sites found by field-walking, insufficient evidence is available to allow for further comment on the nature of the Anglo-Saxon activity. Scatters of pottery may represent settlement and, with the presence of slag, industrial use has been suggested, either in the form of charcoal burning or iron working. However, in the case of Rockingham Forest, all charcoal sites have been dated to the 13th century, and slag deposits themselves are typically difficult to date (G. Morgan, pers. comm.; Foard 2001, 73).

What is so often lacking from present-day archaeology is the opportunity to follow up the identification of a site by field-walking with a period of excavation in order to assess more fully the nature of the activity at that location. In the latter part of the 20th century many pottery scatters across the county were identified from field-walking, and the Raunds Survey contributed much to presenting a detailed picture of the early medieval landscape. In order to more fully understand the types of settlement, surface survey needs to be followed up by excavation and very rarely, in a rural setting is this possible. In the Raunds survey area, several excavations were conducted which produced a
number of mid-Saxon features, including an enclosure near to the church, four structures set within a ditched enclosure, two *Grubenhäuser* superseded by three post-built structures, a further PBS, and an area comprising 488 post-holes, again of the mid-Saxon period. Two Northamptonshire sites where such intrusive investigation has been possible are Upton and Brixworth, both of which were excavated in 1989 (Shaw 1994, 77).

The site at Upton comprises approximately 2 hectares and excavation revealed a sunken-featured building (4.0m x 3.5m) aligned north-south, with central post-holes at each end and smaller corner posts. Excavation also produced a number of linear features and shallow furrows together with 148 sherds of pottery, of which 106 were of the Anglo-Saxon period. Nearby, but in close proximity, is a cemetery of 6th to 7th century date, approximately 800m to the north-east and another sunken-featured building was previously located 200m to the south-east (Anon. *Antiq. J.* 49, 202-221 cited in Shaw 1994, 77). It is suggested by Shaw that this combination of sites is indicative, either of a pattern of dispersed settlement, or of settlement drift, as noted at Mucking, Essex, and with sites on the continent.

At Brixworth, two Anglo-Saxon cemeteries were found in the late 19th century, and since the early 1970s, a number of sites in the area have been located and investigated, ranging from burials to pottery scatters and post-holes. In 1989, excavation of an area underlying a scatter of early/middle Anglo-Saxon pottery revealed two sets of parallel post-holes aligned east-west; the two post-built structures measured 7.0m x 5.4m and 12.0m x 5.9m. The excavators argued that this site represents a small domestic site of an area of approximately 1.5 hectares.

In addition to the post-holes, 32 sherds of pottery were recovered; six fabric types were represented of the period AD 450-850, with one fabric type being granite-tempered and not of a local source. As with all of the Anglo-Saxon ceramic material from Northamptonshire, the close dating of the fabrics is problematic: hand-made wares are regarded as not changing significantly between AD 450 and 850 and certainly at the time of the excavations at Upton and Brixworth it was not possible to further refine the dating of the pottery. Further monitoring at Brixworth revealed a further five PBSs and four SFBs, adding to the picture of Brixworth being part of a landscape of significant
Anglo-Saxon activity of both settlement and cemeteries, in close proximity to a villa of the Roman period.

![Map of Brixworth, Northamptonshire](image)

**Fig. 5.16: Early and Middle Anglo-Saxon activity around Brixworth, Northamptonshire**

(Ford 1995, Fig. 1)

It can be suggested that while the economy may have changed in the late 4th and early 5th centuries from a market system to a strongly subsistence/self sufficient lifestyle, settlements were not totally inward-looking, and communication between sites probably retained value. Although the Anglo-Saxon settlement pattern in Northamptonshire is dispersed in character, the distribution nonetheless follows very closely that of the villa landscape of the Roman period and thus the rivers which would be available primarily
as a source of water but also fish and, by association, the road network which would still be recognisable.
CHAPTER 6

Anglo-Saxon Place-names

'The lack of record or tradition may be remedied to some extent by a careful analysis of place-names, by a classification of the dialects still to be met in the county, and by observing the physical characteristics of the population' (Northamptonshire Victoria County History 1902, 223)

6.1 Introduction

The study of place-names is widely regarded as being one of the best ways in which the development of the historical landscape can be seen and understood, as well as offering a glimpse of how the people of the Anglo-Saxon period saw their landscape (Hooke 1998, 2). The collection and study of early place-names started in the early part of the 20th century, and it was these specialists who provided etymologies for historians. By the 1960s and 1970s thinking had progressed to the extent whereby place-name study was accepted into the mainstream historical study of early England (Gelling 1984, 1, 2).

New place-names come into existence even nowadays, as new developments are approved where people can live or work. While the motives behind the assignment of names have not changed – namely recognition (usually) of a place or feature within the landscape - the reasons behind the selection of specific place-names that are given today probably have changed (e.g. nice-sounding names for houses, or those giving links to individuals, as in street names etc.).

For a study concentrating on the development of the landscape in the second half of the first millennium AD, the prime source for place-names is Domesday Book of 1086. While this document is not wholly reliable in terms of all named settlements, it is acceptable to assume that places recorded were in existence by 1086 (but how long previously?); this list can be supplemented by those places named in documents, for example Anglo-Saxon charters, that pre-date Domesday Book.

Anglo-Saxon place-names mainly fall into one of two categories: Topographical place-names and Habititative place-names (Bourne 2003, 6). Habititative place-names serve to indicate a settlement that could range in size from farmstead or hamlet to a village,
while topographical names include words descriptive of features in the landscape, either natural or manmade in origin.

The Anglo-Saxon peoples had a strong oral tradition; much of what was composed was circulated by word of mouth in a preliterate society, only later being brought together in written form (Bradley 1982, ix). Possibly as a reflection of this emphasis on the spoken word, the language itself is very expressive, having words similar in their meanings but with subtle differences in emphasis. This is apparent in many of the terms used in the description of the landscape.

Since the 19th century, much landscape and place-name study has been carried out with the view that it is possible to derive a chronology for place-names in general and habitation place-names in particular. This chronology was based upon a model for the development of the English landscape which considered the process as one which started with the Anglo-Saxons and Scandinavian incomers founding new settlements in a largely virgin or untamed landscape of woodland, moor and fen (Cox 1999, 224). Arguably such studies need to be re-evaluated in the light of increasing evidence that points to greater continuity in landscape use that goes back into the Roman period and the Iron Age. To take one example, work along the Nene Valley in Northamptonshire has pointed to a number of sites that exhibit evidence of continuity from the Iron Age into the Roman period and through into the early Anglo-Saxon period of the 5th and 6th centuries AD (Taylor 1975, 118).

Typically, place-name studies tend to concentrate upon linguistic links with names, focusing, therefore, upon those with Celtic roots, or Roman, Old English or Norman French origins, rather than imposing a date limit. For the purposes of this study, the key source is Domesday Book, and consequently settlement names that do not occur in this have been left out, except in cases where they are recorded elsewhere in earlier documents, for example Uppingham in Rutland, missing from Domesday Book, but recorded as Yppingeham in a charter of 1067 (Bourne 2003, 112).

In this chapter, I will first introduce the two main variants of place-names - topographic and habitative. Sections will then analyse the specific categories of name within these main groups in order to assess their individual distribution within the landscape. The maps in this chapter have been produced using the GenUK software; settlements are
consequently located according to present-day locations, which may conceivably be at slight variance with settlement locations of 1000 to 1500 years ago; it is felt that this variance will not significantly affect the general patterns of distribution across the study area, certainly not at the scale reproduced here.

6.2 Topographical Place-names

Topographical place-names often comprise two elements: (i) specific and (ii) generic. While it has been acknowledged that there can be an overlap in the classification of settlements having either topographic or habitative place-names, in the case of Topographic names, the emphasis is on the landscape feature as opposed to the type of settlement (Bourne 2003, 9). Below are typical examples of topographic features that occur in the naming of settlements, together with the Old English (OE) terms that are used:

- Dry land, partly surrounded by water or fenland: eg ‘edge’
- Water: ford ‘a ford’, burna ‘a stream’, wella ‘a spring’ or ‘a stream’
- Land: -feld ‘open country’, -land, -ecker ‘newly-cultivated land’

Fig. 6.1: Distribution of Topographical Place-names
• Hills and Valleys: *dun* ‘a hill’, *denu, halh* ‘a long, curving valley’

• Woodland: *leāh* ‘forest’, ‘a woodland clearing’ *wudu* ‘a wood’, *grāf(a)* ‘a grove’

Figure 6.1 (above) shows that Topographical place-names have a reasonably even
distribution across the three counties, occupying upland and lowland areas as well as
wooded and open parts of the landscape (see below). This suggests that landscape
features have had a role to play in the naming of settlements for a long time; however,
they may be less useful in the dating of that process.

### 6.3 Habitation Place-names

Habitation place-names indicate inhabited sites of any type, ranging from minor shelters
and homesteads to larger settlements and towns. Within the field of place-name study,
these names are understood to be indicative of the presence of Anglo-Saxon people.

Typical examples of Habitative place-name elements are:

- **-hām** ‘a village’ or an ‘estate’
- **-tūn** ‘a farmstead’, ‘a village’ or ‘an estate’
- **-worð** ‘an enclosure’ or ‘a compound’
- **burh** ‘a fortified place’ or ‘a manor house’
- **cot** ‘a cottage’, appearing as Cot
- **stoc** ‘a cattle farm’, appearing as Stoke. Like *stōw* and *stede* can also be
  translated as ‘a place’
- **wic** ‘a dairy farm’, appearing as Wick

The distribution of habitative suffixes is similarly widespread (Fig. 6.2 below), but
perhaps not quite as even as the topographic name distribution. In Northamptonshire
and Rutland the distribution appears to be less dense than that in Leicestershire, and
north-east Northamptonshire, encompassing Rockingham Forest, has noticeably fewer
OE settlement names. A similar situation prevails in north-west Leicestershire around
the Charnwood Forest area where again there are far fewer settlements of this type. This
clearly indicates that settlement of the period lay predominantly on the fringes of
heavily wooded areas, reinforcing the impression gathered from archaeological finds.
A characteristic of the settlement pattern exhibited in the distribution of habitative names in the study area appears to be the incidence of what could be seen as pairs of settlements often situated either side of a watercourse. This was identified in the course of fieldwork at Raunds in Northamptonshire which produced evidence for the notion of these ‘twinned’ settlements on a smaller scale (Parry 1994, 40) and can also be seen in Leicestershire in the Langtons and Stonton Wyville (Bowman 1996, 126-129) (see Fig. 6.3). More widely, examples can be seen in the south of the county and across the centre up to the Welland Valley, but such relationships between settlements seem to be much more pronounced in Leicestershire with the sites being closer together, with distances of 1 to 2km.

The two most frequently occurring English place-names in the landscape are –hām and –tūn. Whilst both elements have similar meanings, being the terms applied to a village or to an estate, research has shown a clear differentiation between the two place-name elements in terms of date of recording. English records show that prior to AD 731 (the date of publication of Bede’s Historia Ecclesiastica), –hām place-names were by far the most numerous; in contrast, –tūn place-names were very rare in records before Bede’s time. As Cox points out (1999, 224), this does not necessarily mean that such –tūn
settlements did not exist, but that they may not have been of significant status to be recorded. This may, therefore, be early evidence for the development of larger settlements as opposed to small, dispersed habitation. The date of AD 731 represents the date of the only detailed study of England in this period and it allows for the incorporation into the written record of a number of the early prose works as well as the earliest known examples of Anglo-Saxon charters.

Fig. 6.3: Possible Anglo-Saxon 'twinned' settlements along Langton Brook and The Lipping, Langton Hundred, Leicestershire (Adapted from Bowman 1996, 127 fig. 3)
6.4 -hām Place-names

Analysis of place-names in records has shown that -hām settlements are by far the most numerous for the period prior to about AD 731. Their concentration lies in the east and south-east of England, and shows a close relationship to the routes of Roman roads, to Romano-British settlements and to Anglo-Saxon cemeteries of the pagan period (Cox 1999, 224). It has been proposed that -hām names may have been given to established/remnant late Roman estates that were possibly taken over by the Anglo-Saxons from their Romano-British occupiers. Further credence is given to this notion by the study of wīc-hām (-wickham) suffixes which appear to relate to Anglo-Saxon estates that were based on the territories of Romano-British townships and thus implies a level of continuity of activity.

![Map showing the distribution of -hām Place-names](image)

Fig. 6.4: Distribution of -hām Place-names

Place-names with the -hām suffix are relatively few in number and are located in the south and east of the study area. In Northamptonshire, four -hām settlements lie to the south of the River Nene, three are in the Welland Valley, while in Rutland there are five and three in Leicestershire. This suffix can have a number of meanings centring on the term 'village'; however it can refer to 'house', 'manor' or 'estate'. There is also scope for confusion with the suffix -hamm, which means 'land in a river bend', 'river
meadow’, or ‘dry ground in a marsh’; it is conceivable that this term may be applicable in the case of the settlements along the Welland Valley.

The distribution of such settlements appears generally dispersed (Fig. 6.4), and if one accepts the notion of westward movement by the Anglo-Saxon people and their culture, the presence of these named settlements in the south and eastern part of the area would support the idea of these being ‘early’ dated settlements from the period before AD 731 (ibid., 224). It may be proposed that these represent the early ‘estate’ centres of the area, suggesting that certainly in the south and east of the area, settlement and conceivably landscape organisation had started by the late 6th/early 7th centuries. It is also possible that there was settlement in areas further to the west, although this may have been of the more dispersed type that was still not subject to territorial or estate control.

Settlements having the -ham suffix are in one of two groups, relating either to personal connection, or to location (Cox 1976, 61). In Leicestershire, Keyham and Wymondham both relate to homesteads in the ownership of Caega and Wig mund respectively (Bourne 2003, 55, 94), both OE personal names, as is the case with Wappenham (Northants.) which is indicative of the ownership of Waeppe (Whynne-Hammond 1994, 140). Greetham (Rut.) is descriptive of the surface geology, being the ‘settlement on stony soil’ (OE greot: gravel) (Bourne 2003, 105), and it is no coincidence that this is a place where the underlying geology is Northamptonshire Sandstone (ibid., 2003, 105). Similarly, in Northamptonshire, Higham Ferrars is the high -ham, standing as it does on the higher ground on the south side of the Nene Valley.

In terms of the landscape, the settlement hierarchy (albeit from a certain period or point in time) may be discernable: the use of personal names is suggestive of actual identity and possibly ownership, whilst the use of location terms implies that some settlements were given identities in relation to another settlement, rather than identities of their own.

6.5 -tūn Place-names

-tūn place-names are the most common in the landscape (Cox 1999, 225 and Fig. 6.5 below), although they occur only rarely in records prior to AD 731. From this early period only some six examples have been recorded, including Tomtun (Tamworth). It is
suggested (Zaluckyj 2001, 218) that amongst early place-names i.e. pre-AD 731, -tūn had a much more select meaning, denoting a ‘royal vill’.

From this, it should not necessarily be assumed that such settlements were all newly established after that date, but that they acquired a status that made them worthy of being recorded in written documents.

Such place-names can carry both personal names as prefixes for identity and also use other locational terms. In Leicestershire, both Braunstone and Evington have OE personal names – *Brant* and *Eafa*; however, other terms reflecting location or purpose can also be used. In Northamptonshire, Charwelton is the ‘-tūn on the Rover Cherwell’, while Duston, the Roman predecessor of Northampton, may have been the ‘-tūn on dusty soil’, although it is worth noting that OE dus is the word for ‘heap’, and the Scandinavian *dys* is a ‘grave’ or ‘barrow’, which in itself may indicate a settlement close to a burial site (Whynne-Hammond 1994, 51). In Rutland, Exton is derived from *oxa-tūn* or the ‘farm where oxen are kept’, and Stretton is the ‘-tūn on the Roman Road’.  

**Fig. 6.5: Distribution of -tūn Place-names**
6.6 Folk Names

Place-names that include the -ingas element are typically regarded as being early period Anglo-Saxon in date (Gelling 1988, 74). These were originally folk-names rather than place-names, which would represent a group of people or a grouping of people living together under a common leader and situated within a particular territory or location. It is now believed that these place-names stem from a period of territorial expansion away from the areas of earliest occupation. It is these areas of earliest settlement that are suggested as being related to areas of pagan burial rites and cemeteries. Thus this expansion period is thought to coincide with the advent of Christianity and changes in burial practice in the sixth century.

The distribution of -ingas place-names is not dissimilar to that of the -ham settlements, although they do occupy an area further to the south, being predominantly in Northamptonshire, with only three examples in Rutland and one in Leicestershire (see Fig. 6.6). These settlements lie in the eastern half of the area. This appears to support the notion of encroachment or movement into the area from the south and east into north Northamptonshire and Rutland, with possible movement through central Northamptonshire into south Leicestershire.

Fig. 6.6: Distribution of -ingas Place-names
The -ingas place-names are typically associated with personal names. Peatling (Magna and Parva) in Leicestershire and Rockingham in Northamptonshire are respectively settlements that carry personal names, being settlements of the people of Peotla and Hroca. However, such place-names do not exclusively relate to named groups that have a personal name to identify them, nor do they exclusively relate to settlements. In Rutland, Uppingham reflects its location, being the ‘settlement of the upland people’ or ‘the people who live on the hill’, while Nassington (Northants.) is the ‘farm of the headland dwellers’. Unless these people described themselves as ‘upland’ or ‘headland’ people, such place-names would seem to be of a type ascribed to them by others. A further example from Rutland is that of Whissendine: this again is descriptive of land, being the valley of the Hwiccingas (Hwiccingas -denu), although in this case it is related to a specific name and arguably reflects an element of acknowledgement of landscape ownership and organisation.

6.7 ‘Fort’ Place-names

Place-names that bear links to forts in the form of ‘ceaster’ for Roman sites, or ‘burh’ for Anglo-Saxon sites are not numerous, but they have a wide distribution which concentrates within the central zone of the area (see Fig. 6.7 below).

The one site of this type to be found in Rutland is the Roman small-town site at Great Casterton, on the route of the Ermine Street. The place-name here has its origins in -ceaster and -tun, i.e. ‘the settlement at the fortified Roman town’. Leicester, too, may have similar roots amongst the many that have been suggested (Bourne 2003, 58-9), including that of it being the fortified town of the Ligore/Legore – possibly a Celtic tribal name.

In Leicestershire, there are five ‘burh’ derivative sites. One of these is Burbage on the line of the Watling Street, while the remainder form a line to the north-east of Leicester, which is centred on Birstall and Queniborough and has Loughborough to the north-west and Burrough-on-the-Hill to the east. Given the distribution of Scandinavian place-names and their concentration in the north-east of Leicestershire and along the Wreake Valley, it is tempting to suggest that this formed a kind of barrier or boundary to large-scale Scandinavian settlement, ensuring a form of confinement to this area. In addition to these, there are also three ‘Burton’ settlements - i.e. ‘the settlement at the fortified
place', - Burton Lazars, Burton-on-the-Wolds and at Burton Overy, the suggestion being that they have a late Anglo-Saxon origin, created in order to face the threat of Viking incursions in the 9th century (ibid., 2003, 36). Given this wide distribution, one can only wonder how this system was to work, unless they were part of a broader network of fortified sites. If that was the case, this would point to a highly organised landscape by the later middle Anglo-Saxon period.

In Northamptonshire, it is possible to discern two groups or lines of 'burh'-derived settlements, one along the Nene Valley and the other along the south side of the Welland Valley. While these appear to be isolated groups, the former may suggest, when taken in conjunction with the presence of the forests of Rockingham to the north and Whittlewood and Salcey to the south, that these areas of woodland were not suitable for mass movement and that any movement would have had to be via these 'burh' sites principally between Rockingham and Whittlewood, but also along the Watling Street on the south side of Whittlewood. The latter group of sites lie on the south side of the clay uplands and would seem to have been situated so as to oversee any approach from the south.
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In Northamptonshire, it is possible to discern two groups or lines of ‘burh’-derived settlements, one along the Nene Valley and the other along the south side of the Welland Valley. While these appear to be isolated groups, the former may suggest, when taken in conjunction with the presence of the forests of Rockingham to the north and Whittlewood and Salcey to the south, that these areas of woodland were not suitable for mass movement and that any movement would have had to be via these ‘burh’ sites principally between Rockingham and Whittlewood, but also along the Watling Street on the south side of Whittlewood. The latter group of sites lie on the south side of the clay uplands and would seem to have been situated so as to oversee any approach from the south.
6.8 ‘Word’ Settlements

‘Word’ or ‘worth’ has a primary translation in terms of settlement as an ‘enclosure’. Settlements with this suffix do not occur in written Anglo-Saxon records prior to AD 731; however, by the end of the 8th century it would appear to have developed a meaning of greater significance. A case in point is Tamworth (Staffs.), to the west of Leicestershire, just across the county boundary on Watling Street, at the confluence of the rivers Tame and Anker. As Cox points out (ibid., 224) the settlement was first recorded as being the Royal caput of the kings of Mercia in AD 781 although it also appears to have been a Royal vill, in the form of Tomtun in the early 8th century, the vicus of King Ædilred (Zaluckyj 2001, 218). But if, at that time, place-names reflected the status of the settlement, should it not have been given an -ingas suffix? One would have expected it to have been given a name of greater standing than that of being ‘an enclosure’, unless the ‘enclosure’ was a high status nomenclature with -ingas being more suggestive of ownership or possession.

While lying just outside the study area, the change of place-name of Tamworth, from Tomtun (if the two do in fact represent one and the same settlement) is of interest. In the first instance, it suggests that the principle of the naming of settlements was not so established to such an extent that they were unchangeable, but similarly, while this was the vicus of King Ædilred, it did not have its name changed to represent Ædilred’s ownership. This may in turn suggest that the application of personal names to place-names, at least within Anglo-Saxon society, had either been discontinued by this time, or had not yet started. Certainly, in later times, for example with the Scandinavian incursions and settlement, places acquired personal names.

The distribution of -word place-names shows a clear change from names discussed above (Fig 6.8). In this case, except for Harringworth, the settlements are located in the western half of the area and seem to occur as paired settlements 6-9kms apart.

This apparent pattern raises the notion of paired or ‘twinned’ settlements, although here the relationship is over a larger distance or area. Being largely confined to the western half of the three counties, this may suggest that in this area an alternative form of landscape organisation was in force. An alternative proposal may be that -worth settlements and -hām settlements may have had a similar status as estate centres and
that by the latter part of the 8th century AD place-names had become largely established in the landscape, thereby meaning that -ham settlements remained largely to the east while the 'newer' -worth settlements were situated to the west.

The -word settlements of the area all appear to have personal roots to their names: Bagworth in Leicestershire is 'Bacga's settlement', while in Northamptonshire, Arthingworth is 'the settlement of Earna's people' and Harringworth is 'Hering's enclosure'.

6.9 Woodland Settlements

The main place-names that relate directly to woodland settlement are the -ley and -hurst settlements, plus the linked -feld names. The first two groups have been interpreted as meaning inhabited clearings surrounded by woodland, while those in the latter category were an open space in sight of woodland (Rackham 1986, 82).

Place-names having 'woodland' links occur in several main areas (see Fig. 6.9). In north-west Leicestershire is a group in Charnwood Forest, of which Charley is an example, recorded as 'Cernelega' in Domesday Book, this is a descriptive name of
which the first part is the Celtic *carn* (‘a heap of stones’) and the second element is OE *leah* being a ‘wood’ or a ‘clearing in a wood’ (Bourne 2003, 38). In the centre of the research area is a group which spans the borders of Leicestershire and Rutland and spreads into central north Northamptonshire which may relate in part to the area of Leighfield Forest. Settlements in this area include Wardley (Rut.) and Wakerley (Northants.), both of which have similar meanings. The *-ley* suffix is, as above, from the OE *leah* being ‘a clearing’, and the prefixes are, respectively OE *weard* meaning ‘watch’ (ibid., 112), and OE *wacor* or *wacra* which translates as ‘watchful’ or ‘the watchful ones’ (Whynne-Hammond 1994, 139). The third group lies south of Northampton around the area of Whittlewood Forest with examples such as Cosgrove and Deanshanger, both of which may be personally named sites, being ‘*Cufel’s* grove’, and ‘*Dynne’s* wooded pasture’ (ibid., 39 & 46-7).

Interestingly, the Rockingham Forest area of north-east Northamptonshire appears to be devoid of such place-names. This reinforces the suggestion that Anglo-Saxon settlement was more likely to be found on the fringes of wooded areas rather than in the heart of the woodland; any activity within the forests having been short term seasonal/industrial activity. It is possible that the cluster of settlements to the north-east of present-day...
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Northampton may actually reflect fringe settlement on the outskirts of Rockingham Forest, for in current terms this area appears to be devoid of woodland. This would, in turn, indicate that the extent of the woodland as calculated based on the Domesday Book figures, was much reduced in comparison to the earlier Anglo-Saxon period. Potentially therefore, the area covered by Rockingham Forest in north-eastern Northamptonshire and Leighfield Forest in south-eastern Leicestershire and in Rutland was significantly bigger than at the time of the Domesday survey, which implies that this area saw considerable exploitation of the woodland resources.

In conjunction with settlement, the more informative place-names are those with woodland estate connotations. Two prime examples are the villages of Waltham-on-the-Wolds (Leics.) and Old (Northants.). Waltham place-names have their origins in OE -wald and OE -ham being respectively a ‘large tract of woodland’ or ‘high forest land’ and a ‘village or estate’. These names are regarded as being typically early Anglo-Saxon of the period prior to AD 600 (i.e. late 6th century) and they are often found close to the routes of Roman roads (Bourne 2003, 89). In the case of Leicestershire, close correlations can be discerned between such place-names and, for example, the route of Watling Street, Gartree Road, and the un-named Roman road that continues from Leicester to the north-west. In Northamptonshire similar links can be identified around the line of Watling Street in the south-west of the county and in the north along the route of Gartree Road through the Rockingham Forest area.

An example that would fit this notion is the village of Roade (Northants.) which has two possible roots for its name: firstly, the OE rad meaning ‘road’ or ‘track’, and secondly, OE rod being ‘open woodland’ (Whynne-Hammond 1994, 119). Conceivably, both of these options fit; the village lies within the bounds of the ancient Whittlewood Forest, but it also lies on the route of a suggested Roman road that would have extended from Towcester to Duston (Taylor & Flitcroft 2004, 64, fig. 6.1).

6.10 Water Settlements

In Leicestershire, settlements of this category show two main concentrations, with ‘ford’ and ‘spring’ names in the north-east and ‘brook’, ‘spring’ and ‘ford’ in the south-west along the line of Watling Street. Rutland has a small number of such sites with a
general distribution, while Northamptonshire has a number of these sites evenly distributed along the length of the county from south-west to north-east (see Fig. 6.10).

Fig. 6.10: Distribution of ‘water’ Place-names

Of the four defined categories – brook, pool, spring and ford, the first three are good locations for settlement: they provide sources of water for habitation. The density of settlement around Medbourne (Leics.) may attest to this, being the ‘meadow stream’ from OE mead and burna, which still flows through the village to the Welland, while Braybrooke (Northants.) originates from the OE brad broc, or ‘broad stream’. Elsewhere, Barwell (Leics.) was the OE bar wella (boar well or stream) and Ashwell (Rut.) was the well or stream where the ash trees grew. In Northamptonshire, Harpole was the muddy pool (horh pol), with ‘pol’ being the same word in both Celtic and OE (Whynne-Hammond 1994, 70).

The fourth category, the ford, is more of a location that is ‘on the way to somewhere else’, and by definition, it suggests movement. In Northamptonshire, the majority of the ‘ford’ sites are along the Nene Valley, for example at Woodford (‘the ford by the wood’) and at Lilford (‘Lilla’s ford’), and also in the west of the county. This may indicate that these were main routes of movement and this may further reinforce the notion of the River Nene being a form of territorial boundary. These fords, while being
crossing points, may also have been places where travellers were made to cross, thereby implying an element of control in the landscape and in the movement of people. Interestingly, there are very few crossing points along the course of the Welland, which may indicate that it too was a boundary of some form although it may not have been a boundary at all, merely being an internal feature of a territory that could be crossed at will.

6.11 Hill and Valley Settlement

In topographical terms, the distribution of place-names that have links to hill and valley terminology are largely predictable. In Northamptonshire, the majority lie close to the clay uplands of the western side of the county, with the remainder being along the valleys of the rivers Nene and Welland, either in the valleys or on the uplands, particularly along the southern side of the Nene. In Leicestershire, the main concentrations of these settlements are in the west of the county around Charnwood Forest, which is the highest part of the county, and in the east on the clay uplands of 'High' Leicestershire (Fig. 6.11).
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In north-west Leicestershire, Shepshed was 'the hill where sheep graze', or the OE *sceap* and *heafod*, while Hoton was the 'settlement on the spur of land' or the 'hill settlement', from *hoh* and *-tun*. This name too occurs in the east of the county in the clay uplands of 'High' Leicestershire with Houghton-on-the-Hill, and further to the east lies Billesdon being the OE name *Bill* with *dun* – 'a hill'. Further to the east, Rutland has very few settlements of this type. Two examples are Barrowden, overlooking the Welland Valley, being 'the hill with burial mounds', and also Essendine, which is the OE 'Essa's valley' from the name *Essa* and *denu* – a valley.

In Northamptonshire, the villages of (West) Haddon and Helmdon have similar roots to the above Rutland villages. Haddon was 'a heath covered hill' from the OE *heath* and *dun*, while Helmdon has personal links from the OE *Helma* and *denu*, giving 'Helma's valley'.

### 6.12 Discussion

In terms of understanding the landscape and settlement, two combining textual features can be identified: the writing of 'charters' and the recording of place-names, with the main record of the time being the Domesday Book. Leicestershire does not benefit from the charter evidence of other parts of England, and only now is consideration being given to the identification of estates from Domesday sources, whereas more detailed consideration of landscape continuity has been carried out in Northamptonshire.

By the late 7th century, landscape, or estate organisation was established as a practice: while the majority of surviving Anglo-Saxon charter documents date from the 10th century, the earliest 'original' charter is that of Hlothhere, king of Kent, dated to AD 697. This notes the established boundaries of an estate, albeit in basic terms, which may follow Roman models (Jenkyns 1999, 97). This, in itself would suggest that there was a degree of continuity of practice in estate formation, between the late Roman period and the early/mid Anglo-Saxon era. The natural conclusion from this is that for documents of this type to be effective in defining estates, places must be recognisable, and for them to be recognisable, they need to have names.

Possibly by the late 7th century, and certainly by the 8th century, Anglo-Saxon place-names had become established. The conclusion from this is that settlement activity had
moved on from the small-scale, self-sufficient lifestyle of the early Anglo-Saxons in the 5th and 6th centuries AD to a wider scale range of activity where notions of land-ownership existed, there was territorialism and the concept of ‘place’ was important, being able to identify places and where and what they were. This would indicate a growing need to contact and communicate with people over longer distances; as a consequence of this there would be a need to establish a means recognising or identifying known places and routes so that they could be referred to and identified at a level beyond that of the immediate locality.

The other clear implication regarding the establishment and nucleation of villages, is that this implies that settlements as entities in the landscape were being established at a similar point in time and would start to develop, acquiring their identity from the vill where they were situated.

The notion of the chronology of –ham and –tun place-names is well-established, with the former being numerically dominant in the period up to the mid-8th century, while the latter appear more numerous from the late 8th century onwards. It could be proposed that the relative scarcity of –ham place-names may strengthen the claim for the interpretation of the name as a ‘manor’ or ‘estate’, being a select few high status settlements. What the distribution still reflects, however, is a very strong bias by early Anglo-Saxon settlement towards the eastern half of the three counties.

The next question regards the extent to which the establishment of ‘named’ settlements, together with the necessary social changes that must have taken place to establish the notions of territory and ‘place’, followed in the wake of early ‘settlers’ spreading across the landscape? It is probably a natural progression that, as with the pioneers of the American west, settlers will move across the landscape and eventually settle - in the ideal world - in suitable and advantageous places and ‘territories’ will then develop; with the development of ‘territories’ also follows the notions of ‘leadership’, ‘ownership’ and possessory titles.

In the case of a landscape that is already occupied, those options may not immediately apply, in which case settlers may have to accept a location that is the least unsuitable, and which has few apparent advantages, other than it is unoccupied. This may well be the scenario that was faced by the early Anglo-Saxon settlers in coming into what was
essentially an occupied late-Roman landscape. It is possible that there then followed a process whereby established settlements may have fallen under Anglo-Saxon influence and OE place-names replaced the pre-existing British or Romano-British names in general usage.

It is also important to note that new place-names do not necessarily mean either new people, or new settlements. The evidence from the Wreake Valley, Leicestershire, and the excavations at Eye Kettleby, demonstrates a Scandinavian re-named settlement (Cooper 1995, 4) which archaeological excavation has demonstrated has clear earlier Anglo-Saxon origins. This then raises the scenario of new 'lords' or landowners imposing control and re-naming an area or a place: new place-names need not mean new places.
CHAPTER 7

Data Analysis and Modelling

'Such is, in short, the result of an examination of the interesting but not too copious remains from the county that are dealt with in this chapter; but it is important to consider what is conspicuously absent, and so to give light and shade to what would otherwise be the slightest of sketches'  
(Leicestershire Victoria County History 1907, 221)

7.1 Introduction

In addressing the study of Anglo-Saxon settlement and the issues of continuity of occupation and new settlement, two key themes stand out: (i) Continuity, (ii) Proximity.

These twin issues of continuity and proximity within the study of the landscape and land- and/or site-use are of prime importance in terms of transitional periods such as that between the late Roman period and that of the early Anglo-Saxons as well as from the dispersed settlement patterns of the early Anglo-Saxon period and the move towards nucleated settlement (Hawkes, forthcoming).

In seeking to differentiate between the resident Romano-British population and a possible immigrant population as represented by the early Angles, Saxons and Jutes of the 5th century, it is important to try and identify sites where one can claim continuity of occupation from the late Roman into the early Anglo-Saxon period, and possibly beyond, and contrast these with sites where there appears to have been no apparent prior Roman use. However, does continuity have to be in immediate proximity to the site in question for it to represent continuity? If not, how far does it have to be from the site before it becomes new use or occupation as opposed to continued occupation?

7.2 Villa Continuity

The Roman villa is regarded as being typically representative of the rural structure of late Roman Britain. As a result it would be expected that if there were to be evidence of continuity of activity and ownership in the landscape between the late Roman period
and the early Anglo-Saxon period, villa sites would be a prime source to investigate for evidence.

Continuity (from Roman to Anglo-Saxon) can take place on three levels, and these may help to differentiate between new people moving into the landscape and the survival of those who were already occupying it (Hawkes, forthcoming). The three levels are:

1. Spatial continuity whereby settlement continues in close proximity (e.g. within 1km) to a site but without using the site of former Roman buildings;
2. Physical continuity where these original (even if ruinous) buildings are put to use;
3. Landscape continuity whereby elements of the old site, such as field divisions, are retained and are put to use;

The characteristics of such continuity can be seen more easily from excavations and surveys elsewhere in England: at Orton Hall Farm (Cambs.), Frocester (Glos.) and Wharram Percy (Yorks.) respectively.

At Orton Hall Farm on the outskirts of Peterborough (see Fig. 7.1 below), excavation showed continuity of a farming settlement in five phases spanning the whole of the Romano-British period with the final phase lasting from the mid/late 4th century AD into the early 6th century (Mackreth 1996, 27-42).

![Fig. 7.1: Orton Hall Farm, Peterborough (after Mackreth 1996)]
Excavations at Frocester, Gloucestershire, also show significant physical continuity of use of an area from the Bronze Age and Iron Age, into the Roman period. In the early Roman period the site was simply a working farmstead; in contrast, the construction of a multi-storey winged villa has been dated to the later part of the 3rd century with additional gentrification taking place in the mid-4th century. The significant evidence from the settlement at Frocester is the evidence for the 5th-6th centuries: scatters of grass-tempered pottery have been identified across the villa site (Gracie & Price 1979, 17, fig. 6). These scatters have been studied in some detail (Fowler 1970, 50-1) and when plotted on the site plan, their main concentrations coincide with identified areas of post-Roman activity, namely the eastern half of the villa, the central courtyard area and the two structures at the eastern and southern corners of the site (Price 2000b, 137) (see Fig. 7.2). The presence of identifiably Anglo-Saxon artefacts, namely a glass bead, part of a glass claw beaker (Price 2000c, 169), together with a leaf-shaped pendant and a socketed spear head (Price 2000a, 115), as well as post-hole structures are all indicative of continued use in the late Roman or early post-Roman period. The Frocester villa was described by its excavator as being "...unusual in that it is one of the few villas where occupation appears to go on down into the 5th and 6th centuries, but it is occupation of an increasingly impoverished type." (Price 2000c, 18).

Fig. 7.2: Anglo-Saxon pottery at Frocester Roman Villa
(after Gracie & Price 1979, fig. 6)
In Yorkshire, work at Wharram Percy (Rahtz et al. 1986) has revealed a Roman landscape dominated by seemingly high status villa sites at Wharram Le Street and Wharram Grange, but here too, there is what can be interpreted as material continuity. These villas may have been centres of estates with discrete and defined boundaries and in the view of the excavators these may even have been robust enough in local and regional terms to have survived any political, social or economic changes of the transitional period of the 5th and 6th centuries. Fieldwalking has revealed scatters of Anglo-Saxon pottery, which suggests a settlement pattern of greater density than that of the Roman period, although less regular in its pattern of distribution across the landscape (Fig. 7.3).

Fig. 7.3: The Anglo-Saxon landscape near Wharram Percy (after Rahtz et al. 1986)
The signs of villa continuity can be seen, depending upon the scale of excavation or the extent of landscape survey. The evidence from finds in Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire suggests a high number of villa sites which show no evidence for continuity: in excess of 80% of the recorded villa sites in each county show not only no evidence of continuity from the Roman period into the Anglo-Saxon period, but also appear to have no Iron Age predecessor (see Chart 7.1). One note of caution in these figures is that in recent times, a number of the new villa sites have been found through fieldwalking with no subsequent excavation, while the finds from earlier discoveries may repay further examination, particularly of the ‘Iron Age’ pottery, which may be difficult to separate from early Anglo-Saxon material (Cooper, pers. comm.); thus, continued activity on villa sites in the post-Roman period may be more prevalent than is currently thought.

Chart 7.1: Villa continuity
At present, approximately only 6% of villa sites in Leicestershire and Rutland and 13% in Northamptonshire demonstrate some form of continuity of occupation from the Prehistoric/Iron Age period to the Roman period, and across the three counties an average of just 5% of sites show signs of continuity from the Roman period to the Anglo-Saxon period (see Appendix 2). Whilst these figures are low, nonetheless where further excavation has been carried out on sites, it has produced material of the Anglo-Saxon period as is the case also at Piddington and Whitehall Farm, Northamptonshire, and at Empingham, Rutland. When studying villa and landscape continuity, the recurring problem is that of the nature of the material culture of the post-Roman period and the nature of the activity conducted there: in each case the physical evidence may be scarce - in marked contrast to that of the late Roman era; in consequence, recognition of such early Anglo-Saxon presence in the course of excavation may be difficult.

7.3 The Landscape

The key feature of the Romano-British landscape was the road network which served to connect the major towns, and remnants of this network with its made-up, metalled surfaces are still visible in places, either through their physical presence or as a result of the subsequent creation of boundaries based upon the use of existing Roman roads. A good example of this is the county boundary between Leicestershire and Warwickshire which follows the route of Watling Street, while the route of the Roman road into Leicester from Watling Street in the south-west of the county can be identified from the linear arrangement of parish boundaries in the area. This also reinforces the notion of continuity in as much as the roads themselves still had a presence and role in the landscape in the post-Roman period and well beyond.

In the Roman period, roads were key in settlement location, in a society that was organised and administered on a regional or national basis. The population needed easy access to markets both to acquire goods and to transport produce for sale. With the break-down of the market system, and an increasing emphasis on self-sufficiency, such a need diminishes at a local level, and the data from fieldwork suggest that there was movement away from roads towards locations that were more suited for a self-sufficient lifestyle; most typically this involved sites with a supply of running water, either a
spring or a stream. At Brooksby in the Wreake Valley, in the Langtons and at Stonton Wyville in Leicestershire, we find Roman settlement along the route of a road; however, after Roman settlement fails in the late 4th/early 5th centuries, Anglo-Saxon settlement develops at alternative locations away from the road, but close to sources of water (Figs 7.4 & 7.5 below).

Roads do not, however, appear to have been totally neglected in 5th and 6th century society. Not only do they show signs of use as territorial boundaries, as considered above, but their continued use as corridors of communication may be confirmed by the presence of burials close to roads. Such actions may serve one of two functions: burial in close proximity to a road may have been used as a means of preserving the memory of a person of high status within a territorial area, as can be suggested with the warrior burial at Wollaston, Northamptonshire (Meadows 1997, 395); alternatively, road burials may have been used to reinforce a boundary, with the dead either serving as a spiritual guardians of a territory, keeping watch over its boundaries, or, depending upon who was buried there, serving as a warning to aggressors that they too may meet their end in that place. This latter interpretation may be seen as incomers seeking to impose their authority in that locality.
As regards status and burial, it may not be coincidence that the richly furnished burial site in Rutland at North Luffenham, which produced a significant number of weapon burials, occupies a prominent location on high ground overlooking the valleys of the rivers Gwash and Chater (Cooper 2000, 151), while other burial sites, larger and individual, generally lie in much less visually obtrusive locations along valley bottoms.

Fig. 7.5: The Langtons and Stonton Wyville with Anglo-Saxon settlement focus on watercourses (Bowman 1996, fig. 3)

Firm evidence for large-scale settlement is still largely elusive; few opportunities have arisen for excavation and thus the majority of sites remain located through fieldwalking without any further investigation. Eye Kettleby, Leicestershire, remains the one major settlement to have been excavated within the study area, although Northamptonshire has a wider distribution of excavated Anglo-Saxon sites. Analysis of the dimensions of the structures demonstrates a similarity to other early period sites that have been excavated,
for example the 5th to 7th century settlement at West Stow, Suffolk (West 1985), and also reveals the differences between early period structures and the larger structures of the Middle Saxon period e.g. Maxey and Raunds (see Charts 7.2 and 7.3 below).

Chart 7.2: English Anglo-Saxon Post-Built Structures – Comparison of dimensions
From seven key sites that have been excavated, which geographically range from Bishopstone, Sussex, to Thirlings, Northumberland, predominantly the majority of PBSs were between 5m and 10m in length, with a width around 5m.

The PBSs at Eye Kettleby (Leics.) and Brixworth (Northants.) clearly demonstrate conformity to the national trend of lengths of 5m to 10m and widths of around 5m. The PBSs at Maxey and Raunds (Northants.) also demonstrate widths of around 5m, but lengths extend to 15m and 20m respectively. This may reflect the use of a ‘modular’ system of 5m x 5m blocks in constructing these PBSs.
7.4 Urban Continuity

7.4.1 Leicestershire and Rutland

What happened at the end of the Roman period? The general view with regard to Roman towns has been one of a break in urban activity and the archaeological evidence would appear to support this with examples of the abandoned walled town at Calleva (Silchester), or Verulamium (relocated to St Albans) as well as the numerous deserted ‘small-town’ sites which have no direct successor. However, other major Roman towns, for example Leicester, Lincoln, York and London, all flourished in the medieval period and thereafter, which suggests that the issue of urban continuity/discontinuity is not a clear-cut division.

In terms of ‘continuity’, the city of Leicester provides evidence for a sequence of ‘continuity of occupation’ which appears to be unbroken: present-day Leicester, with a population of towards 300,000 can be seen to be a direct descendant of the prosperous county town of the medieval period, which has its roots in the walled of the Roman town, which, in turn, lies on the site of the Iron Age settlement on the banks of the River Soar. But ‘continuity’ from one to another is not fully secure. In the case of late Iron Age to Roman Leicester, do we see:

- ‘Roman’ occupation taking place with the introduction of a new Roman population coming into a place? or
- ‘Romanised’ occupation being introduced by the adoption (possibly imposed, but possibly adapted) of Roman ways by an established resident population willing to embrace new ideas?

Similarly, evidence of an Anglo-Saxon presence, in the form of structures and artefacts, is identifiable, ranging from cremation burials outside the gates of the town (Cottrill 1946), to pottery fragments inside the walled area (Connor & Buckley 1999) and traces of post-built structures both inside and outside the Roman town (Finn 2004) (see also section 3.5.1.2). This would suggest that Anglo-Saxon groups were present in the late Roman period or soon afterwards, and that the organisation of the town, for example extra-mural burial practice, was still being respected. With regard to urban character, despite the somewhat fragmentary nature of the archaeology of the post-Roman/early
medieval period, when viewed in conjunction with the history of the town for the period prior to the Norman Conquest, during which it was elevated to the position of Bishopric and the later had a major role within the Danelaw area (Courtney 1998), an argument can be presented for the continued central and regional role of the town.

Rutland, by comparison, is largely un-urbanised: its two ‘urban’ Roman sites are the small towns at Thistleton and Great Casterton, the former distinctly industrial in nature, not unlike other similar sites such as that at Goadby Marwood (Leics.); Great Casterton, however, lies on Ermine Street and while it lacks overt evidence of Anglo-Saxon period occupation - due in part to the lack of detailed investigation within the circuit of the town walls (Corder 1951, 1954, 1961) - excavation has revealed a number of extramural Anglo-Saxon period cremations and burials, some close to Roman burials (Granger & Mahany 1985). As with Leicester, this may indicate the presence of a new population, either living alongside the ‘Roman’ population but being culturally different, or occupying a Romano-British site in the post-Roman period, possibly replacing the indigenous population and yet respecting and continuing existing traditions or customs in terms of burial location (if not practice).

7.4.2 Northamptonshire

Northamptonshire appears to be significantly different to Leicestershire and Rutland: like Rutland, it too lacked a major Roman urban centre to act as an influence on the landscape; as a town, the earliest reference to Northampton itself is from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for AD 917 (Williams 1977, 131). This is not to say that the area around present-day Northampton was not a focal point in the landscape, with the Roman settlement at Duston to the west and Hunsbury Iron Age hillfort to the south. There does, however, seem to be an identifiable concentration of early Anglo-Saxon activity to the north of the River Nene extending north to Brixworth; again this relationship to settlement and river may further reinforce the notion of such features as boundaries, as could also be suggested with the River Soar between the eastern and western halves of Leicestershire.

The ‘Northamptonshire Extensive Urban Survey’ (Taylor et al. 2002), which seeks to assess the archaeological potential of urban settlements and those which may have had urban attributes from the Roman period onwards, has provided a summary of the
historical development of the Roman ‘small towns’ of Northamptonshire, all of which appear bigger and better defined than those in either Leicestershire or Rutland. A general trend in the history of these sites, based upon coin finds from fieldwalking data, is their origins in the pre-Roman Iron Age, with the presence of Roman material dated to the mid- to late first century or early second century AD. Furthermore, rarely does occupation appear to continue beyond the fourth century. The main issue here is again one of proximity or continuity.

The nature and evidence for late Roman activity are not always clear: this is the case at Duston (Taylor 2002b, 8) where quarrying has had a major impact on the archaeology; at Kings Sutton (Taylor 2002c, 7) featuring minimal excavation within the settled area; and at Ashton where the dating of material suggests that occupation continued into the 5th century AD, but without any Anglo-Saxon material of the early to middle periods (Taylor 2002a, 8).

It cannot be said that Anglo-Saxon activity is lacking from these sites: at Titchmarsh, again a town with Roman ‘roots’, there is evidence of an Early/Middle Anglo-Saxon settlement (Taylor 2002d, 8). It is suggested here that its role as a small town or as a local market was lost during this transition period (ibid., 8). Similarly at Ashton, the discovery of Anglo-Saxon material nearby on the north bank of the Nene, at Oundle, is indicative of the establishment of a new settlement (Taylor 2002a, 8).

This evidence for lack of continuity on Roman ‘small town’ sites in Northamptonshire is matched in Leicestershire, with only Medbourne demonstrating an Anglo-Saxon presence within the town area. Rutland too, with its two ‘small towns’ of Great Casterton and Thistleton/Market Overton, demonstrates little physical evidence of continuity of occupation within the settlement areas. Both sites however demonstrate evidence for a late Roman presence, and at Thistleton this includes finds described as being of the late 4th or early 5th century (Garwood, unpub.). In the case of both settlements, what they do have is evidence of Anglo-Saxon burials, at Great Casterton outside the main gate and close to Roman burials and at Market Overton to the west of Thistleton. These burials are in close proximity to the Roman sites but as yet no clear evidence for post-Roman settlement has been identified nearby.
The evidence from town sites, both large and small, is contrasting. In the case of the Roman 'small towns', the trend appears to be one of lack of continuity with general decline in the late Roman period accompanied by associated Anglo-Saxon settlement being indicative of proximity, rather than of continuity. This could be explained by the failure of the economic or market system in the late Roman period which meant that it was impossible to produce the surplus crops and materials that were required to support larger centres of occupation. As a consequence, the residents of those settlements may have moved out to adopt a more self-sufficient and dispersed pattern of settlement. In terms of late Roman decline, this process was already underway with towns in general being less active as the villas developed and interacted less with the towns, rather than this process occurring as a result of the withdrawal of formal Roman authority in the early 5th century.

7.5 Anglo-Saxon Population and Settlement

Artefacts, particularly from burials, reflect the largely 'Anglian' nature of the population (see Sections 1.10.3.1 & 1.10.3.2). What is difficult is the analysis of the data in order to differentiate between a possible incoming Anglo-Saxon population and their settlement and the native population.

A number of villages recorded in Domesday Book have produced artefacts that span the period from the pre-Roman Iron Age, into the Roman period and then the Anglo-Saxon period. This would suggest continuity of occupation by an indigenous population who may have acquired or adopted the characteristic 'trappings' of those respective periods. From a research view-point, the problem is that those villages may have often formed the focal points of medieval nucleated villages; such places present limited opportunity for excavation of the scale typically required to identify earlier phases of occupation beyond the level of casual or isolated finds. In this respect, the work conducted as part of the Whittlewood Project (Page & Jones 2003), as well as the Channel 4 Television 'Big Dig' project (Priest & Cooper 2004), has served to demonstrate the value of 'test-pitting' as an archaeological technique within village environments. This can be contrasted with those examples of Anglo-Saxon settlement with no apparent predecessor (e.g. Eye Kettleby, Leics.).
Those village sites which show apparent continuity of activity (even if not an unbroken sequence) can be contrasted against those which show no evidence for continuity. This may represent the difference between the vestiges of the dispersed settlement of the early Anglo-Saxons which were abandoned, and those which survived the transition towards nucleated settlements and formed the basis of the landscape of medieval England.

The dating of settlements can be considered in relation to place-names. It is likely that the process of settlement naming would have been a widespread activity, if not one that was initially recorded. As Margaret Gelling says of Cox’s 1976 analysis ‘some types of place-name were just coming into fashion c.AD 730, and that other types were obsolescent at that date’ (Gelling 1988, 69). The evidence of the study area would seem to confirm this with typically early place-name suffix varieties, e.g. \textit{ham} and \textit{ingas}, being confined to the east of the area (see Sections 5.4 & 5.6, figs 5.3 & 5.5 above), while a late form \textit{wörö} commonly occurs in the west of the area, suggesting an east-west movement of early settlement. Meanwhile \textit{tun} has an area-wide distribution (although again with gaps coinciding with wooded areas) suggesting a later use once nucleated settlement was more widely adopted.

7.6 Towards Settlement Nucleation in the Middle Saxon Period

7.6.1 Population

One of the key changes associated with the Middle Saxon period is the drawing together of a dispersed population to create larger, more centralised, nucleated settlements. It is this change, defined by the presence of villages as recorded in Domesday Book, and the creation of parish boundaries that were therefore established (if not complete) by the late 11th or 12th century, and which, in turn, set the pattern for the settlement patterns that largely persists today (Wade Martins 1995, 29). It is important to bear in mind that settlement nucleation did not occur across the whole of the English landscape, and as can be seen from the evidence of the Whittlewood Project, even at a local level, zones of nucleation and of dispersed settlement continue to co-exist (Christie 2003, 10).

The visibility of the population in the middle Anglo-Saxon period is hampered by the constant problem of the characteristics of the material culture of the period and the
identification of the ceramic material in particular: (See Chapter 2, sections 2.1.1 & 2.1.2):

1. In Leicestershire and Rutland, what is seen as ‘typical’ Anglo-Saxon pottery — the dark, coarse, hand-made fabrics, locally made and fired at low temperatures — may have only been in use for the early Anglo-Saxon period, up to about the end of the 6th century. This suggestion is based upon an inability to differentiate the pottery of the middle Saxon period from that of the earlier period, and the interpretation of negative data has contributed to a theory that the region entered an ‘aceramic’ period (Knox 2004, 103). One fabric that may contribute to a reinterpretation of early to middle Saxon pottery, is the Charnwood ‘granitic tempered’ pottery; not only do similarities exist with local examples of prehistoric fabrics in terms of inclusions (Williams & Vince 1997, 218). This, in turn suggests a possible period of use, at least for this fabric, spanning the first millennium AD. This prolonged period of use suggests that there was an advantage to be gained from such a fabric; this may have been benefits for the potter in pot formation and/or firing, but an alternative interpretation, albeit less easy to prove, may have been that the fabric may have had some form of symbolic significance (Knight et al 2003, 121).

2. In Northamptonshire, the adopted view is that the period over which the early-middle Anglo-Saxon wares remained in use is substantially longer, approximately AD 450 to 850, and generally they cannot be dated more closely than this broad period (Perrin 2006, 91). During this time the fabrics remained largely unaltered, with changes being difficult to identify accurately.

There are, therefore, two scenarios: either the population declines severely, with a reduction in the visibility of the material culture; consequently with the adoption of organic materials, for example wood and leather, as alternatives to ceramics, the evidence of settlements tends to be lost from the archaeological record until the appearance of the Ipswich and Maxey wares in East Anglia in the 8th centuries (Hurst 1976), or the ceramic material is in use, unchanged, for a long period. In view of this, how can the changes in the Anglo-Saxon period be recognised?
7.6.2 Changes

The general transition from the Early to the Middle Anglo-Saxon period is conventionally set to c.650, with the 7th century seeing an increased tendency towards the definition of settlement space (Reynolds 1999, 50). The late 7th century saw the earliest charters recording places and features in written form, so it was at that time that the notions of ‘location’, ‘belonging’ and ‘identity’ probably became more important, along with ‘status’ and land ownership. This period follows the coming of Christianity to Britain in the form of St Augustine in AD 597 and the mission of St Aidan in AD 634 (Walker 2000, 176). Christianity came to Mercia through two monks: Diuma, from Ireland, who became the first bishop of Mercia, and Cedd from Northumbria (ibid., xii). This had a progressive impact on burials and, in time, on rural and urban organisation. This scenario has been described for the East Midlands (Lewis et al. 2001, 95) as a landscape of small farms and hamlets being supplanted by nucleated villages in the period post AD 850, which suggests a gradual process of change over a period of 150 to 200 years. It is important to consider that this should not be regarded as a definitive statement, and that local conditions may have created circumstances which could have brought on nucleation before or after AD 850.

Two factors can be identified for the early medieval period of AD 450 – 850, which have links to the preceding Roman era and the subsequent Norman Conquest. In the case of the former, the Roman administrative system functioned in two ways, being a hierarchical system, akin to ‘lordship’, while also being a well organised ‘market economy’. Both of these aspects gave a degree of structure or organisation to the landscape and settlement which would appear to have been lost at the start of the 5th century and created a vacuum in the landscape leading to the need for greater self-sufficiency and hence the evolution towards a more dispersed form of settlement.

The other factor that is applicable to the early period in comparison to the subsequent pre-Norman Conquest era is the impact of Christianity and the Church on settlement and social customs. Probably the most apparent change that can be associated with this period is the change in burial traditions, with the adoption of a Christian east-west orientation of the body, together with the reduction in the presence of grave-goods. Härke puts forward the view that by the 7th century the presence of weapons in burials had almost become common-place, ceasing to be an ethnic indicator, and thereby losing
its special significance, before ultimately being replaced by an archaeologically less visible symbolism (1992, 164-165). In clear contrast to this change is the presence of high status 'royal' burials as at Sutton Hoo (Suffolk) (Carver 2005), Prittlewell (Essex) (MoLAS 2004), and Wollaston (Northants.) (Meadows 1997), which have been dated to the early to mid-7th century. Such burials and their finds imply a new focussing of authority, with a need for overt display in the landscape, probably in the form of barrow burials (Härke 1992, 164). That this change took place at a similar time to that at which it occurred on the continent suggests that any suggestion of a link with the spread of Christianity would be wrong, given that Christianity spread to the continent prior to it re-establishing itself in England and yet any changes as regard grave goods took place at about the same time on both sides of the North Sea (ibid., 165).

Also noted as starting in this period is the incidence of Anglo-Saxon burials within Roman villas. Documented examples come from the villa site at Empingham, Rutland (Cooper 2000, 17-22) and at Piddington, Northamptonshire where the link has been proposed with 'squatter occupation' (Friendship-Taylor & Friendship-Taylor 2002). An alternative suggestion when considering the pattern of 6th to 8th century burials in villas relates to more formal use in association with ancient burial sites or the continued use of the site as family shrines (Bell 2001; Blair 2005, 377).

On urban sites, the relationship between Roman structures and early Anglo-Saxon churches is accepted (Parsons 1996, 12). That between villa/villa site and medieval church is also attractive, but often difficult to prove, although across England there are nearly 200 examples of places of worship that overlie or adjoin villas (Blair 2005, 377). Further afield, excavation at the medieval Wells Cathedral, Somerset has revealed a sequence of a Saxon burial chapel over-lying a late Roman or sub-Roman mausoleum (Morris 1989, 33-34), a view now disputed (Blair 2004, 134-137). A similar relationship can be seen at Lullingstone, Kent (ibid., 41) with the presence of a pre-Norman Conquest church that had been constructed on the site of a Roman temple/mausoleum which also featured a possible early Christian chapel (Meates 1979). The parish church at Ab Kettleby (Leics.) is also thought to be a case in point (Allsop 1998, 162) and more recently in the course of trial trenching, Roman material has been identified adjacent to the north aisle wall of St Michael and All Angels Church at Fenney Drayton, Leicestershire (Bradley-Lovekin 2006). A similar relationship appears
to exist at Great Easton (Leics.) as confirmed in the course of the Channel 4 television ‘Big Dig’ (Priest & Cooper 2004) with finds of both Roman material and Anglo-Saxon pottery emerging within the churchyard and in the immediate area of the village. The presence of Roman material that has been incorporated into the structure of churches has also been noted, and examples such as St Nicholas, Leicester (Kenyon 1948; Radford 1955; Parsons 1996, 11) and the parish church at Brixworth (Northants) (Sutherland & Parsons 1984, 45-64) are well documented. Elsewhere, the example of the church at Rivenhall, Essex, is well known (Rodwell & Rodwell 1985).

Fig. 7.6: Suggested model for settlement nucleation

An associated question is whether villas that become adopted as places of worship subsequently become foci for the dispersed population of the surrounding area in the form of the church congregation (see fig. 7.6 above). Importantly, there are no recorded references to churches being located for the convenience of ready availability of structural materials (Bell 1998, 7) and Morris puts forward the view that, especially with early churches being built of timber, it was more likely to be the case that Roman materials were taken to the site of the church rather than vice versa (Morris 1989, 102). Significantly, Morris suggests that in the 7th and 8th centuries stone-built churches were high status places of worship – monastic, episcopal or royal – with an elite or private foundation, rather than more ordinary ‘first phase’ churches or chapels (ibid., 102).
The notion of a ‘congregation’ may reflect a coming-together of the population, moving from a pattern of dispersed settlement towards one of nucleated settlement and living as a community. This movement may have been initiated by the introduction of Christianity providing a focus for society on ‘churches’ or places of worship in the early 7th century.

7.6.3 Implications

The impact of this stimulus would be to draw together small groups of people as a larger community, forming fewer, larger population groups, thereby locally increasing the available manpower. This, in turn, would make it both necessary and possible, with a larger population, to work areas of the landscape that had previously (in the 5th and 6th centuries) been unusable, for example, the heavier clay soils – areas that had been worked in the Roman period. The Roman ‘villa landscape’ would also have demonstrated a similar degree of organisation of the population through the estate system.

The development of an increasingly nucleated landscape and settlement pattern in the middle Saxon period would mean that nucleated or merging populations (or congregations) would need to work for the common good in an organised manner within established boundaries. These boundaries may have reflected the old estate boundaries of the Roman villa - some of which were recorded in early Anglo-Saxon charters - and these may then have formed the basis of early parish boundaries. This relies upon the possibility of the boundaries of a villa estate still being identifiable. This may be in one of three ways: firstly being still physically visible upon the landscape, secondly in a recorded, written form, and thirdly verbally, being passed on by word of mouth.

In each of these three options, some form of connection is required between the occupants of the Romano-British landscape and the population of the Anglo-Saxon period both to recognise the existence of the estate and to have access to, and an understanding of the information containing the details of the boundaries.

Also recorded in charters is a specific reference to a ‘holy place’ (Blair 2005, 377) as is the case of the site of a medieval chapel at Fawler (Berks.), where excavation has
revealed the tessellated surface of a villa – a place clearly thought to be ‘holy’ in the 10th century and which later saw the development of a chapel.

7.6.4 Territories

The existence of territories or ‘Kingdoms’ is recorded already in the writings of Gildas (Yorke 1990, 2), however, early ‘kings’ were rulers of people rather than of land (James 2001, 116) having sufficient influence to draw disparate groups together under single identities (ibid., 120). From an organisational point of view, administrative areas would be made up of a number of smaller territorial groups, thereby establishing a hierarchy of territories. Indeed it is possible that these early small territorial groups may be represented by the early distribution of –ingas place-names, particularly between the Nene and Welland valleys, conceivably coming to prominence towards the end of the early Anglo-Saxon period.

The notion of social stratification and territories or ‘kingdoms’ developed on a broader scale during this Middle Anglo-Saxon period (Arnold 1997, 211) and this further coincides with the appearance in the early 7th century of richer ‘warrior’ burials. Most notable and best recorded examples are those at Sutton Hoo, Suffolk and the more recent site at Prittlewell, Essex (MoLAS 2004), although other sites are known at Taplow, Buckinghamshire, excavated in the late 19th century, and Broomfield, also in Essex (Yorke 1990, 9). Taplow is particularly noteworthy, comprising a burial mound situated within the churchyard of a former parish church (Lapidge et al. 1999, 440), implying an interesting relationship between such burial sites and later Christian places of worship. Within the East Midlands, the later warrior burial at Wollaston, Northamptonshire, discovered in 1997 in the course of gravel extraction alongside the route of a Roman road, may lie in this category of burial (Northamptonshire County Council 2004; Brown & Foard 2004, 91). The characteristics of these burials clearly set them apart from the larger ‘community’ cremation and inhumation sites of the Anglo-Saxon period, as well as the smaller, more basic burials, and it further indicates that at around this time, individuals of status were coming to the fore in society.

The next question to address is how such administrative groups or kingdoms first came into being. Bassett puts forward two ideas for their creation (1989, 23): firstly, the view that the kingdoms were created through the gradual coming together of a number of
smaller territories, with the leaders of the more dominant groups becoming 'rulers'. Ultimately, in this case, the notion of 'kingship' evolves as part of a gradual process through the development of an increasingly hierarchical leadership, possibly family based, from which a single leader eventually is chosen. The second possibility is that external groups could come into an area, taking over existing territories.

The likelihood, given the acknowledged early settlement patterns of Anglo-Saxon England, would seem to be the latter scenario. In this case, the small-scale, dispersed settlement of the early period started to come together into larger, nucleated population groups during the middle Anglo-Saxon period, which coincided with the reintroduction of Christianity during the early 7th century. These population groups, themselves then started to group together into larger groups or territories, ultimately under the leadership of one figure, thence forming the first English kingdoms. The means by which this could have taken place has been suggested as a four stage process (Scull 1993):

1. Local populations develop ‘ranked lineages’.

2. Competition between lineages leads to the emergence of ‘local hegemonies’ with their own leaders.

3. Competition between leaders creates temporary regional hegemonies.

4. Temporary regional control develops into the creation of permanent ruling dynasties.

Looking beyond the study period, this model of territorial hierarchy has a comparable pattern within the Christian Church with the organisation of parishes and dioceses and throughout the medieval period, and the relationship of lordship to the Church remained closely linked during this period.

The main urban centre in the study area, Leicester, demonstrates these links in its early history. As has been seen, Leicester had been a Roman civitas capital (Connor & Buckley 1999, 6). In the 8th century this development went further with the creation of a Bishop’s see in Leicester, a move that was traditionally based upon the presence of a ‘Royal’ site (Courtney 1998), implying that, at that time, Leicester was (still?) an established focal point lying at the heart of a larger territory. This high status appears retained in the 9th century when the establishment of the Danelaw saw Leicester, along
with Lincoln, Stamford, Nottingham and Derby, as part of the 'Five Boroughs' (subsequently retaken by the English only in the early 10th century). Noticeably, there is no archaeology currently to go with these two centuries of 'high status' role.

7.7 Discussion

In terms of the towns and small towns of the study area, a case can be made for continuity of activity, even if at a limited level, in towns, while the small town sites would appear to have been abandoned in most cases.

Four main issues arise relating to the nature of Anglo-Saxon settlement. With regard to continuity of settlement, there is increasing evidence coming to light, both in urban areas and rural sites, to suggest that there was some continuity of activity. Evidence of this nature has been noted elsewhere (Chapters 3, 4, 5 and Appendices 1 & 3); what is not necessarily clear, however, is what the activity was. A further limiting factor is that of time – limitations in the interpretation of chronologies of the Anglo-Saxon period make it difficult to identify when, or how long such activity persisted; similar limitations imposed by the fragile nature of the archaeology also makes it difficult to identify different population groups in terms of incoming Anglo-Saxon people, or resident native British.

The impact on the landscape had already started with the failure of the villas in the later Roman period. A feature of the later Roman period and noticeable in the early Anglo-Saxon period is the movement of settlements. At Raunds (Northants.) there was a move from the claylands down to the more favourable river valley locations, while in other locations in the Wreake Valley, and along the Welland Valley there was a move from roadside locations to settlements close to water. What, however, of continuity of settlement? The majority of villa sites have been seen to demonstrate little evidence for continued use, although excavation at several sites is starting to address this issue, suggesting that some type of activity was conducted in the post-Roman period, if not at the level of visibility previously associated with such structures or such productive estates.

With towns, increasing evidence is coming to light supporting the notion of early Anglo-Saxon settlement activity within urban areas. Small-towns seem to have fared in
a similar manner to villas, although as the evidence from Northamptonshire indicates, there are cases of settlement close to such sites without apparently being in them. The presence of the Anglo-Saxon burials at Great Casterton would, however, suggest that well maintained settlements may have still offered scope for habitation, without the occupiers leaving the sort of evidence that would normally be associated with Anglo-Saxon people. This, as discussed above, seems to be becoming the case with the major town site at Leicester and while recognising the fragile nature of the archaeological evidence, that fragile evidence is becoming more tangible.
CHAPTER 8

Conclusions

'Much has undoubtedly been lost in the past through lack of interest or supervision, but there is no reason to suppose that all the early Anglo-Saxon sites have been discovered or that those already known have been exhaustively examined; and it is likely that the spread of local archaeological societies will do something to prevent the destruction of objects that may demonstrate in course of time the character and nationality of the folk whose property these objects were some thirteen hundred years ago'

(Northamptonshire Victoria County History 1902, 223)

8.1 Introduction

The past hundred years, since the publication of these thoughts in the VCH have seen a considerable change in the role of archaeology in society. Not only have we witnessed a growth in archaeological societies, but archaeological fieldwork, occasionally excavation, but more frequently as fieldwalking, has blossomed as a recreational activity for many. Archaeology, too, is an integral part of the development process, and, with the introduction of PPG 16, this has contributed to regular supervision of development projects, together with opportunities for the undertaking of major (and minor) urban (and rural) excavations that might otherwise have been missed. All of this is contributing significantly to our knowledge of the past even if the picture sometimes becomes a bit more confused before it clears up again.

Arguably, the changes that occurred between AD 450 and 850 had a greater lasting impact on the landscape of southern England than the four hundred years of Roman rule (James 2001, 114). Certainly the Romans introduced and developed the concept of the town and created rural estates with villas; physically, such entities remained visible beyond the 5th century, even if functions underwent (sometimes dramatic) change or loss. In contrast the Anglo-Saxon period saw key changes in the use and organisation of the landscape of the East Midlands: a more dispersed pattern of settlement was adopted due to social and economic fragmentation, followed by a move towards settlement nucleation and rural church creation from the 8th century onwards. This nucleated
settlement can be seen recorded in the Domesday Book and has persisted through to the present day.

This thesis has sought to address issues relating to the use and settlement of the Roman landscape and changes that took place in the post-Roman period, while relating these changes to the population, both existing native and Anglo-Saxon newcomers. Such topics are highly current in Anglo-Saxon research as highlighted in the recently published *East Midlands Archaeological Resource Assessment and Research Agenda* (Vince 2006, 161-183). But the answers to these issues are very much dependent upon the quantity and quality of the data that are available. In this respect, with greater archaeological monitoring of developments, particularly in built-up areas, there is now a significant quantity of data available at the start of the 21st century. What is a problem is the quality and legibility of that data, which still results in an inadequate chronology for the Anglo-Saxon period in terms of the material culture.

A summary overview presented below of the settlement patterns of both the Roman and the early Anglo-Saxon period shows to what extent the landscape has had an influence on the use of the land and the location of settlements.

### 8.2 The Roman Period

Based on recorded archaeological fieldwork, the evidence of the Roman period suggests that the landscapes of Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire were settled in what can be described as a dense, concentrated manner (Liddle 2004, 71; Taylor & Flitcroft 2004, 63) (Fig. 8.1). This could only have been possible if a coherent and secure system of economic and social organisation was in operation, with the rural population working and being required to work the land in order to produce crops to support an agriculturally non-productive population. These may be those involved in industrial activities, in administration, and those in a large military force, all of whom were carrying out necessary work, outside of a self-supporting life-style. Within the Roman Empire, such systems worked not only on a regional or national basis, but on an international scale, allowing for the import and export of goods across the extent of the Empire.
Fig. 8.1: Charting Roman Leicestershire from 1907-2001
(Liddle 2004b, fig. 1)
With the advent of agriculture, society had of necessity become increasingly organised, acknowledging that specific tasks had to be carried out at certain times, new skills had to be learnt and all members of the population had to take on certain roles for family and extended family groups to survive and grow. By definition, society, however big or small, functions in order to support the population and with the development of hierarchies, those who are lower down in society work to support those at the top. Roman society took this notion to new extremes. The presence of a large army, specialist craftsmen and a clear urban social hierarchy all represented a large and agriculturally unproductive element of the population which needed to be provided for, while the later Roman period saw the growing organisation of the rural landscape with the wider establishment and growth of villa estates. This required the development of regional economies which were able to produce a surplus in order to participate in trade and also support the entire population.

Such an organisation of society, and thus the economy, at a regional level through transport networks and the establishment of markets for the exchange of goods, implies a high level of control and guarantees that as much of the available landscape as possible can be used in the most efficient manner. Therefore, for example, the heavy clay soils and the pastures may not be best suited to arable farming, but they are good for livestock. However, because of the way in which the regional economy and society functions, producers can come together to sell or exchange their produce, and use the surplus of their own production to generate the means by which they can then acquire other items that they are otherwise unable to produce.

In the study area only part of this picture can be followed: surveys have been productive for charting Roman activity but arguably we still lack enough well dug sites to clarify chronologies, forms and roles – especially for villas. To date none have been properly excavated in Leicestershire; only Empingham in Rutland has undergone detailed investigation. Even in terms of urban centres, Leicester is still fairly weakly understood.

### 8.3 Post-Roman Continuity

The hierarchy of settlements and their territories ranging from the *Civitas* capital at the top to ‘small towns’, and down to ‘villas’ and farmsteads reflects the organised nature of society in the Roman period, but it was the maintenance of this organisation, together
with the supply network that it required, that would ensure its continuity; the breakdown of that organisational network would ensure the failure of society at a national and regional level.

Evidence for the continuity of Roman structures and organisation in the post-Roman period is not easy to identify. The material expansion and growth associated with villas in the 4th century is easy to recognise archaeologically; what is even less identifiable is what happened subsequently, when the evidence is less well defined (Christie 2004). This issue is key in terms of this thesis and for the issues of continuity and proximity. Roman features may remain in use by association with a nearby local population, although the actual purpose may have changed; this has been seen at Leicester and at Great Casterton, Rutland, with the presence of Anglo-Saxon burials outside the main gates of the towns, while on villa sites like Piddington and Whitehall Farm, Anglo-Saxon activity has been identified in the form of burials and structural evidence respectively. The major problem which affects much of this transitional period is the lack of accurately dateable material (and thus chronologies), both for the Roman material continuing in use after AD 410, as well as Anglo-Saxon material being visible prior to AD 450. This problem of dating has clear implications for the visibility of populations, both native and incoming. As suggested by Cooper (2000) with the failure of the Roman system, the population had two options – either stay, or go elsewhere. This partly depends upon whether the Anglo-Saxons are seen as a peaceful migration, or a full-scale invasion; however, if the market/supply system fails, then the population will by necessity turn to new alternative items, which may by definition be local, hand-made and organic - all characteristics that are also applicable to aspects of the ‘Anglo-Saxon’ population and their life-style. What is hard to determine is the level of resilience by ‘natives’ – did families seek to stay in lands long farmed and owned, or did insecurity force a shift? We are probably too far removed at the start of the 21st century to clarify this now and the archaeology itself is too weak to clearly and fully reveal the initiatives and the changes that were implemented.
8.4 The Anglo-Saxon Period

Failure of a hierarchical system, such as that used in Roman Britain, can take place through one of two scenarios: (i) failure from the top downwards, or (ii) failure from the bottom upwards.

In the case of the former scenario, it is the role of those at the top to keep those lower down the social ladder together and working for the good of society. If that coercion is lost, then the cohesion of society is also lost. In the latter scenario, if those at the bottom of society stop working, then ultimately the system will fail - the foundations of society begin to crumble and eventually the top will collapse. In both cases, the result is the same and 'society' breaks down. The one question from the first situation is how far the failure of the system reaches: if society is made up of several hierarchical layers, a point may be reached where one of the layers, even if at a local level, is able to retain its authority, and thus continue to exert some power over the population.

Britain in the late 4th and early 5th centuries lost the guidance of society from the top downwards with the withdrawal of Roman support. Arguably, being the end of Roman support and with or without the Anglo-Saxons, this would automatically have become a period of transition; the question is 'transition to what?' Could a society that had been subject to authority and administration for almost four centuries readily adjust to a situation where that guidance or influence had been removed, and in the light of that situation, would it also have been readily susceptible to a new influence, particularly given that the country was being subjected to a series of raids and attacks? In part, the answer to this question lies in another question: how Roman was Roman Britain? It is hard to imagine that the population could have lived under Roman rule and law for almost four centuries without there being some lasting impact: was that impact tangible in material terms or was it merely superficial? Was there an element of mental impact on the psyche of the population?

Just as fieldwork indicates that Roman settlement was extensive across the landscape of the East Midlands, so the Anglo-Saxon presence appears to be much more restricted. Yet it is not insubstantial. Thus, data from the SMR/HER show early Anglo-Saxon settlement activity of the 5th and 6th centuries across much of east Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire (Knox 2004, 96, fig. 1; Brown & Foard 2004, 79, fig
Much of this evidence does not relate directly to established ‘nucleated’ settlements, however, but instead indicates a distribution of small, dispersed settlements in the form of hamlets and farmsteads. This may be attributable to the selective manner in which fieldwork has been conducted in Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire but the widespread distribution of Roman material, drawn from the same sources and found using the same methods suggests that fieldwork that has produced Anglo-Saxon sites has not been selective in its choice. This more restricted pattern of settlement therefore appears to be genuine.

The three essential ingredients that are required for settlement are: (i) materials for the construction of shelter, (ii) fire to provide heat, both for cooking and for warmth and security, and (iii) water for drinking and cooking. With this in mind, any person who wants to survive in a landscape will go towards the nearest available area of woodland which immediately provides two of the three essentials – building materials and fuel for fire. For people who lead an agricultural life-style, there is then the consideration of how they will survive and what the preferred environment would be to satisfy their requirements.

The impression that can be gained from the size and distribution of Anglo-Saxon settlements and their material culture is that these were people who lived in small, dispersed population groups - possibly in a family or extended family group - and who were self-sufficient in meeting their needs.

The heavy reliance on timber gathered from woodland is shown in writings of the early medieval period, and archaeological excavation has shown that the buildings, through the presence of post-holes, were based on a wooden framework of vertical earth-fast posts. Above this level, the form of the structure is open to supposition; however, it would probably require a tie beam and wall plate, to brace the uprights and support the roof timbers (Brunskill 2000, 79). On top of the wall plate would be the roof, most likely of thatch, either of reeds or straw, depending upon local availability, but possibly of wood shingles. To build a number of such structures in a location away from a ready supply of building material would not be sensible or feasible in a period of limited centralised control.
Animals too can influence settlement choice. The three most common species of animal as represented in bone assemblages from Anglo-Saxon settlement sites (Arnold 1997, 35) are cattle, sheep and/or goat, and pig. Such species, while not being found to the exclusion of all other animals, are better suited to being kept on open pasture for grazing in the case of cattle and sheep. Pigs, however, have a tendency towards foraging in woodland undergrowth. To be successful, therefore, a settlement would need to be located in an area with an adequate supply of wood for building and for fuel, but also with access to open pasture and woodland for the grazing of livestock.

When viewed in relation to the extent of the Domesday woodland (Holly 1971, 343, fig. 118; Terrett 1971a, 405, fig. 142; Terrett 1971b, 405, fig. 142), this woodland fringe settlement pattern can be seen in Leicestershire along the valley of the River Soar, and in the south-east of the county around Leighfield Forest. In Rutland, the Anglo-Saxon settlements are, without exception, situated around the woodland fringe, and the same can be seen around both Rockingham Forest and Whittlewood in Northamptonshire.

In all three counties, these extensive areas of woodland, while on the one hand appearing to be an attraction to the establishment of settlement, also appear to have been an obstruction to the movement of population. That woodland should be a barrier to the movement of population should perhaps not be a surprise. At a national level, major geographical features such as the woodland of the Weald of Kent or the Wash and the Fens of East Anglia appear to be devoid of settlement, while there is evidence of an Anglo-Saxon presence in the surrounding area (Arnold 1997, 60, fig. 3.10).

The difference between the settlement patterns of the Roman period and those of the Anglo-Saxon period is clear. The settlement of the Roman-British period represents the take-over by an experienced, militarily powerful administration of a landscape that was already settled by a tribal, and thus by definition, hierarchical, late prehistoric population. Combined with this is the scenario that links had already been forged with the continental Roman Empire and arguably the process of Romanisation had already begun amongst some of the more powerful members of the population. Potentially, therefore, the coming of the Romans in the 1st century AD merely pushed some of the population further in the direction that culturally they were already moving in, while maintaining the hierarchical balance, even if a new upper tier was put into place.
The coming of the Anglo-Saxons in the 5th century presented a different scenario. These were settlers coming in to an already organised, cultivated landscape, settled by a population of perhaps four million (James 2001, 114). The combination of the withdrawal of the army and the decline of villas, however, would suggest that in some areas at least, the landscape was not as widely cultivated as it may have been. The use of *foederati* – irregular allies recruited individually or as tribal groups under formal treaty – in 4th century Roman Britain implies that Britain was known to the Germanic people (ibid., 49). The Anglo-Saxons then had to find a means of settling into that organised landscape; some estates may have been vacated by the 5th century, hence the opportunities for ‘squatter-type’ settlement as seen at Piddington, and similar Anglo-Saxon presence noted at Orton Hall Farm and at Frocester. The key issue here is what was the nature of the coming of the Anglo-Saxons, and how many of them actually came? Estimates for the number crossing the North Sea in the 5th century lie between 10,000 (Higham 1992) and 100,000 (Härke 2002), with a preference developing for the lower end of the range (James 2001, 114). These equate to between 0.25% and 2.5% of the native population and numerically these figures are clearly inadequate for the staging of a major, successful ‘military’ invasion, even if those involved were all ‘armed warriors’, which certainly the burial evidence of the East Midlands would suggest that they were not. Nor would these figures seem to be adequate to support a highly visible ‘mass migration’. The possibility does exist for concentrations of the earliest settlers being located in regions on the outskirts of the study area - i.e. East Anglia and the Thames Valley - and thus pre-dating the settlement of the East Midlands. The concern expressed by Francis Pryor (2004, 128) is that such a situation, or Higham’s image of small élite groups of incomers, should lead to the presence of distinct British and Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in close proximity to settlements; this has not been noted as yet. While archaeological data do not offer any proof, the possibility exists of a native population, devoid of leadership at a local level and seeking to create a new way of life for itself, being susceptible to the arrival of a new, culturally not dissimilar, élite body and the ideas that it brought with it.

8.5 Roads

One of the lasting features of the Romano-British landscape is the network of major roads. The impression gained from the orientation of the roads in the East Midlands is
that the *Civitas* capital of *Ratae* was westward-looking: with the exception of the Gartree Road approaching from the south-east, Roman roads enter and leave the town from the south, north and west gates. It is surprising that no major road leaves the town in a direction of due east, although this would mean it would have to pass through Leighfield Forest.

Similarly the distribution of Roman material in Rutland would suggest that the main sphere of interest lay to the east with Ermine Street and the town of Great Casterton, again avoiding Leighfield Forest - the more heavily forested western part of the county and High Leicestershire. The implication arising from this is that the central area of east Leicestershire, which appears to be the main area for Anglo-Saxon settlement, was one of the lesser populated areas of the Roman landscape (see fig. 8.1 above).

Continuity of road use after Roman rule will not have been universal: the Roman road network still acted as a guide for settlement, for example in Leicestershire along the Gartree Road in the south-east, along the Fosse Way to the north, and in the north-east of the county along the Wreake Valley between Leicester, Melton Mowbray and Thistleton (Rutland). Likewise in Northamptonshire, the Nene Valley which was a focus for Roman settlement (villas and small towns), between Ermine Street to the east and Watling Street to the west remained a focus for much of the Anglo-Saxon settlement, as did roads through the Rockingham Forest. In some cases - Stonton Wyville, the Langtons and at Brooksby - there are signs of settlement being moved away from roads. This may have rendered settlements less visible and thus more secure, however, smoke from fires would still be apparent and a more likely motive was possibly to be nearer to water or better land (Section 6.3 above). This suggests that while there may not have been universal continuity in the post-Roman landscape, nor was there complete break-down.

The issue of burials on roads is still unclear, reflecting either lack of continuity or else a form of continuity. Burials, such as those at Stretton (Leics.), may reflect a complete breakdown of the road network; however, those at Bensford Bridge (Leics.) and in Northamptonshire at Wollaston, possibly serving as commemorative markers in the landscape suggest that the roads in those areas were still in use (see Fig. 8.2). At a more local level, Anglo-Saxon settlements still appear to occur in proximity to, if not exactly on the routes of recognised Roman roads.
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Fig. 8.2: Anglo-Saxon burials on Roman Roads

Continuity of road use, and hence of landscape organisation, into the post-Roman period has been suggested with parish boundaries respecting road alignments. It has been acknowledged that this is 'reasonable presumption' rather than 'firm archaeological proof' (Jones & Mattingly 1990, 249), however, this can be seen in south-west Leicestershire where both parish boundaries and the county boundary are aligned on Watling Street, and in Northamptonshire where hundred (and parish) boundaries also respect the route of Watling Street (Fig. 8.3). Watling Street itself was
confirmed as a territorial boundary in the Peace of Wedmore *circa* AD 878 which established a firm frontier, north and east of which would come to be called the Danelaw (Stenton 1971, 257-261).

*Fig. 8.3: Northamptonshire hundred boundaries with Watling Street area highlighted* (Foard 2004, fig. 8.1)

**8.6 Anglo-Saxon Settlement**

As outlined below, the archaeological evidence combines to suggest four basic categories of rural Anglo-Saxon settlement in the study area:

**8.6.1 Anglo-Saxon activity on Roman period sites**

Excavations at Piddington (Northants.) have revealed a significant winged Roman villa with late Iron Age roots which developed as a villa from the early 2nd century and continued to grow until the late 3rd century. From the late 3rd or early 4th century, the nature of occupation changed with the villa being abandoned to be replaced by so-called ‘squatter’ occupation which appears to have continued into the early post-Roman period.
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(Friendship-Taylor & Friendship-Taylor 2003, 161). Elsewhere, Frocester Roman villa in Gloucestershire too shows similar characteristics in the late 4th century with a significant quantity of pottery of the early Anglo-Saxon period in and around the villa, suggesting some continued use of the structure (Price 2000b, 137). This may follow on from examples of ‘squatter’ settlement activity that have been identified at a number of late Roman villa sites, and may represent either incoming Anglo-Saxon people using standing buildings for shelter, or members of the native British population continuing use of such sites, but using different ceramic materials, while being unable to maintain the old built units.

Later activity in this category has also been noted on villa sites in the form of burials, for example at Empingham, Rutland (Cooper 2000a, 20), and again at Piddington, Northants (Friendship-Taylor & Friendship-Taylor 2003, 161-162). The use of such locations for burial purposes may indicate abandoned Roman structures used as points of reference in the landscape or perhaps as places of worship; dating evidence was limited at Empingham, comprising of a pin of the mid-Saxon period. What this relatively late date of the mid- to late 7th century shows is that, even if abandoned, such structures remained visible in the landscape and came to acquire a significant meaning for the local population.

8.6.2 Anglo-Saxon activity in close proximity to Roman sites

‘Proximity’ is a subjective term, and what may be ‘close proximity’ for one person may be a substantial distance away for another. On a wider scale, settlement at Wharram Percy, Yorkshire suggests Anglo-Saxon settlement within an organised (if residual) Roman landscape. Within (and on the outskirts of) the study area, there are cases of an Anglo-Saxon presence close to a Roman site, particularly in an urban context; in the case of Great Casterton, Rutland (Granger & Mahany 1985), Longthorpe, Peterborough (Dakin 1969, 15, 16) and Leicester, burials either respected Roman burial grounds or Roman burial practice in terms of location. With the exception of the burials, neither Great Casterton nor Longthorpe have shown any evidence for ‘settlement’, however, at Leicester, previously regarded as being devoid of Anglo-Saxon material, further inference of this close relationship can now be drawn from the increasingly apparent presence of Anglo-Saxon structures and material within built (but supposedly abandoned) areas (Buckley, pers. comm.).
8.6.3 New Anglo-Saxon settlement

The data from the HER/SMR suggest that much of the early new settlement respects the extent of the woodland (as recorded in Domesday Book). This environment would provide the resources necessary in terms of structural material for shelter, raw materials for heat/cooking, pasture and open land for livestock, and in many cases close proximity to flowing water. Field survey in Raunds, Northamptonshire, has identified the presence of ‘twinned’ settlements, with a number of such sites either side of streams (Parry 2006, 93, fig. 4.14); this can be identified also in Leicestershire at Stonton Wyville (Liddle et al., 1996).

Evidence from Leicestershire and Northamptonshire points to many settlements occupying promontory locations on permeable geology; this would allow improved drainage, avoiding water-logging and helping to protect the timber used in the construction of structures. The one example of such a settlement in Leicestershire is Eye Kettleby (Finn, forthcoming); here, significantly there is minimal evidence for Roman material, other than some pierced pottery sherds and similarly pierced Roman coins which may suggest a small-scale settlement of incoming Anglo-Saxon settlers within an already settled landscape.

The relationship of the distribution of settlements and cemeteries suggests that in the Anglo-Saxon period use was made of woodland areas for industrial activity (such as charcoal burning and iron working); however, the lack of burial sites in woodland areas would suggest that this activity was short-term and possibly seasonal, and thus such ‘settlement’, while new, was not permanent.

These categories, 1-3, suggest a scattered, low-level rural settlement pattern with few major foci, if with old towns possibly retaining some level of economic value and demographic role.

8.6.4 Middle Saxon settlement

The mid-Saxon period saw the start of settlement nucleation, and for this, the presence of the Church, from the 7th century, may have been a driving force in drawing together communities or congregations. As discussed above, some villa sites served as places of burial, and as such may have been regarded as special places of worship. Significantly,
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while excavation within villages tends to present limited opportunities, some churches have produced examples of Roman material within the church yard - for example at Great Easton (Wallis, pers.comm.) and Fenney Drayton. Similarly, the Time Team ‘Big Dig’ (Cooper and Priest 2003, 53-55), together with test pitting at Whittlewood (Jones & Page 2003b, 37), and sporadic finds of early and mid- Anglo-Saxon pottery within villages suggest the presence of Anglo-Saxon settlement beneath existing medieval villages.

Fig. 8.4: Settlements (edged red) on glacial sand and gravel deposits

Crucially, what is still lacking in the East Midlands is a firm chronology for pottery of the middle Anglo-Saxon period, and until this matter can be rectified the issue of
settlement nucleation will remain hazy, for at present the ceramic evidence of the middle Anglo-Saxon period is missing or unrecognised. In terms of setting, many nucleated villages of the region (e.g. those in much of east Leics.) are in geologically-sound locations, being in elevated positions, on permeable, well-draining glacial gravels, e.g. Houghton-on-the-Hill, Humberstone, Hungerton and Stoughton (Hoskins 1934, 126, fig. 3) and Little Stretton, King's Norton, Gaulby, and Burton Overy (see fig. 8.4). These gravels are capable of forming wells or springs, a combination of factors which are well-suited to such settlement (Hill, pers. comm.), but it is also a problem that these gravels have long been subject to quarrying, potentially removing much of the evidence for early settlement of the early and middle Anglo-Saxon periods.

As well as the Church, changing social hierarchies may have had a role to play in the nucleation of settlements in the form of manors and estate centres, as it was often through the developing ‘royal’ dynasties that the process of the conversion to Christianity started (Reynolds 2002, 69), leading, in turn, to the close relationship that can be drawn between early estates or territories, and parishes and diocesan boundaries, and thence to ‘shires’ by the mid-11th century (ibid., 65-69).

8.7 Towns

An indicator of how things changed in the towns can possibly be gained by looking at events in the late 7th or early 8th century and the establishment of a bishopric in Leicester (Courtney 1998, 110).

As early as the 4th century the canons of the early Christian Church decreed that bishops should have their seats located in the urbs or civitas, and the later Carolingian influence stressed the importance of the link between Church and royalty. As a consequence, the common practice of the early Anglo-Saxon period was for ecclesiastical centres to be set near to established royal centres (ibid., 113), possibly suggesting ‘royal’ or ‘élite’ ownership of old villa sites. From this it may be suggested that within the walls of early Anglo-Saxon Leicester there was a ‘royal’ centre or place of high status which may have had its roots in the change from provincial administration in the mid 3rd century to the more localised administration that arose following the troubles of the late 3rd century and which continued sporadically during the 4th century. Therefore what may have been a major, but not wholly unique settlement at a provincial level in the organisation of
Roman Britain may subsequently have become elevated to being the key centre at a
more local level. Looking further back to the development of Leicester as a major Iron
Age centre, this implies that its high local status was maintained throughout the Roman
period.

It can be argued that the notion of a Roman town and to an extent of ‘Romanisation’ in
Britain is an artificial one. Millett (1990, 154-156) lists 117 Roman small towns,
including a note of their origins; the majority of these have their origins as Roman forts
and associated settlements, while a few had roots in the late Iron Age: very few of these
towns developed into major urban settlements. Within Leicestershire and Rutland,
Leicester grew into a sizeable centre, but in the first century it was already established
as an important Iron Age centre. Elsewhere ‘small-town’ sites, some of which may have
had late pre-Roman predecessors, failed to continue in their development and, in some
cases, for example at Medbourne and Thistleton, the area that they occupied may have
exceeded that of their medieval counterpart. This would indicate that the continued
existence and development of settlements that could be identified as being ‘purely
Roman’ was not possible once the impetus behind their establishment and continued
role had been removed.

Similar statements can be made concerning ‘small-towns’ in Northamptonshire. In
many respects there were fewer, larger and better documented sites in
Northamptonshire than there were in Leicestershire and Rutland, suggesting a different
set of circumstances to the south of the River Welland to those pertaining to the north.
While there are Anglo-Saxon settlements in close proximity to Roman towns, there
seems to have been little or no direct continuity in terms of growth and development of
the sites themselves. In the case of the county town of Northampton there is no directly
comparable Roman predecessor to the Anglo-Saxon burh: whilst Iron Age and Roman
sites lie nearby in the form of Hunsbury Hillfort and Duston respectively, Northampton
itself is securely mid-Anglo-Saxon in origin (Shaw et al. 1997, 415).

Comparison can be made between the Roman towns of *Ratae* (Leicester) and *Calleva*
(Silchester) which lies to the south of the River Kennet between Reading and
Basingstoke. Respectively, the area of these Roman towns has been recorded as 105
acres and 107 acres (Clayton 1980, 182, 191). Both towns were walled and lay on the
routes of major roads, both were *civitas* capitals and both show signs of prosperity and
industrial activity continuing into the 4th century and beyond. There the similarity ends: Silchester now lies under open farmland and has the most complete circuit of Roman town defences in Britain, while Roman Leicester is largely lost under an industrialised modern city and has no surviving defences to be seen. Why, then should two such seemingly identical towns have such contrasting fortunes? The one discernable difference appears to be that of location. In the case of Silchester, the road network was manipulated to pass through the town; the same may also be said of Leicester, however Leicester also lies at a major river crossing which was probably an important focal point for the population prior to the coming of the Romans and it may be that crossing point which drew the Romans themselves to Leicester (Clay 2004, 45). For towns to survive and grow, they needed more than order and an administrative structure to hold them together, nor was economic productivity sufficient. What was important was having a reason for people to be drawn to that place, and in the case of Leicester, a river crossing provided that focus. As Silchester shows, a road crossing was not enough.

It is possible that the towns of the late Romano-British period were able to continue in existence because they took on the roles that they assumed in the late Iron Age: that of regional capital and economic centre by virtue of being situated at a strategically important river crossing and providing a focal point for the region. It is indeed possible that in many cases these towns, and in particular the civitas capitals never really relinquished such duties. In fulfilling this work, the towns were overseen by members of the local élite who had been confirmed and educated into their role by Rome, but had retained vestiges of their Iron Age heritage; in consequence they may have had more in common with their Romano-British subjects and their Iron Age predecessors than they did with Rome. This local élite, in governing through their role as members of the Ordo, may in turn have provided the basis for any continuity in town life in the post-Roman period. The presence of Minsters in towns is often regarded a phenomenon associated with a royal palace or a royal tūn (Morris 1989, 131; Blair 2005, 80-83). Even if the urban population does decline in some instances and areas of towns exhibit signs of decay, what more prestigious place would there be for a local ruler to establish a seat of power than an established local capital that is still an important focal point in the landscape, having sound defences and substantial buildings that still show signs of their former glory?
8.8 Population

What conclusions can be drawn concerning the population of the East Midlands during this period? By the end of the 4th century, the population were at least nominally Romano-British. The depth of their ‘romanisation’ is open to discussion, however, based upon the presence of the majority of the population working the land, and the perceived failure of towns to survive into the post-Roman era; the population may have been more ‘British’ than ‘Romano-British’ yet they might overall have seen themselves as ‘Romans’. This brings up the issue of identity. Rather than make direct associations between artefacts and ethnic identity, research is putting forward an alternative interpretation whereby local elites used access to, or the possession of such material as a means of expressing an affinity with a higher ranking population group and thus gaining an advantage over other groups who may have been their own rivals (Wells 1992; Lucy 2005b, 108).

What, then, are the implications for the population of post-Roman Britain? Hoskins, with his now dated model for the incursion of Anglo-Saxon people into Leicestershire, based in part on cemetery location and the evidence of associated material culture, saw the movement of a new people along river valleys, along the River Welland in the south, and from the north along the River Trent (both of which are navigable to the North Sea) and down the Soar (1934, 117). The evidence suggested by the fieldwalking data confirms the presence of what can be recognised as an Anglo-Saxon population or material culture in the eastern half of the county, concentrated mainly, but not exclusively, in two areas, around Medbourne in the south-east and along the Wreake Valley in the north-east. The nature of the settlement, as suggested by the presence of small burial sites and small scatters of pottery, appears to be that of dispersed farmsteads, presenting an image of a population living in (peaceful) non-aggressive conditions; even the one larger settlement within the study area - Eye Kettleby, Leics. - which has been the subject of extensive excavation, showed no evidence for the presence of defences – an absence also met on similar settlements in England that have been excavated more fully, for example West Stow, Suffolk (West 1985) and Catholme, Staffs. (Losco-Bradley & Kinsley 2002). This contrasts markedly with the view presented in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle which indicates a prolonged period of endemic warfare. It may also reflect what was essentially a society where events happened on a
much smaller scale than that to which we are accustomed in the 21st century: the size of armies may have been measured in hundreds (or even fewer) rather than tens of thousands; killing was a personal act, one to one, with sword or spear, not pitched battles or mass murder with explosives, and conceivably the events of a few miles away may have had little or no impact on the lives of the general population. Thus the overview presented by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle may suggest one thing, while a close study of a particular area may give a different impression.

Few burials of status have been identified at present in the study zone, although the early period burial site at North Luffenham – in a highly visible location and with a significant number of swords – is a prime example, as is the ‘warrior’ burial at Wollaston, Northamptonshire, suggesting a small tier of high status members of the population.

The implication is that a Romano-British population was still present and that the Anglo-Saxon settlers had to ‘fit in’ and occupied less popular, or less densely settled parts of the landscape. It is also possible that these settlers were not Anglo-Saxon, but may have been native farmers, displaced from their land further east, who had themselves already adopted traits of Anglo-Saxon material culture. How visible archaeologically, then, is the native population? The problem is one that has already been discussed, which affects the accurate dating of the Anglo-Saxons: the nature of the archaeological evidence. As has been considered, just because the official Roman presence ended in AD 410, it does not mean that all things Roman came to an end at that same time: people carried on dressing as they had previously, just as the material culture and access to supplies possibly continued, while trading levels probably declined, and arguably had been in decline in the 4th century; homes have remained largely unchanged. The suggestion here is that sites that have been identified as being ‘late Roman’ or ‘late 4th century’ could quite conceivably be of a date significantly later based upon the dating evidence. Hence the interpretation of the ‘Roman’ burials at Great Casterton, Rutland as potentially being as late as AD 460 (Granger & Mahany 1985), indicates the continued presence of a Romano-British population alongside the Anglo-Saxon settlers. The problem here lies in the accuracy of the dating of material relating to the early Anglo-Saxon period. Previously the ideas of ‘invasion’ or ‘mass migration’ meant that it was seen as being impossible for the two groups to co-exist,
with the expectancy of seeing distinct British and Anglo-Saxon identities in terms of settlements, burial practice and material culture; this distinction does not exist in the archaeological record. The martial, Germanic burials could be perceived as those of incoming warriors, but it is more likely that they symbolise a more inward-looking society, one where the right to bear (and be buried with) arms could be conceived as an index of social standing, rather than serving as an indicator of conflict in society. It is here that the application of isotope analysis could be of benefit, differentiating a first generation immigrant population from that which could be regarded as ‘native’ (Tatham 2004, 235, 236).

8.9 Future Directions

8.9.1 Data

In spite of the apparent quantity of available data, as this thesis has shown, weaknesses exist in terms of quantity and quality. While the increased use of fieldwalking as a survey technique has significantly increased the number of early Anglo-Saxon sites that are recorded in the HER/SMRs of the area, it is still apparent that there have been, and continue to be, too few excavations of late Roman and Anglo-Saxon settlements. The nature of the development process and archaeological practice has greatly reduced the scope and opportunity to conduct the type of long-term, large-scale excavations necessary to fully reveal such sites.

At present, within the study area, still only one settlement of the Anglo-Saxon period, that at Eye Kettleby, Leicestershire (Finn, forthcoming) has been subjected to detailed archaeological investigation following discovery through fieldwalking. This means that at a national level only a handful of sites can be studied and used for comparison purposes, while at a regional level, clearly this figure is substantially reduced. What Eye Kettleby demonstrates is the potential that such sites can offer. The 141 sherds of early and middle Anglo-Saxon date found during fieldwalking (Liddle & Knox 1993) developed into 2,581 sherds and 45 structures recorded during excavation (Finn 1999, 27). There is a very clear need to conduct further excavations of field.walked sites to more closely identify the characteristics of Anglo-Saxon period settlement.
One area of fieldwork to be pursued is the practice of ‘test-pitting’. Occasional finds of fragments of early Anglo-Saxon pottery have been recorded from within the confines of local villages within the study area, however ‘test-pitting’ has now been formally used in the study area at Great Easton, Leicestershire as part of the Channel 4 Time Team ‘Big Dig’ (Cooper & Priest 2003, 53) (Fig. 8.5 below) and at Silverstone, Northants. as part of the Whittlewood Project (Jones & Page 2003, 37-38). Both projects revealed the presence of early Anglo-Saxon pottery within nucleated village areas – albeit in varying quantities – but in both cases, the findings were consistent with other finds within the respective areas. In this respect, this further demonstrates the possibility of specific dispersed settlements acting as a focus for the development of nucleated village settlements. Whilst being a valid academic strategy, this is also an ideal community activity allowing local groups to learn more of their village origins.

Fig. 8.5: Great Easton, Leicestershire – early medieval pottery found through test-pitting (Priest & Cooper 2004)

At a site specific level, there is also a need to reconsider the nature of the Iron Age ceramic material that has been recorded on villa sites from earlier excavations. The similarity of Iron Age pottery to early Anglo-Saxon material can lead to potential confusion, and it would be useful to conduct a re-assessment of the available material to
clarify this issue. While recent fieldwork has increased the number of sites that have been identified, a fundamental need still exists for the development of a ceramic chronology for the dating of Anglo-Saxon sherds. At present, Anglo-Saxon settlement is regarded as covering a period in excess of 500 years, purely for lack of a firm means of dating. Excavation of more sites may, in turn produce samples of material suitable for analysis for radio-carbon dating. As a consequence, the recovery of ceramic material from more accurately dated contexts, may thus enable the formulation of a more accurate and comprehensive chronology for Anglo-Saxon pottery. Ultimately this may enable different interpretations to be placed on settlement development and growth in this archaeologically difficult period.

8.9.2 Geographical Information Systems (GIS)

An immediate step for this research is the exploration of the full capabilities of GIS.

Fig. 8.6: Whittlewood GIS plot of pre-850 AD settlement (Jones et al, 2006)
Whilst it has been possible to use GIS to place sites within the landscape of the study area and to look at their location in relation to natural features, the limitations referred to above similarly restrict the ability to question the data through GIS.

The use of GIS makes it possible to address a number of issues relating to landscape use, concerning location of sites, the distribution of site types, possible relationships between sites, as well as addressing 3-dimensional aspects of the landscape, for example visibility between settlements and cemeteries. The distribution of artefacts both within more confined areas and in broader landscape terms could also be opened up to investigation.

![GIS plot of the Anglo-Saxon landscape](image)

**Fig. 8.7: Wreake Valley, Leicestershire. GIS plot of the Anglo-Saxon landscape (Δ-cemeteries; □-settlements)**

While this recording and analysis can be achieved by the placing of dots on maps, the area in which GIS is adding new perspectives to landscape and settlement studies is with regard to recognising the layering of activity, relationships to water and other resources, and to site visibility and intervisibility, relating not only to single sites, but also to groups of sites within single periods as well as multi-period sites (Wheatley & Gillings 2002, 202-209). Within the East Midlands, the data that have been produced in...
the recently published Raunds Project (Parry 2006) together with the GIS data generated from the Whittlewood Project (Jones et al. 2006), will add greater scope for a regional GIS approach to the landscape (fig. 8.6).

For Leicestershire, a significant quantity of fieldwork has been carried out along the Wreake Valley between Leicester and Melton Mowbray, ranging in scale from small, isolated sites to the parish field-walking survey at Barkby Thorpe (Liddle 1989) and large-scale excavation at Eye Kettleby (Finn, forthcoming). The data from this area of north-east Leicestershire offer an ideal opportunity for a multi-period study of the landscape to which the full capability of GIS would certainly be applicable (fig. 8.7 above). As well as being used in conjunction with the sites referred to above, this could also be used in addition to, or in conjunction with similar cross-period regional studies from elsewhere in England, for example Essex (Morris 2005) and Draper’s recently published work from Wiltshire (Draper 2006).

8.9.3 Parishes and Churches

A natural progression for this project is to look at estate and parish formation in the later Saxon period, together with the location of nucleated villages and parish churches in the medieval landscape, similar to recent doctoral research conducted in Norfolk (Godfrey 2006). This will present opportunities to further pursue the relationship between Roman roads, settlements and parish boundaries; this approach would appear to be particularly applicable to south-west Leicestershire and south-west Northamptonshire where Watling Street remained identifiable as a feature to form not only a county boundary in the case of the former county, but also parish and hundred boundaries and a boundary with the Danelaw area (fig. 8.3 above).

In developing the Roman links within this research, it is suggested that data relating to the presence of Roman and Anglo-Saxon material in churchyards should also be drawn together, as has already been noted at Great Easton in eastern Leicestershire (Priest & Cooper 2004, 37), Fenny Drayton in south-west Leicestershire (Bradley-Lovekin 2006), and at Ab Kettleby in north-east Leicestershire (Allsop 1998, 162). This research would provide a further opportunity to introduce GIS to the study of the East Midlands landscape with regard to site location, relationships and visibility, both of settlements and of churches in the medieval period.
8.10 Summary

In sum, the data presented and analysed above would indicate that settlement location in the East Midlands in the post-Roman period was more closely influenced by the natural landscape of the study area rather than the major man-made features of the Romano-British period; the analysis of the data reflects the other problem of the period – the fragile nature of the material culture. At the top of the hierarchy of settlements, the few towns appear to have experienced a degree of decline, although they do not seem to have suffered complete desertion. Despite poor archaeology, historical events suggest that, in the case of Leicester, the town still retained a degree of status within the area, both as a bishopric and subsequently being a centre of importance in the Five Boroughs of the Danelaw. Northampton, on the other hand, has Saxon origins, separate from, but in close proximity to major Iron Age and Roman sites at Hunsbury and Dunston.

Rural settlement entered a phase of dispersed, low-level activity during the early Anglo-Saxon period, and this dispersal of the population indicates that, from the point of view of settlement, the area was devoid of major foci – and a centralised or even regional authority/power. What is also apparent is the close relationship of early settlement sites to natural resources, particularly woodland fringes and water, providing the preferred conditions for human habitation as well as the necessary land for both livestock and cultivation.

Burial sites tend to demonstrate a slightly different pattern of distribution to settlement, being more concentrated in identifiable areas. While not being comparable to the large cremation urnfields of eastern England, the location of the burial sites suggests that they may have served areas of settlement as opposed to specific settlements. When considered in conjunction with the small dispersed settlements and a seemingly complete lack of defences, this appears to present a view of a landscape that was occupied peacefully, where inhabitants were able to take time and trouble to dispose of their dead. This would not be the case in a time of strife.

Evidence based on the distribution of place-name studies suggests a movement from east to west of early Anglo-Saxon culture, and settlement distribution appears to confirm this. In Northamptonshire, settlement evidence of the period is more widely and evenly distributed than in Leicestershire, where the early Anglo-Saxon presence is
largely confined to the middle of the county, east of the River Soar and south of the River Wreake. In Rutland, the impression is one of an area that is more eastward looking, divided from Leicestershire by the boulder clays of ‘High Leicestershire’ and by Leigfield Forest. In the case of Leicestershire and Northamptonshire, these patterns of settlement distribution may reflect contrasting influences of the Roman period – Leicestershire being dominated by the presence of a *civitas* capital, while Northamptonshire was more on the fringe of such a strong influence, being between *Ratae* to the north and *Verulamium* to the south. Consequently the concentration of Roman settlement activity along the Nene Valley, while probably reflecting the rich nature of the land, may also stress its role as a form of ‘cultural boundary’ supplied from the south rather than from the north (Friendship-Taylor, pers. comm.).

Are the counties of Leicestershire, Rutland and Northamptonshire atypical in not reflecting the notions of mass-migration or invasion? James, in his conclusion to his review of the migration period (2001, 115) proposes the case for carrying out more local landscape study, and Welch in his works on Anglo-Saxon Sussex (1971, 232-7; 1983) presents a picture of a landscape that sounds very familiar: Anglo-Saxon cemeteries located within a restricted area bounded by rivers and with few extant Roman villas. The suggestion that was drawn is that the Romano-British population controlled where the Anglo-Saxons were allowed to settle; it is equally possible that, rather than being ‘controlled’ in their settlement, the incoming Anglo-Saxons may have sought to lead a peaceful existence, fitting in, in small groups, to an already occupied landscape and settling those localities that were less densely populated.

By way of conclusion, the September 2006 edition of *The Fieldworker* (Newsletter of the LMAFG) contains two pieces of information relating to Leicestershire: in addition to the presence of a SFB and early Anglo-Saxon brooch, excavations for the Highcross Quarter of the Shires Shopping Centre Development in Leicester city centre revealed three SFBs, including one that was cut into the collapsed wall of the Roman *macellum* (Plate 8.1) and associated pits, while near to Market Harborough a newly-formed fieldwalking group has located a scatter of early Anglo-Saxon pottery.
Plate 8.1: Excavation of an Anglo-Saxon SFB from the collapsed macellum wall during the Shires extension development, Leicester 2006 (ULAS)

The story continues.
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Significant Dates and Key Events
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Significant dates and key events of the 4th to the 7th centuries

367 Ammianus Marcellinus records the vicious raids in the North by the *Attacotti* (from the Western Isles) and the *Scotti* (from Ireland). In the south east there were raids on coastal settlements by Frankish and Saxon pirates as well as incidences of deeper penetration into the countryside. Reference is made to a ‘Barbarian conspiracy’.

368-9 Campaigns of recovery by Count Theodosius, followed by a programme of extensive reconstruction of Romano-British defences.

375-425 General period of collapse of civil settlement in towns combined with the abandonment of villas.

383 The revolt of Magnus Maximus sees the withdrawal of troops from Britain for an invasion and occupation of Gaul; as a consequence, many frontier forts were abandoned.

395-9 Civil War in Britain.

401 Further troop withdrawals from Britain for the defence of Italy, then under attack from Visigoths.

406 Rhine frontier overrun. Revolt in Britain.

407 Further troops withdrawn from Britain by the usurper Constantine III in preparation for invasion of continent.

408 British ‘rebels’ overthrow residual Roman administration. Documented Saxon attacks on Britain.

410 Traditional date for the end of Roman Britain: British make appeal for help from the Emperor Honorius; Honorius sends a letter to the *civitates* of Britain telling them to defend themselves.

410-420? Peasant war in the countryside.

429 Mission of St. Germanus of Auxerre to Britain to counter heresy.

440-455 Vortigern, a British warlord, and other British leaders hire Saxon mercenaries to defend their territories against other barbarians. Saxons subsequently revolt against British paymaster and attempt to create own territories.

446/453 Period of the last dated contact between Britain and Roman Gaul. Attributed as being followed shortly afterwards by the settlement of more *foederati* in eastern Britain.

Pre-450 Patrick writes two texts, the *Confessio* - about his early life in Britain, his capture as a boy, his life as a slave, his escape and return to Ireland as a
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missionary - and the Epistola. From his writings and from archaeology we see that basic settlement pattern and rural fabric of the late 4th century Romano-British landscape persisting into the 5th century. On his return home, the estate that he was raised on was described as still sufficiently intact for his family to try to persuade him to carry on running it.

446-454 Appeal of the Britons to the Roman general Aëtius in order to attempt to make Britain secure. Sometime after making this appeal, a Germanic population from outside the Empire – Saxons – come to Britain as mercenaries, or foederati, under the terms of a Treaty. This may be the first sign of Saxon settlement in Britain as opposed to raiding.

475-500 Ambrosius Aurelianus organises a British ‘confederation’ to challenge the power of the Saxon settlers; he seeks to keep them in the south east and apparently is successful in the defence of British-controlled territory against Saxon inroads. Period sees reoccupation of hillfort sites with new defences (Faulkner 2000, 178).

490s Rebellion of Saxon foederati. This would imply that, although subject to a degree of Saxon settlement, eastern Britain remained under the control of the Britons for practically the whole of the 5th century. Following the rebellion, the Britons fought back culminating in victory at the Battle of Mount Badon (mons Badonicus) in 500.

500 Having written De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae at the age of 44, and died in 570, Gildas may have been born around 500, which he himself also says was the date of the Battle of Mount Badon.

547 Gildas’ De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae describes a sub-Roman society with Latin literacy, terminology and symbolism, education, law and bureaucratic government, libraries of texts and manuscript production. In the mid-6th century, these still have a place in society, together with kings, monasticism and the church, in a tribal political system recognisable from the in Romano-British era.

?550 Wuffa, grandfather of Rædwald, is recorded as king of the East Angles, or Wuffingas.

571 Britons defeated at Bedford, and lose Lenbury, Aylesbury, Benson, and Ensham.

575 Sledd, king of the East Saxons, or East Sexena.

577 Britons defeated at Derham and lose Gloucester, Cirencester and Bath

591 Britons slaughtered at Wanborough.

597 Mission of St. Augustine to Britain, sent by Pope Gregory I.

West Saxons fight and conquer Angles, Welsh, Picts and Scots.
607  Welsh defeated by Ethelfrith. Proves prophesy of Augustine: ‘If the Welsh will not have peace with us, they shall perish at the hands of the Saxons’.

614  West Saxons defeat the Welsh at Bampton.

617  Ethelfrith killed by Rædwald of the East Angles. He is succeeded by Edwin who subdues all Britain except for Kent.

625  Death of King Rædwald (Christian at death; buried at Sutton Hoo).

626  Edwin survives assassination attempt and defeats the West Saxons, killing five kings. Start of the reign of Penda, King of the Mercians.

633  Edwin, King of Northumbria, is killed by Penda and Cadwalla, who then attack the lands of the Northumbrians.

642  Oswald, King of the Northumbrians, is slain by Penda, King of the Southumbrians.

645  King Kenwal is driven out by Penda.

655  Penda is killed at Wingfield and is succeeded by his son, Peada, who dies in 656 and is succeeded by his brother. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle lists the full extent of the boundaries of Mercia.

731  Bede completes Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum.
APPENDIX 2

East Midlands Roman Villa Sites
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>OS Ref</th>
<th>E N</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>IA material</th>
<th>Roman material</th>
<th>AS material</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ab Kettleby</td>
<td>SK 72 22</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Drill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Asfordby</td>
<td>SK 72 21</td>
<td>Welby Grange</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barkby</td>
<td>SK 69 5</td>
<td>Spring Grange</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Barkby Thorpe</td>
<td>SK 64 7</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>DMV</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Barkby Thorpe</td>
<td>SK 63 9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.5km</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Barrow on Soar</td>
<td>SK 59 16</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Soar</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Barrow on Soar</td>
<td>SK 58 16</td>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Soar</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beby-Barkby</td>
<td>SK 65 6</td>
<td>Spring Grange</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Belvoir-Knapton</td>
<td>SK 82 31</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1m</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Watch brief, Pot &amp; slag</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bittesby</td>
<td>SP 49 85</td>
<td>DMV</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Newspaper, Watling Stret, 5km</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Broadway-on-the-Hill</td>
<td>SK 39 22</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Tran</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Brighurst</td>
<td>SP 84 92</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Broughton and Old Dyke</td>
<td>SK 64 20</td>
<td>Mounds</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.5km</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Burbage</td>
<td>SP 44 94</td>
<td>Park House</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Burton Overse</td>
<td>SP 67 94</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Castle Donington</td>
<td>SK 41 28</td>
<td>Donington Hall</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Tran</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17        | Cathorpe | SK 45 15 | Mt St Bernard Abbey | Spring Hill | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Report, Road, 'very old building'
<p>| 18        | Charley | SP 48 86 | Mount Pleasant | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 19        | Claybrooke Magna | SK 40 11 | D 5km | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 20        | Craville | SP 61 13 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 21        | Cold Newton | SP 51 29 | Park House FM | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Watch brief |
| 22        | Costington | SP 40 15 | Y | 0.5km | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Fieldwalked |
| 23        | Croxton Kaml | SP 49 3 | Park HouseFM | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Watch brief |
| 24        | Detford | SP 83 93 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Fieldwalked |
| 25        | Drayton | SP 81 91 | Drayton II | R | Settland | Y | Y | Y | Y | Excavated |
| 26        | Drayton | SP 75 26 | Piper Hole | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Excavated |
| 27        | Eaton | SP 5 11 | R | Soar/Sence | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 28        | Endonby | SP 91 19 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 29        | Freby | SP 51 21 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 30        | Freby-Sideby | SK 62 19 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 31        | Glen Parva | SP 58 66 | Kirkdale Close | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 32        | Glocester | SP 75 98 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 33        | Great Glen | SP 65 66 | R | Sence | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 34        | Groby | SP 53 8 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 35        | Gumley | SP 19 90 | Holloway Spinney | Spring | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 36        | Halston | SP 78 78 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 37        | Hinckley | SP 43 94 | Proxy Barn | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 38        | Hinckley (Brackwell) | SP 44 96 | High Close | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 39        | Hinckley (Burbage) | SP 44 94 | Park House South | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 40        | Houghton-on-the-Hill | SK 79 68 | Sewage Works | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 41        | Ilston-on-the-Hill | SP 71 99 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 42        | Kimberworth Harcourt | SP 67 95 | Westfield | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 43        | Leicester | SP 47 92 | N FIeld Street | Y | Soar | Y | Y | Y | Y | Excavated |
| 44        | Leicester | SK 55 4 | Western Park | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Excavated |
| 45        | Leicester | SK 48 94 | General Hospital | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Excavated |
| 46        | Lookington Hamlet | SP 48 28 | Raschle Lane Farm | R | Soar | Y | Y | Y | Y | Excavated |
| 47        | Loughborough | SK 53 19 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Now Discounted |
| 48        | Lubbesthorpe | SP 50 4 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 49        | Luttrellworth | SP 53 83 | Moorams Farm | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | C2-4 |
| 50        | Market Bosworth | SK 40 3 | Berton Road | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Geophysics &amp; excavated |
| 51        | Market Harborough | SP 74 88 | The Ridgeway | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Fieldwalked |
| 52        | Medbourne | SP 79 93 | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Excavated/drawing brief |
| 53        | Melton Mowbray | SK 77 20 | Soarford Brook | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Excavated/drawing brief |
| 54        | Mountcorrel | SK 57 14 | Mountcorrel Hill | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Excavated/drawing brief |
| 55        | Narborough | SP 53 97 | Red Hill School | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Excavated/drawing brief |
| 56        | Nettleham | SP 93 92 | Bradley Park | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Excavated/drawing brief |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>1983</th>
<th>1984</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Fieldwalked</th>
<th>Excavated</th>
<th>Material &amp; Burials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>67, 26, 27, 66</td>
<td>Nevill Holt</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>68, 26, 27, 66, 67</td>
<td>Nevill Holt</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>69, 20, 27, 66, 67</td>
<td>Nevill Holt</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Dibnton</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Peatling Magna</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Peckleton</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Potters Marston</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Cropmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Rothley</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td></td>
<td>Material &amp; Burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Rothley</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.5km</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Sapcote</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Sapcote</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Shangton</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Shangton</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Sproxton</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Sproxton</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Sproxton-Stoneby</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Sproxton-Stoneby</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Shunton</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td>C3-C4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Tur Langton</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Shepphams Farm South</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Tur Langton</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Shepphams Farm South</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Tur Langton</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tur Langton</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Manor House</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>West Langton</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>R. Wetland</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>West Langton</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Six Hills</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Wyonham</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gann's Close</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Wyonham-Edmondthope</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Gann's Close</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td></td>
<td>Near to hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Scott No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>OS Ref</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>IA material</td>
<td>Roman material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Clipsham</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Black Piece</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Bdg</td>
<td>Burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Empingham</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gwash Valley</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Bdg</td>
<td>Burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Empingham</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gwash Valley</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Bdg</td>
<td>Burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Essendine</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
<td>Fieldwalked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Great Casterton</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>R. Gwash</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>C4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ketton</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Post office</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R. Chater</td>
<td>Bdg</td>
<td>Watch Brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Ketton</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>R. Chater</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Watch Brief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Market Overton</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lodge Farm</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>0.5km</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Market Overton</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fountains Row</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Tlxover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Normanton</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Gwash Valley</td>
<td>Bdg</td>
<td>Watch Brief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Ryhall</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Borderville West</td>
<td>R. Gwash</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>C3-4 villa bdgs and courtyard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Thistleton</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>C3-4 villa bdgs and courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Tinwell</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>R. Welland</td>
<td>Bdg</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Mosaics and burials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Tixover</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tixover Grange</td>
<td>R. Welland</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>C2 Mosaics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Tixover</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>R. Welland</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Fieldwalked surface scatter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Whissendine</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Ploughed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Whitwell</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gwash Valley</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Bdg</td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Stone, aisled bdgs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northamptonshire Villa Sites</td>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Scot. No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>OS Ref</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>IA material</td>
<td>Ro material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Northwicke</td>
<td>TL 0 81</td>
<td>SW village</td>
<td>Stream/Neave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, C4 coin, Roman road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ashby</td>
<td>SP 78 91</td>
<td>NW village</td>
<td>R. Welland</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Timber, cliffs, C2-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ashby</td>
<td>SP 79 91</td>
<td>NW village</td>
<td>R. Welland</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>IA and C3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Aleskton</td>
<td>TL 4 89</td>
<td>NE village</td>
<td>R. Welland</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Large settlement, small town/villa estate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ashby</td>
<td>SP 55 89</td>
<td>NW village</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Cobble surface, foundations, cliffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bainton</td>
<td>TF 10 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, coins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bainton</td>
<td>TF 10 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, coins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Barmwell</td>
<td>TL 7 83</td>
<td>NW village</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, C3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Barmwell</td>
<td>TL 7 83</td>
<td>NW village</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, C3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Barmwell</td>
<td>TL 5 85</td>
<td>NE Northwicke</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>C4 bath suite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Barmwell</td>
<td>TL 7 84</td>
<td>E village</td>
<td>0.5km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Benefield</td>
<td>SP 96 86</td>
<td>E Bigbyton</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, stall, debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Billing</td>
<td>SP 80 62</td>
<td>E Northampton</td>
<td>Nene</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Debris, timber beams, circular stone building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Buzell</td>
<td>SP 69 58</td>
<td>NW village</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>C2-4, circular stone building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Brickley</td>
<td>SP 59 37</td>
<td>E village</td>
<td>R. Ot Oxen</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Masonry, tesserae, coins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Brickley</td>
<td>SP 59 37</td>
<td>E village</td>
<td>R. Ot Oxen</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Roof, flat tile, inset stone foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Brixworth</td>
<td>SP 74 71</td>
<td>NW village</td>
<td>0.5km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Villa &amp; bath suite, C2+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Bugbrooke</td>
<td>SP 56 56</td>
<td>S village</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Burton Latimer</td>
<td>SP 89 74</td>
<td>W Burton Latimer</td>
<td>R. Is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Roman features and debris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Burton Latimer</td>
<td>SP 89 74</td>
<td>W Burton Latimer</td>
<td>R. Is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Burton Latimer</td>
<td>SP 90 74</td>
<td>W Burton Latimer</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Burton Latimer</td>
<td>SP 90 74</td>
<td>W Burton Latimer</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Byfield</td>
<td>SP 30 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Castle Ashby</td>
<td>SP 95 60</td>
<td>E Whitton</td>
<td>0.5-1km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Wing-storied villa, C5, part lost to plough?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Chipping Warden</td>
<td>SP 51 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, stone, ploughed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Cogenhoe</td>
<td>SP 83 60</td>
<td>E village</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>C2-4, C44, temple to C5, post-holes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cosgrove</td>
<td>SP 79 42</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>R. Tove</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, coins, accumulated evidence of villa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cottingstock</td>
<td>TL 3 91</td>
<td>NW village</td>
<td>0.5km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Cottingstock</td>
<td>TL 3 91</td>
<td>NW village</td>
<td>0.5km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Cottingham</td>
<td>SP 84 40</td>
<td>N village</td>
<td>R. Welford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Ot, debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Coughton</td>
<td>SP 8 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>L4C4, mosaic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Dennington</td>
<td>SP 58 63</td>
<td>NE Dennington</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Deanshanger</td>
<td>SP 70 39</td>
<td>S village</td>
<td>Stream/R. Ot Oxen</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Enclosed timber-framed, tiled house, C1-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Erks Barton</td>
<td>SP 84 62</td>
<td>NW Erks Barton</td>
<td>Stream/R. Nene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Easton Maudlin</td>
<td>SP 59 58</td>
<td>E village</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Easton Nlinton</td>
<td>SP 72 51</td>
<td>S Bisworth</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Farthinghoe</td>
<td>SP 12 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Finchdon</td>
<td>SP 91 70</td>
<td>S village</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Finchdon</td>
<td>SP 91 70</td>
<td>S village</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Finchdon</td>
<td>SP 85 76</td>
<td>E village</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Fineshade</td>
<td>SP 97 97</td>
<td>W Kings Cliff</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Structural debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Fotheringhay</td>
<td>TL 7 94</td>
<td>N village</td>
<td>Stream/R. Nene</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Gayton</td>
<td>SP 71 63</td>
<td>SE Gayton</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Goddington</td>
<td>SP 69 60</td>
<td>SW Stilton</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Glatton</td>
<td>TL 1 91</td>
<td>NW village</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Glatton</td>
<td>TL 1 91</td>
<td>NW village</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Godalming</td>
<td>TL 9 60</td>
<td>E village</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Great Addington</td>
<td>SP 94 75</td>
<td>W village</td>
<td>0.5-1km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Great Doddington</td>
<td>SP 67 63</td>
<td>SW village</td>
<td>R. nene</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Great Doddington</td>
<td>SP 68 65</td>
<td>N village</td>
<td>R. Nene</td>
<td>1km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Great Harlwhich</td>
<td>SP 87 70</td>
<td>SW village</td>
<td>0.5-1km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Great Halsley</td>
<td>SP 66 86</td>
<td>GWL, Olveston</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Great Longthorne</td>
<td>SP 79 71</td>
<td>N village</td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Great Langthorne</td>
<td>SP 82 72</td>
<td>NE village</td>
<td>R. Welland</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Great Langthorne</td>
<td>SP 90 72</td>
<td>S village</td>
<td>0.5-1km</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Great Langthorne</td>
<td>SP 78 72</td>
<td>SW Podington</td>
<td>0.5-0.8km</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>C1-4, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Great Langthorne</td>
<td>SP 85 56</td>
<td>N village</td>
<td>0.8km</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Great Langthorne</td>
<td>SP 85 56</td>
<td>N village</td>
<td>0.8km</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excavated</td>
<td>Pot, debris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Anglo-Saxon Brooches and Burial Sites in the East Midlands

The sites that are listed and described below have been recorded and interpreted as being inhumation or cremation related. In all cases the material is principally drawn from Meaney's *Gazetteer of Early Anglo-Saxon Burial Sites* (1964), supplemented by data from County HER/SMRs and Journals.

Anglo-Saxon Burials in Leicestershire

i) *Barkby (SK 63 09)*

A number of Anglo-Saxon artefacts including a stamped urn, a shield boss, sword fragments and three spearheads have been recovered near Barkby. A Roman glass bottle and Roman pottery was also found. Finds are suggestive of inhumation burials, possibly accompanied by a cremation.

ii) *Barrow on Soar (SK 57 17)*

A mid-19th century report mentions ‘Anglo-Saxon burial mounds’.

iii) *Barrow on Soar (SK 569 166)*

A report made in the 1950s records finds which may be indicative of a mixed cremation and inhumation cemetery. The pottery suggests a 6th century date.

iv) *Beeby (SK 66 08)*

A single inhumation burial was found in ‘The Gorse Close’ in 1844; associated finds included three brooches and wrist clasps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-6th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-6th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-6th C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Beeby brooch forms*

v) *Belvoir (Harston & Knipton) (SK 83 31)*

A brief and confused report of inhumation burials noted a skeleton, pottery, sword and spearhead found in 1939-40.

vi) *Bensford Bridge (SP 526 812 – 524 816) (Churchover, Warks.)*

In the middle of, and alongside Watling Street, a mixed cremation and inhumation site was excavated between the early part of the 19th century and the middle of the 20th century. The site included a number of burials with weapons, spearheads and shield bosses along with other grave goods. Various brooches were present:
This cemetery shows a wide range of brooch types, although all are of the early Anglian period, being predominantly of the 5th century.

vii) Birstall (SK 596 103)

In 1959 two plain Anglo-Saxon pots were found with a sword, spear and shield boss. The previous year three Anglo-Saxon pots (two of which were decorated) were found but reportedly they did not contain cremation material.

viii) Freeby (Saxby/Stapleford) (SK 816 192)

Significant 19th century finds reported including a variety of brooches, pots, a shield boss, spearheads and knives.

ix) Frisby (Kirby Bellars) (SK 718 182)

Part of a small-long brooch recovered, but other evidence is indicative of settlement rather than burial.

x) Glen Parva (SP 569 987)

An inhumation cemetery found in the late 19th century. This site included one inhumation that is now on display at The Jewry Wall Museum, Leicester and is known as the ‘Glen Parva Lady’ (Plate 4.1). This particular burial had walls lined with large stones and was stone covered. Dated to around AD 500 it included a number of ornaments, including brooches. Shortly afterwards, the grave of a male skeleton was found with a sword and spearhead; three further burials were found nearby.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-late 6th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-late 6th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-late 6th C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
xi) Glen Parva (SP 580 981) Kirkdale Close

Possibly a duplication of the previous entry, but including several pieces of Roman pottery and flue tile. In 1872, part of an urn from an Anglo-Saxon burial was exhibited.

xii) Hungarton (Baggrave) (SK 69 08)

A late 18th century discovery of a burial in a barrow; included a shield boss, spearhead(s) and the possible remains of a bucket.

xiii) Hungarton – Fox Holes Spinney (SK 687 062)

An inhumation burial with associated spearhead and clasp.

xiv) Hungarton (Ingarsby) (SK 685 053)

A find of several skeletons and artefacts, including an ornate English Square Headed Brooch. A sword fragment may also be related to the site. Possible duplication of the above entry. A mound was being planted, possibly suggesting a barrow burial.

xv) Husbands Bosworth (SP 648 836)

In the course of gravel digging, some human bones and an Anglian gold annular brooch of the 5th century were found.

xvi) Knipton (SK 823 311)

Mid-20th Century finds that were suggestive of a cemetery site including pottery and skeletal material.

xvii) Leicester – Belgrave Gate (SK 588 047)

A decorated early 5th century pot (incised neck lines and chevrons) recorded. No associated material was noted, but an annular Anglian brooch of the 5th century was also found. Seen in association with the following site, it may support the notion of an Anglo-Saxon burial site outside the east gate of the Roman town.

xviii) Leicester – Churchgate (SK 587 047)

An early, decorated 5th century pot and two skeletons together with a shield boss which covered the pot, possibly indicative of a mixed cremation and inhumation site, although there is some doubt as to whether the bones in the pot had been burnt.

xix) Leicester – Rowley Fields (SK 570 019)

A find of at least four vessels (groove and boss decoration) and a spearhead which may represent a mixed cremation and inhumation cemetery.

xx) Leicester – Westcotes (SK 577 038)

At the side of the Fosse Way, a quantity of late Roman material, comprising pierced coins, brooch and pottery, and Anglo-Saxon material including a number of skeletons, brooches, pottery and sword blades.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Lozenge foot</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Åberg IV</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>Late 6th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Westcotes brooches*

xxi) *Little Stretton (SK 66 00)*

A probable Anglo-Saxon inhumation site comprising eight skeletons was found in 1844 on the route of the Gartree Road. Some beads found but no other information on finds offered.

xxii) *Loughborough (SK 72 07)*

A bossed, stamped cremation urn found near Loughborough with the sherds of at least two other vessels.

xxiii) *Lowesby Hall (SK 722 075)*

In the mid 19th century, a skeleton together with a sword and two spearheads. Another spearhead and part of a human jaw were found subsequently and are probably related.

xxiv) *Market Harborough (SP 745 871)*

In the mid 18th century, several urn fragments, coins and ‘little bits of brass of uncommon form’ were found which were suggested as being possibly Anglo-Saxon.

xxv) *Market Harborough (SP 723 879)*

A scant report of a cemetery used by ‘both Romans and Saxons’ that had been discovered in 1873.

xxvi) *Medbourne (SP 794 929)*

Several skeletons were found in 1794, one accompanied by a spearhead. Probably Anglo-Saxon but the pottery found was Roman.

xxvii) *Melton Mowbray (unknown)*

A bequest was made to Leicester Museum of 16 urns and 7 brooches together with a string of beads. This would appear to be from a cemetery, but the find site is unknown.

xxviii) *Melton Mowbray (SK 756 194)*

In the course of gravel and clay extraction during the 1860s, a number of skeletons, aligned E-W (head to the west) were found, including a sword, spearheads, shield bosses and a bucket (e.g. Taplow, Bucks.) (VCH Leics. I, 232, 233).

xxix) *Melton Mowbray - Sysonby (SK 738 189 - Churchyard)*

At Sysonby, in 1859, human bones, together with goods including spearheads and a shield boss were found. (TLAHS 3, 39; VCH Leics. I, 232). Artefacts found in the
churchyard include a spearhead and knife/fragment and a spearhead was found on Shoulder of Mutton Hill, Sysonby.

xxx) Oadby (SP 622 998)

Probably a Roman burial site found in the late 18th century, poorly described but comprising some 80 burials and/or cremations. Further finds were made in 1955 (definitely Roman but with one Anglo-Saxon pot and hearth). A suggested Anglo-Saxon domestic site overlies a Roman cemetery. Subsequently, in 1960, on or in the immediate vicinity of the same site (SP 623 998), a ‘pagan cruciform brooch’, probably Anglian in origin, was found.

xxxi) Peatling Magna (SP 59 92)

Suggested Anglo-Saxon inhumation burial site of the 5th century, but without sound evidence.

xxxii) Rothley (SK 569 123)

During work on the Great Central Railway in 1896, material was recovered that may represent both a late Roman villa site and an Anglo-Saxon cemetery (Liddle 1981, 20), including a tessellated pavement, coins, 11 plain and decorated Anglo-Saxon vessels, spearheads and wrist clasp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Åberg IV or V</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6th-7th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-late 6th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>Leeds Type A</td>
<td>Rhineland</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rothley Temple brooches

This may be a cemetery of the late 5th to 6th centuries. The brooches are of styles associated with the Anglian area of settlement; the Leeds Type A square-headed brooch has its origins in the Rhineland of the late 5th century.

xxxiii) Rothley (SK 571 125)

Garden find of a brooch (type unknown) and two iron objects, but no further information.

Saxby (see Freeby above, Stapleford Park below)

xxxiv) Shawell (SP 535 794) (Cave’s Inn)

Anglo-Saxon material including spearheads was found which is suggestive of inhumation burials.
xxxv) Somerby (SK 761 120) (Burrough Hill)

Nine skeletons and swords were found in 1849. Two spearheads were identified as Anglo-Saxon.

xxxvi) Stapleford Park (see Freeby above)

Significant 19th century finds including a variety of brooches (of which only one has been described in detail), pots, shield boss, spearheads and knives. Also a number of beads, and two pierced, defaced Roman coins. This has the appearance of an early Anglian period cemetery of the 5th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square-head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>panelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>Large, gilt</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6th-7th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Large, florid</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-late 6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stapleford Park brooches

xxxvii) Stoke Golding (SP 396 970)

A possible inhumation burial based upon the find of a hanging bowl in the middle of a round barrow. No other finds apart from some flints.

xxxviii) Thurmaston (SK 617 084)

Found in 1954, ninety-six cremations in early dated urns with some burnt ornaments, plus an unburnt spear and shield boss. Some urns also of a late date with elaborate decoration.

xxxix) Tugby & Keythorpe (SK 767 002)

A rich burial found at Keythorpe Hall; finds included a bronze bowl, comb, silver ornamental knife handle and gaming pieces.

xl) Twyford (SK 73 10)

A collection of finds from between Twyford and Burrough Hill, one of which came from a gravel pit at Twyford. Included annular brooches, wrist clasps, shield boss, a tankard (?), and hanging bowl escutcheons.
xlii) Wanlip (Birstall) (SK 596 103)

Anglo-Saxon material including pottery, spearhead, sword, shield boss and bridle bit.

xliii) Wigston (SP 608 978)

An inhumation cemetery of approximately 20 burials from an area 10m x 10m, probably on the site of the modern Wigston cemetery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Áberg I (part)</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform?</td>
<td>Áberg V?</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6th-7th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Áberg I</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wigston brooches

This appears an early Anglian cemetery on the basis of the brooch forms, with the Áberg I brooches being of types which have examples from the early 5th century which occur both in Britain and on the continent.

xliii) Wymeswold (SK 598 238)

Four inhumations and a sherd of Roman pottery. A Roman date has been suggested but an Anglo-Saxon date is possible.
Anglo-Saxon Burials in Rutland

i) Barrow (SK 896 150)

Three urns found in the course of ironstone working close to the Barrow and Cottesmore parish boundary.

ii) Burley (SK 893 125)

Approximately three Anglo-Saxon urns found with Roman material in ironstone workings.

iii) Cottesmore (SK 90 13)

Two plain urns and a shield boss found in ironstone workings. The boss had a flat gilt-bronze disc with zoomorphic decoration.

iv) Empingham I (SK 944 077)

A Pagan-period burial site of approximately 14 inhumations in the Gwash valley. No conclusive evidence for Christian burials was noted, nor was there any evidence for the use of the site continuing beyond the early 7th century. The numbers referred to in the table relate to the illustrations in the text, all graves being from Site 3 (Cooper 2000, 27-40).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square headed</td>
<td>Leeds? Undivided foot</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Late 5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Åberg II</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th &amp; 6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Trefoil head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal arm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Import</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Åberg I?</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Cross-potent</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Empingham I brooch forms

The cemetery has a strong Anglian influence, but the two Cruciform brooches and the Equal Arm brooch are brooch-types with continental parallels.

v) Empingham II (SK 936 082)

Lying in the valley bottom of the River Gwash, this is a Pagan burial site with no Christian burials. The cemetery produced evidence for 153 individuals from one cremation and 135 inhumation burials. There is no suggestion of use of the cemetery continuing beyond the early 7th century. The numbers below relate to the assigned grave numbers in the excavation report (Timby 1996, 4, 5).
### Empingham II brooch forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Trefoil head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Trefoil head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Trefoil head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Trefoil head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Cross-potent</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Cross-potent</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>L&amp;P Vc</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th})-7(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>L&amp;P VI</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th})-7(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>L&amp;P VI</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th})-7(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>L&amp;P Vh</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th})-7(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>L&amp;P VI</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th})-7(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>L&amp;P Vc</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th})-7(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>M D4</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>M D1</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>M D4</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>M B1</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>M C2</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>M C2</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon the evidence of the brooch types, the Empingham II cemetery is wholly Anglian, comprising late period Cruciform brooches and Small-long brooches of the 'English' Anglian form.

vi) Essendine (TF 048 113)

A find of a single Anglo-Saxon urn reported to have been found in 1868. No further investigation was carried out.
vii) Glaston (SK 894 005)

An inhumation cemetery was recorded in the Glaston sandpit. Grave goods included wrist clasps, shield boss, an iron knife and tweezers. A total of 11 graves were recorded with some additional stray finds. Numbers relate to the individual grave numbers (Leeds & Barber 1950, 185-187).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Åberg I</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Åberg IV</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>late 6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Åberg IV</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>late 6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Åberg IV</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>late 6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Trefoil head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Trefoil head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>?lozenge foot</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>Leeds A3</td>
<td>Rhine copy</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Glaston brooch forms_

The Glaston burials have a strong early Anglian influence, including a copy of Rhineland Square-headed brooch an early Cruciform type.

viii) Great Casterton (TF 002 090)

Excavation revealed 79 burials that were cut into the bank of the town defences. This bank was created in the course of the re-cutting of the town ditch in the mid- to late fourth century. A total of 29 burials were late Roman inhumations, 35 were Anglo-Saxon cremations with the remaining 15 being Anglo-Saxon inhumations. The ‘Roman’ burials extend into the 5th century, and it is conceivable that the latest could have taken place as late as AD 460. The Anglo-Saxon cremations appear to span the period AD 475-550, while the inhumations post-date them, with finds indicative of use up to the latter part of the 6th century or later.

ix) Market Overton I (SK 887 166)

A burial site found in the early 20th century: Market Overton I was an inhumation cemetery found during ironstone extraction to the north-east of the church. Also recorded was a significant quantity of Roman pottery and Roman coins described as surface finds on the arable fields from Thistleton to Market Overton. Also found were 6 spearheads, shield bosses, a sword blade fragment, part of a scabbard, a knife, and part of a bucket.
### Type | Form | Production | Date
---|---|---|---
Square-headed | Ornate, gilt | English | 6th C?
Square-headed | Ornate, gilt | English | 6th C?
Square-headed | Ornate, gilt | English | 6th C?
Square-headed | Not known | English | 6th C?
Square-headed | Not known | English | 6th C?
Saucer (pair) | | Saxon | 5th-6th C.
Annular (pair) | | Anglian | 5th C.
Ring brooch | Swastika | Anglian | 5th C.
Disc | Star pattern | Romano-British | 5th-6th C.

**Market Overton I brooch forms**

x) **Market Overton II (SK 887 162)**

A cemetery of mixed burials approximately 300m to the south of Market Overton I cemetery. Twenty five urns, some with bone fragments were recovered, also 30 spearheads, 8 shield bosses, evidence for a large bucket, and a number of beads.

### Type | Form | Production | Date
---|---|---|---
Radiate brooch | Frankish/mid-European | Import | 5th-6th C.
Square-headed | Cruciform foot | English | 7th C.
Square-headed | Leeds B Divided foot | English | 6th C.
Square-headed | Leeds B Divided foot | English | 6th C.
Square-headed | Leeds B Divided foot | English | 6th C.
Cruciform | Áberg V | Anglian | 6th-7th C.
Cruciform | Áberg V | Anglian | 6th-7th C.
Cruciform | Áberg V | Anglian | 6th-7th C.
Saucer | - | Saxon | 5th-6th C.
Ring brooch | Swastika | Anglian | 5th C.
Ring brooch | Swastika | Anglian | 5th C.

**Market Overton II brooch forms.**

xi) **North Luffenham (SK 932 045)**

Lying on the watershed of the rivers Gwash and Chater (unlike the above sites) and excavated in the late 19th century, this burial site produced a total of 10 swords, shield
bosses, spearheads and arrow-heads, together with 2 buckets and the fragments of other buckets. This appears to substantiate suggestions that it may relate to an elite group within the local or regional population (Cooper 2000, 151). Illustrations of the brooches, together with other artefacts, appeared in *The Rutland Magazine* (Crowther-Beynon 1903/4, 152ff.), and can be classified as follows (Numbers relate to photograph numbers in original text):

While having brooch types that extend into the 6th century, North Luffenham demonstrates a strong, early Anglian influence of the 5th century, suggesting that it is a site with early origins.

The Market Overton II cemetery has a strong Anglian presence of the 6th-7th centuries. Some 5th century material is present, which includes an imported radiate brooch and a Saxon Saucer brooch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>Leeds A</td>
<td>Rhineland</td>
<td>Late 5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Trefoil head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Cross-pattée</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Lozenge foot</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring brooch</td>
<td>Swastika</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring brooch</td>
<td>Swastika</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Åberg I</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Åberg V</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6th-7th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Cross-potent</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long?</td>
<td>Cross-potent? (head only)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square head (plain)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square head (plain)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Åberg IV</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>Mid/late 6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Trefoil head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North Luffenham brooch forms
Anglo-Saxon Burials in Northamptonshire

i) *Aynho (SP 524 323)*

A crouched inhumation enclosed between four slabs, associated with other similar finds alongside the road to Bicester. Later, in 1843, some stone cists and some skeletons were found.

ii) *Badby (SP 563 591)*

An inhumation cemetery, skeletons aligned north-south with spears, swords, shield bosses, knives, beads, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6th C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Romano-Brit?</td>
<td>5th–6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square-head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Badby brooches*

iii) *Barton Seagrave (SP 887 773)*

Mixed cemetery having several cinerary urns, a shield boss and other small ornaments.

iv) *Boughton (SP 753 658)*

A Saxon inhumation burial found in 1917.

v) *Bozeat (SP 906 588)*

Three inhumation burials were found on a Roman period site; they contained brooches of the 6th century period.

vi) *Brixworth I (SP 747 720)*

A mixed cemetery situated to the north of the church produced cremation urns, spearheads, shield bosses, knives and brooches.

vii) *Brixworth II (SP 744 715)*

A mixed cemetery to the north-west of the church. Similar in character to Brixworth I with urns, spearheads and knives.
Early Anglo-Saxon Settlement in the East Midlands AD 450-850

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6th C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-late 6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Trefoil head, cresc feet</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Triangular feet</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Cross potent</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square-head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Brixworth II brooches*

viii) *Brixworth III (unlocated)*

An assemblage from the inter-war period including a rough, hand-made (accessory?) pot and other pieces. Also four pairs of wrist clasps and 9 shield bosses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Åberg</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penannular</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Brixworth III brooches*

ix) *Brixworth IV (SP 75 70)*

Cremation burials with several cinerary urns found to the south of Brixworth church.

x) *Brixworth V (SP 74 70)*

Found in the course of fieldwalking, an early Anglo-Saxon cremation site.

xi) *Clipston (SF? 714 815)*

An inhumation with *scramasax* (short sword), spearhead and knife.

xii) *Cranford (unlocated)*

Three small cremation urns.

xiii) *Cransley (SP 838 778)*

A mixed cemetery found during ironstone digging. Finds included cinerary urns, spearheads, a sword, beads, a bronze bowl and work box.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Cransley brooches_

xiv) Daventry, Borough Hill (SP 588 622)

An inhumation burial, secondary in a barrow with Roman and Anglo-Saxon items, including pierced Roman coins and an English 5th century small-long brooch with crescent foot. Also, elsewhere on the hill, a cist burial of a man with a spear-head.

xv) Daventry (SP 589 633)

An early inhumation burial with a spear.

xvi) Desborough I (SP 805 830)

Inhumation cemetery found during ironstone digging. Very few grave goods, general alignment with heads oriented to the west.

xvii) Desborough II (SP 80 84)

A mixed cemetery found in the mid-18th century comprising several skeletons with amber and glass beads, and bronze clasps; also two urns with bone and ashes.

xviii) Desborough III (SP 790 828)

Two accessory vessels found in a field on high ground.

xix) Desborough (SP 805 830)

An early Anglo-Saxon cemetery (possibly the same site as Desborough I).

xx) Desborough (SP 794 825)

A cemetery spanning the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods. Finds include bone and also Romano-British and Anglo-Saxon pot.

xxi) Desborough/Rothwell (unlocated)

An Anglo-Saxon cinerary urn found between Desborough and Rothwell.

xxii) Duston (SP 726 602)

A mixed cemetery of at least 30 inhumations and two cremation burials with 8 spearheads, 7 knives, 4 shield bosses, a bucket and a bronze bowl. Also a number of brooches:
### Early Anglo-Saxon Settlement in the East Midlands AD 450-850

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circular</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large saucer</td>
<td>Star design</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring Brooch</td>
<td>Swastika</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring Brooch</td>
<td>Swastika</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring Brooch</td>
<td>Swastika</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square-head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Square-head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duston brooches**

xxiii) *Ecton (SP 830 637)*

Recovered in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, inhumation burials of several bones and skulls aligned east-west, also two Anglo-Saxon coins.

xxiv) *Eye (TF 239 035)*

An inhumation cemetery of several burials with an Anglian annular brooch, two spearheads, wrist clasps, fragments of bronze and pottery.

xxv) *Fotheringhay (TL 079 946)*

A cemetery dated between the early Roman period and the early Anglo-Saxon period.

xxvi) *Fotheringhay (TL 078 943)*

An early Roman to Anglo-Saxon period funerary site.

xxvii) *Great Addington I (SP 957 744)*

A mid-19<sup>th</sup> century find of an inhumation burial with 'many human skeletons' found in the course of gravel digging. Three were without heads. Grave goods included spearheads, daggers and 'other war-like instruments' and other ornaments.

xxviii) *Great Addington II (SP 96 75)*

A cremation urn found on a hill overlooking the Nene valley. Rope pattern decoration and incised zigzag lines.
xxix) *Great Oxendon* (SP 732 834)

An inhumation burial of a skeleton with a spearhead, knife and *scramasax*.

xxx) *Grendon* (SP 879 604)

Anglo-Saxon inhumation burials

xxxi) *Hardingstone/Hunsbury* (SP 737 583)

First found in the mid-19th century and probably at Hunsbury, a site 'where evidences of Pagan rites attending some of the internments coupled with the Christian character of the relics accompanying others' suggest probably a late 7th century date. Finds included two spearheads. Also a part of a bridle reportedly found in the mouth of a horse. In 1953, two Anglo-Saxon inhumations were found in a bank during a training dig at Hunsbury.

xxxii) *Harringworth/Wakerley* (SP 941 981)

A cemetery site was found dated between the Iron Age and the early Anglo-Saxon period.

xxxiii) *Helpstone* (TF 104 067)

An inhumation cemetery, reference to a cinerary urn, human remains and an iron knife.

xxxiv) *Holdenby* (SP 695 671)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bronze brooch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze brooch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-late 6th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-late 6th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-late 6th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-late 6th C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penannular</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Animal design</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Animal design</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Early 7th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Holdenby brooches*
A mixed cemetery found in the late 19th century during gravel extraction was excavated by Leeds in 1909; finds were of pot, charred bones, six crouched inhumations and a shield boss. Earlier in 1899, one cinerary urn and 12 skeletons were found (three male, nine female) with a two spearheads and shield boss; most of the females had bronze cruciform fibulae. The 1909 excavation recovered 11 skeletons, of which six had grave goods including wrist clasps, amber beads and brooches.

xxxv) Irchester (SP 925 660)

Inhumation burial found by E. T. Leeds in 1912.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Geometric design</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Geometric design</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Irchester brooches

xxxvi) Islip/Twywell (SP 980 790)

Inhumation cemetery of the late 5th to mid-6th century, first found in the late 18th century with a skeleton with spearhead and shield boss. Later, ironstone extraction revealed three or four more skeletons with a shield boss, beads, pottery and clasps. Further excavations in 1917 and 1918 revealed more remains, shield bosses, spear-heads, clasps, beads, pots and glass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circular</td>
<td></td>
<td>Romano-Brit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring Brooch</td>
<td>Swastika</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Star pattern</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Knot design</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small disc</td>
<td>Incised ring</td>
<td>Romano-Brit?</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Trefoil head</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Islip/Twywell brooches

xxxvii) Islip (SP 970 785)

A cemetery site of the early Roman to the late Anglo-Saxon periods.
Kettering I (SP 876 792) (Stamford Road)

A mixed cemetery of, in total, 15-20 inhumations and approximately 110 cremations in urns that were recovered between 1846 and 1929. The urns were of early style with chevron and stamped decoration, and long and round bosses. Also found was a cruciform brooch of the late Anglian period.

Kettering II (SP 877 780) (Windmill Avenue)

A plain urn found inverted in a drain trench.

King’s Sutton (SP 515 370)

Human remains and spearheads.

Loddington (SP 814 783)

Probable inhumation burials found in the form of a shield boss and two spearheads.

Lowick (SP 952 798)

An inhumation cemetery of the Anglo-Saxon period. The site included both burials and finds, suggestive of the Pagan period.

Marston St Lawrence (SP 542 439)

A mixed cemetery of the late 6th century with 33 inhumations and three or four cremations and also a horse burial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saucer (pr)</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long (pr)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long (pr)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long (pr)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long (pr)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6th C?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marston St Lawrence brooches

Milton Malsor (SP 731 552)

Two cinerary urns, one a Buckelurne of the late 5th century.

Nassington (TL 071 956)

A mixed cemetery on a slope overlooking the River Nene. Three urns were recorded and 56 graves (65 bodies) of which three were unfurnished and 10 were quite rich, including a bucket, spearheads and shield bosses. Many types of brooches were present, also wrist clasps and some possible ‘Celtic’ pieces. Pots and brooch types suggest an early date but lasting long enough for Anglian influence to be represented.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penannular</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th}) C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annular</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc</td>
<td>Romano-Brit?</td>
<td>5(^{th}-6^{th}) C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring Brooch</td>
<td>Swastika</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6(^{th}) C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5(^{th}-late 6^{th}) C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nassington brooches**

xlvi) *Newnham (SP 595 596)*

Inhumation cemetery of about 20 skeletons found in 1829. Some goods may have been lost in recovery. Beads and wrist clasps were found as were an iron spearhead, three knives and three shield bosses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6(^{th}) C?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc</td>
<td>Romano-Brit?</td>
<td>5(^{th}-6^{th}) C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5(^{th}-6^{th}) C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penannular</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>Large florid</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>6(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring brooch</td>
<td>Swastika</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5(^{th}) C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Newnham brooches**

xlvii) *Newton-in-the-Willows (SP 880 833)*

A cremation burial site where seven urns were found including one Buckelurne, plus two pairs of wrist clasps.

xlviii) *Northampton I (SP 774 613) (Abington)*

A female inhumation burial including a knife.

xl ix) *Northampton II (SP 758 600) (Cow Meadow)*

An inhumation barrow burial, possibly primary. A number of grave goods, including an Anglian swastika decorated ring brooch of the 5\(^{th}\) century, was recovered along with a possible cinerary urn which is lost. The mound was lost in the creation of the park in 1957.
l) Northampton III (SP 770 605) (St Andrew’s Hospital)

A mixed cemetery of ‘several skeletons’ and three urns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>Central stud</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small saucer</td>
<td>Star design</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc brooch</td>
<td>Ring/dot design</td>
<td>Romano-Brit?</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Northampton III brooches

li) Norton (SP 619 638)

Inhumation burials along the route of Watling Street, secondary in an existing mound. Six skeletons were found, heads to the south.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc brooch</td>
<td></td>
<td>Romano-Brit?</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square-headed</td>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6th C?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Norton brooches

Two further sites at Norton are recorded which may be related. Excavation recovered a wrist clasp in 1936 and on an area of sand and gravel was found an amber bead and some metalwork.

lii) Pitsford (SP 747 684)

A cremation cemetery of a tumulus with 14 cinerary urns in close proximity. Finds also included part of a comb and a spearhead.

liii) Pytchley (SP 860 747)

A site of the early Roman to late Saxon.

liv) Raunds (TL 000 729)

The SMR records a Dark Age/Early Medieval period cemetery.

lv) Rothwell (SP 815 810)

A mixed cemetery found in the course of ironstone working comprising 12 cinerary urns and an unspecified number of skeletons. Finds also included a spearhead, a number of ‘cruciform and other brooches’, a saucer brooch and two defaced Roman coins.
Early Anglo-Saxon Settlement in the East Midlands AD 450-850

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cruciform</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th-late 6th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saucer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Saxon</td>
<td>5th-6th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rothwell brooches**

lvi) *Stoke Bruerne (SP 740 498)*

An Anglo-Saxon inhumation burial found in 1910.

lvii) *Sudborough (SP 967 821)*

Anglo-Saxon urns and ornaments found in 1916 in ironstone workings. Described as inhumation burials, but most probably mixed.

lviii) *Tansor (TL 057 901)*

Two early Anglo-Saxon inhumation burials found within a Neolithic/Bronze Age enclosure of a Bronze Age round house. Also included sherds of pottery and beads.

lix) *Thenford (SP 527 435)*

A quantity of bones and pottery found in a large pile of earth and stone. Seven further skeletons were found with an iron knife blade. Situated nearby are two further burial sites, one an inhumation of seven burials and pottery in a mound (SP 514 419), the other of early Roman to early Anglo-Saxon date with *tesserae*, pottery and a medal.

lx) *Thorpe Malsor (SP 832 789)*

An inhumation cemetery with parts of at least two skeletons and an urn. Also found were two spearheads, two shield bosses and a sword, and some wrist clasps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ring brooch</td>
<td>Swastika</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ring brooch</td>
<td>Swastika</td>
<td>Anglian</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thorpe Malsor brooches**

lx) *Titchmarsh/Aldwincle (SP 999 801)*

A single inhumation burial of a body with a knife, located on the line of a Roman road.

lxii) *Towcester (SP 684 484/485)*

A cemetery and funerary site of the early Anglo-Saxon period.

lxiii) *Twywell (SP 937 768)*

Records of inhumation burial(s) - ‘Anglo-Saxon remains found 1870’.
lxiv) Wakerley (SP 494 983)

An early Anglo-Saxon cemetery comprising 85 inhumations of the 6th to early 7th century. A smaller group of late 7th century burials, sparsely furnished, was also located nearby.

lxv) Watford/Welton (SP 595 678)

In 1845, on or beside the route of a Roman road, six skeletons were found buried with weapons.

lxvi) Weekley (SP 888 909)

Inhumation burials comprising two Anglo-Saxon skeletons, a dagger and a spearhead.

lxvii) Welton (SP 570 664)

An inhumation cemetery found in the late 18th century with two small skeletons and an urn decorated with line and stamped decoration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Production</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-long</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>5th C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Welton brooches

lxviii) Weston and Weedon (SP 459 770)

Found in 1948, some bones in a cemetery that has been dated to a period spanning from the early Anglo-Saxon period to the late medieval period.

lxix) Whitehall Roman Villa

A number of Anglo-Saxon burials found including one with a sword.

lxx) Wollaston (SP 896 654)

Two separate, but possibly related, early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries. The ‘Warrior’ burial was also found at Wollaston.

lxxi) Woodford Halse (SP 960 760)

lxxii) Woodford (SP 965 765)

A cremation burial indicated by a cinerary urn.
APPENDIX 4

Anglo-Saxon Burial Sites
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Brooches</th>
<th>Weapons</th>
<th>Coins</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barkby</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Barrow on Soar</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5th C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barrow on Soar</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5th C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bissacre</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5th C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Belvoir (Harston &amp; Knorton)</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Berford Bridge</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B渕ord on-the-Hill</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Burrough Hill</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cold Newton, Lowestby Hall</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Croft</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Freeby (Seaby/Stapleford)</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Finby (Kiby Belairs)</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Glen Peva</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hinckley</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hungarton (Baggrave)</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Hungarton (Inghamby)</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hungarton (Foxholes Spenny)</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Inghamby</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Leedsley</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Leicestershire Early Anglo-Saxon Burials</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Little Stanlow</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Loughborough</td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Market Harborough</td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Market Harborough</td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Medbourne Field</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Melton Mowbray</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Melton Mowbray (Sysonby)</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Melton Mowbray</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Melton Mowbray (Sysonby)</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Meriton Mowbray</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Oadby</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pearting Magna</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Queniborough, Barkby Field</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Rothley Temple</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Rowley Fields (see above)</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sandby, Stapleford Park</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Shawell, Caves Inn</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Somery</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Stapleford Park (see Freeby)</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Stowe Golding</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Sydonby</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Tilton-on-the-Hill</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Tugby, Keythorpe Hall</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Twyford</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**
- mid-19th C, report
- Med. Arch IV, 135
- TLAHS XXXI (1883), 122
- TLAHS XXX (1884), 122
- TLAHS XX (1887), 94-6
- TLAHS XXIII (1888), 225-26
- TLAHS XXIII (1888), 225-26
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Grid Ref</th>
<th>OS Ref</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>YR</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Wanlip</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>459600</td>
<td>310300</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>find Meaney, Arch J XIX, 279; VCH 240, VCH Ws 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Wilsuff</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>447900</td>
<td>287700</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Wigston Magna</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>460800</td>
<td>297800</td>
<td>Inhum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y skele + finds Meaney, TL AHS III, 123, IV, 113, 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Wigston Magna, Kirkdale Clt</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>459600</td>
<td>298100</td>
<td>Inhum</td>
<td></td>
<td>AS urn Meaney, VCH 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Wymeswold</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>456800</td>
<td>323800</td>
<td>Inhum</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 Skews + Ro pot, Ro or AS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Brooches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Burley</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>486600</td>
<td>315000</td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Burley</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>489300</td>
<td>312500</td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cottesmore</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>490200</td>
<td>313600</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Empingham I</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>494400</td>
<td>307700</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Empingham II</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>493600</td>
<td>308200</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Essendine</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>504800</td>
<td>311300</td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Glaston</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>489400</td>
<td>300500</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>11+</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Great Casterton</td>
<td>TF</td>
<td>502000</td>
<td>309600</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Market Overton I</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>488700</td>
<td>316200</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Market Overton II</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>488700</td>
<td>316200</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>North Luffenhham</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>493200</td>
<td>304500</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N Type</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Brooches</td>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>Coins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aynho</td>
<td>SP 452400</td>
<td>232200</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aynho</td>
<td>SP 453300</td>
<td>234300</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bedby</td>
<td>SP 450300</td>
<td>259100</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Barton Seagrave</td>
<td>SP 488700</td>
<td>277300</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Boughton</td>
<td>SP 475300</td>
<td>258500</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brixworth I</td>
<td>SP 474330</td>
<td>270030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Brixworth II</td>
<td>SP 474700</td>
<td>272000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Brixworth II</td>
<td>SP 474400</td>
<td>271500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brixworth III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Brixworth IV</td>
<td>SP 475000</td>
<td>270000</td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Brokhall (see Norton)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cranford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Crimeany</td>
<td>SP 483800</td>
<td>277800</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>Meaney, SMR NN12508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Deventry, Borough Hill</td>
<td>SP 456900</td>
<td>252200</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Deventry</td>
<td>SP 458940</td>
<td>263350</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>Meaney, SMR NN18822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Desborough</td>
<td>SP 480500</td>
<td>263070</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>SMR NN694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Desborough</td>
<td>SP 479420</td>
<td>292590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Desborough I</td>
<td>SP 480500</td>
<td>283000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Desborough II</td>
<td>SP 480000</td>
<td>284000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Desborough III</td>
<td>SP 479000</td>
<td>282800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Desborough/Rothwell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Duston</td>
<td>SP 472600</td>
<td>260200</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Eaton</td>
<td>SP 483800</td>
<td>253700</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Eye</td>
<td>TF 523900</td>
<td>303500</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fotheringhay</td>
<td>TL 507600</td>
<td>294600</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>E-Ro-eAS</td>
<td>SMR NN8049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Fotheringhay</td>
<td>TL 507800</td>
<td>294350</td>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td>E-Ro-AS</td>
<td>SMR NN765</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Great Addington I</td>
<td>SP 495700</td>
<td>274410</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Great Addington II</td>
<td>SP 496000</td>
<td>275000</td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Great Oxendon</td>
<td>SP 472300</td>
<td>283450</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Grendon</td>
<td>SP 487900</td>
<td>290400</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hardingstone</td>
<td>SP 473700</td>
<td>258300</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Hardingstone</td>
<td>SP 472700</td>
<td>256300</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Hardingstone</td>
<td>SP 473800</td>
<td>258300</td>
<td>Funeral</td>
<td>E-MidAS</td>
<td>SMR NN3551</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Harrington/Wakerley</td>
<td>SP 494180</td>
<td>296180</td>
<td>eA-EAs</td>
<td>SMR NN 1240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Helspont</td>
<td>TF 510400</td>
<td>306700</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Holdenby</td>
<td>SP 469500</td>
<td>297100</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Hunbury (see Hardingstone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Horister</td>
<td>SP 492500</td>
<td>296000</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ilp</td>
<td>SP 497000</td>
<td>278500</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>E-Ro-L-Sax</td>
<td>SMR NN15846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Ilp (Topswell)</td>
<td>SP 489600</td>
<td>279000</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>Meaney, 19th C. report, Foard, G. 2000, SMR NN103278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Kelletting I, Stamford Rd</td>
<td>SP 487600</td>
<td>279200</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Kelletting II, Windmill Ave</td>
<td>SP 487700</td>
<td>278000</td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>SMR NN12621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>King's Sutton</td>
<td>SP 451500</td>
<td>273000</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Loddington</td>
<td>SP 481400</td>
<td>278300</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Lowick</td>
<td>SP 465280</td>
<td>278800</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>E-Med-DA</td>
<td>SMR NN21095, Burials &amp; finds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Marston St. Lawrence</td>
<td>SP 454200</td>
<td>243800</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Milton Maisor</td>
<td>SP 473100</td>
<td>255200</td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Naseington</td>
<td>TL 507180</td>
<td>296400</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>SMR NN9592</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Naseington</td>
<td>TL 507100</td>
<td>295600</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>SMR NN12621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Newbolfile/Newnham</td>
<td>SP 457200</td>
<td>258700</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Several</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>EAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Newnham</td>
<td>SP 459800</td>
<td>259800</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Newton-in-the-Willows</td>
<td>SP 486000</td>
<td>283300</td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Northampton I, Abington</td>
<td>SP 477400</td>
<td>261300</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Northampton II, Cow Meadow</td>
<td>SP 475600</td>
<td>290000</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Northampton III, St Andrew's Hospital</td>
<td>SP 477000</td>
<td>190050</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>EMed-DA</td>
<td>Meaney, SMR NN 10569</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>SP 472700</td>
<td>260400</td>
<td></td>
<td>EMed-DA</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>SP 475700</td>
<td>266800</td>
<td></td>
<td>EMed-DA</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td>SP 475100</td>
<td>263050</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>SP 461450</td>
<td>263770</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y(Ro)</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>SMR NN19446, found 1936, wrist clasp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Norton</td>
<td>SP 461510</td>
<td>262630</td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Norton, Brockhall</td>
<td>SP 461900</td>
<td>263800</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Old Stratford</td>
<td>SP 478030</td>
<td>236700</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Oundle</td>
<td>TL 504200</td>
<td>288190</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Passenham</td>
<td>SP 478100</td>
<td>239000</td>
<td>?Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Passenham</td>
<td>SP 477950</td>
<td>236500</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAs-LMed</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Peterborough I, Woodstone</td>
<td>TL 515000</td>
<td>297500</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Peterborough II</td>
<td>TL 519500</td>
<td>298600</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Peterborough II</td>
<td>TL 519500</td>
<td>298600</td>
<td>?Cremation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Pitsford</td>
<td>SP 475080</td>
<td>207740</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Pitsford</td>
<td>SP 474700</td>
<td>264000</td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Pytchley</td>
<td>SP 485010</td>
<td>274780</td>
<td>ERo-LSta</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Round</td>
<td>TL 505050</td>
<td>272860</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Rothwell</td>
<td>SP 480200</td>
<td>281800</td>
<td></td>
<td>EMed-DA</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Rothwell</td>
<td>SP 481500</td>
<td>281000</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Stoke Bruerne</td>
<td>SP 474000</td>
<td>249800</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Sudborough</td>
<td>SP 496700</td>
<td>239210</td>
<td>?Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Tansor</td>
<td>TL 505700</td>
<td>290170</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Thetford</td>
<td>SP 451400</td>
<td>241600</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Thetford</td>
<td>SP 451000</td>
<td>245150</td>
<td></td>
<td>EAs</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Thetford</td>
<td>SP 452700</td>
<td>243500</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Thrapston</td>
<td>SP 482200</td>
<td>279900</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Titchmarsh/Alfriston</td>
<td>SP 469500</td>
<td>280150</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Towcester</td>
<td>SP 468420</td>
<td>248440</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Towcester</td>
<td>SP 468400</td>
<td>248500</td>
<td></td>
<td>EMed-DA</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Turweston (Bucks.)</td>
<td>SP 460000</td>
<td>237800</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Tyrell</td>
<td>SP 497000</td>
<td>276800</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Tyrell</td>
<td>SP 497200</td>
<td>276690</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Tyrell (see tarp)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EMed-DA</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Watford/Welton</td>
<td>SP 492000</td>
<td>276300</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Watton &amp; Wootton</td>
<td>SP 459500</td>
<td>278600</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Weddon &amp; Wootton</td>
<td>SP 459700</td>
<td>287920</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Welford</td>
<td>SP 461000</td>
<td>276000</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Welton</td>
<td>SP 457000</td>
<td>296400</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Wetherby &amp; Wootton</td>
<td>SP 459700</td>
<td>287920</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Wootton</td>
<td>SP 459600</td>
<td>278400</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Wootton</td>
<td>SP 459600</td>
<td>278500</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Woodford Halse</td>
<td>SP 496000</td>
<td>278000</td>
<td>Inhumation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Woodford Halse</td>
<td>SP 496500</td>
<td>278500</td>
<td>Cremation</td>
<td>Meaney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5

Anglo-Saxon Settlements
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>SMR Area</th>
<th>Old Ref.</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pottery</th>
<th>Post Holes</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leicestershire Anglo-Saxon Settlements (SMR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>LE907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>LE273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>LE908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>LE909</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LE994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LE695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LE447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LE453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LE713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>LE809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LE509</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LE505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LE354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>LE510</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>LE803</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>LE107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>LE112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>LE253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>LE110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>LE23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Code</td>
<td>Grid Ref</td>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date of Excavation</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Find</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>LE6976</td>
<td>NW Leics.</td>
<td>Castle Donington</td>
<td>NW of Willows Farm</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated, sub surface deposit</td>
<td>446800</td>
<td>328800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>LE4656</td>
<td>NW Leics.</td>
<td>Kegworth</td>
<td>NE of Long Lane Farm</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>aAS, Roman scatter</td>
<td>449100</td>
<td>326800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>LE4716</td>
<td>NW Leics.</td>
<td>Kegworth</td>
<td>E of Gissarde Farm Cottage</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>aAS</td>
<td>448200</td>
<td>326800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>LE9633</td>
<td>NW Leics.</td>
<td>Kegworth</td>
<td>Northover Farm</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated, sub surface deposit</td>
<td>445400</td>
<td>326800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>LE4523</td>
<td>NW Leics.</td>
<td>Ravenstone Farm</td>
<td>SW of Farham Bridge</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated, sub surface deposit</td>
<td>440100</td>
<td>311500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>LE4916</td>
<td>NW Leics.</td>
<td>Ravenscote Farm</td>
<td>SW of Churh Yard</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated, sub surface deposit</td>
<td>436800</td>
<td>310500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>LE8343</td>
<td>NW Leics.</td>
<td>Sawestone</td>
<td>Newton Burgoland</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated, sub surface deposit</td>
<td>437500</td>
<td>309800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>LE4665</td>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>Oadby</td>
<td>University Road</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>aAS</td>
<td>460200</td>
<td>301600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>LE9005</td>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>Oadby</td>
<td>Oadby</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>aAS</td>
<td>463500</td>
<td>301500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>LE9006</td>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>Oadby</td>
<td>S of Dam's Spinney</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Excavated, sub surface deposit</td>
<td>462200</td>
<td>297800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>LE8987</td>
<td>Oadby &amp; Wigston</td>
<td>Oadby</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>aAS</td>
<td>463200</td>
<td>297800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Y indicates a positive find or feature.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Number</th>
<th>Old Ref.</th>
<th>Admin Area</th>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pottery</th>
<th>Post Holes</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LE5155</td>
<td>80NE S</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Egleton</td>
<td>E of Mount Pleasant SK</td>
<td>469900</td>
<td>308100</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Metal working</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>Fieldwalk, surface deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE5174</td>
<td>90NW A</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Empingham</td>
<td>Empingham 1 Dam SK</td>
<td>484400</td>
<td>307600</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SFB, Pits</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>Excavated, sub-surface deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE5197</td>
<td>90NW Q</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Empingham</td>
<td>SE of Sykes Spinney SK</td>
<td>498700</td>
<td>307900</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>SFB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>Excavated, sub-surface deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE5204</td>
<td>90NW AS</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Empingham</td>
<td>NE of Mowmires SK</td>
<td>493900</td>
<td>307400</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Pits</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>Excavated, sub-surface deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE5208</td>
<td>90NW AS</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Empingham</td>
<td>NE of Mowmires SK</td>
<td>493900</td>
<td>307400</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Rect. Struct</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>Excavated, sub-surface deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE8510</td>
<td>80NE CD</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Gunthorpe</td>
<td>B of Coll Bungalow SK</td>
<td>487100</td>
<td>305600</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5km</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE8530</td>
<td>80NE A</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Hambleton</td>
<td>Nether Hambleton SK</td>
<td>489300</td>
<td>306700</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5km</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>Fieldwalk, surface deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE8555</td>
<td>90NE AY</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Ketton</td>
<td>Old Heath Lodge Field SK</td>
<td>497300</td>
<td>308000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1km+</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>1 sherd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE8523</td>
<td>81SW AK</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Langham</td>
<td>N of Ranksborough Hall SK</td>
<td>483500</td>
<td>31200</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5km</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>Find, 1 sherd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE8500</td>
<td>80SE BK</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Manton</td>
<td>W of Manton Lodge Fm SK</td>
<td>487400</td>
<td>304100</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Metal working</td>
<td>5km</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>Occupation site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE8511</td>
<td>80NE AX</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Oakham</td>
<td>Dog Kennet Spinney SK</td>
<td>487100</td>
<td>306300</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>Find</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE9227</td>
<td>99NW T</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Seaton</td>
<td>Main Street SP</td>
<td>490000</td>
<td>309820</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5km</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>Residual, in pit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE5796</td>
<td>90NE R</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Tickencote</td>
<td>Tickencote Lodge SK</td>
<td>498500</td>
<td>309200</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2 SFB, hearth</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>Excavated, sub-surface deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE5837</td>
<td>90SE AM</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Thoover</td>
<td>Thoover Hall SK</td>
<td>488300</td>
<td>306000</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>Excavated, sub-surface deposit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE5645</td>
<td>80SE M</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Uppingham</td>
<td>London Road SP</td>
<td>488600</td>
<td>299600</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>E-W ditch</td>
<td>5km</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>Ipswich ware Excavated, sub-surface deposit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LE6247</td>
<td>89NE AA</td>
<td>Rutland</td>
<td>Uppingham</td>
<td>S of Gower Lodge SP</td>
<td>488300</td>
<td>299600</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5km</td>
<td>eAS</td>
<td>3 sherds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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