

**Lincoln in the Viking Age:
A 'Town' in Context**

Aleida Tessa Ten Harkel

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Archaeology,
University of Sheffield

March 2010

Volume 1

**Paginated
blank pages
are scanned
as found in
original thesis**

**No information
is missing**

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates the development of Lincoln in the period c. 870-1000 AD. Traditional approaches to urban settlements often focus on chronology, and treat towns in isolation from their surrounding regions. Taking Lincoln as a case study, this PhD research, in contrast, analyses the identities of the settlement and its inhabitants from a regional perspective, focusing on the historic region of Lindsey, and places it in the context of the Scandinavian settlement. Developing an integrated and interdisciplinary approach that can be applied to datasets from different regions and time periods, this thesis analyses four categories of material culture – funerary deposits, coinage, metalwork and pottery – each of which occur in significant numbers inside *and* outside Lincoln.

Chapter 1 summarises previous work on late Anglo-Saxon towns and introduces the approach adopted in this thesis. Chapter 2 provides a discussion of Lincoln's development during the Anglo-Saxon period, and introduces the datasets. Highlighting problems encountered during past investigations, this chapter also discusses the main methodological considerations relevant to the wide range of different categories of material culture that stand central to this thesis, which are retrieved through a combination of intrusive and non-intrusive methods under varying circumstances.

Chapters 3-6 focus on funerary deposits, coinage, metalwork and pottery respectively, through analysis of distribution patterns and the impact of changes in production processes on the identity of Lincoln and its inhabitants. It is argued that a straightforward distinction between 'town' and 'country' is too simplistic. Viking-Age Lincoln was firmly embedded within the surrounding region, and neither Lincoln nor Lindsey was a homogenous entity. The formation of Lincoln's 'urban' identity was the outcome of changes in late ninth- and tenth-century socio-political structures, many of which had been set in motion centuries before the Scandinavian settlement.

CONTENTS

List of figures	v
List of appendices	vii
List of abbreviations	ix
Acknowledgements	xi
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1: Aims and objectives	1
1.2: The political background	2
1.3: Lincoln and the study of Anglo-Saxon towns	6
1.4: Lindsey and the study of late Anglo-Saxon rural settlement	12
1.5: Lincoln and Lindsey, or the study of Anglo-Saxon towns in their regional context: towards a new approach	16
1.6: Terminology	24
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY	27
2.1: Introduction	27
2.2: The archaeology of Lincoln	31
<i>2.2.1: The archaeology of Lincoln: introduction</i>	31
<i>2.2.2: The archaeology of Lincoln: the Upper City</i>	33
<i>2.2.3: The archaeology of Lincoln: the Lower City</i>	37
<i>2.2.4: The archaeology of Lincoln: Wigford</i>	40
<i>2.2.5: The archaeology of Lincoln: Butwerk</i>	42
<i>2.2.6: The archaeology of Lincoln: conclusions</i>	43
2.3: The archaeology of the rest of Lindsey	43
2.4: The datasets	49
<i>2.4.1: The datasets: introduction</i>	49
<i>2.4.2: The burials</i>	49
<i>2.4.3: The sculpture</i>	51
<i>2.4.4: The coinage</i>	54
<i>2.4.5: The metalwork</i>	56
<i>2.4.6: The pottery</i>	59
<i>2.4.7: The datasets: conclusions</i>	64
2.5: Conclusion	64
CHAPTER 3: FUNERARY DEPOSITS	67
3.1: Introduction	67
3.2: The sculpture: existing research	68
3.3: The burials: existing research	79

3.4: Spatial distribution of the sculpture	85
<i>3.4.1: Spatial distribution of the sculpture: introduction</i>	85
<i>3.4.2: Spatial distribution of the sculpture: The Upper City</i>	85
<i>3.4.3: Spatial distribution of the sculpture: The Lower City and Butwerk</i>	89
<i>3.4.4: Spatial distribution of the sculpture: Wigford</i>	92
<i>3.4.5: Spatial distribution of the sculpture: conclusions</i>	95
3.5.1: Burials and settlements	96
<i>3.5.1: Burials and settlements: introduction</i>	96
<i>3.5.2: Burials and settlements: Lincoln</i>	97
<i>3.5.3: Burials and settlements: Lindsey</i>	103
<i>3.5.4: Burials and settlements: conclusions</i>	108
3.6: Funerary deposits as a medium for social and political display	109
<i>3.6.1: Funerary deposits as a medium for social and political display: introduction</i>	109
<i>3.6.2: Funerary deposits below ground as a medium for social and political display</i>	109
<i>3.6.3: Funerary deposits above ground as a medium for social and political display</i>	110
<i>3.6.4: Funerary deposits as a medium for social and political display: conclusions</i>	119
3.7: Production and power: the rise of a new elite	119
3.8: Conclusions	121
 CHAPTER 4: COINAGE	 123
4.1: Introduction	123
4.2: The coinage: existing research	124
4.3: The coinage from a spatial perspective	130
<i>4.3.1: The coinage from a spatial perspective: introduction</i>	130
<i>4.3.2: Coin-finds from Lincoln and Lindsey: before c. 880</i>	131
<i>4.3.3: Coin-finds from Lincoln and Lindsey: 880s-910s</i>	134
<i>4.3.4: Coin-finds from Lincoln and Lindsey: the early tenth century</i>	139
<i>4.3.5: Coin-finds from Lincoln and Lindsey: 927-46 AD</i>	140
<i>4.3.6: Coin-finds from Lincoln and Lindsey: 946-73 AD</i>	143
<i>4.3.7: Coin-finds from Lincoln and Lindsey: after 973 AD</i>	147
<i>4.3.8: The coinage from a spatial perspective: conclusions</i>	151
4.4: Lincoln's mint	152
<i>4.4.1: Lincoln's mint: introduction</i>	152

4.4.2: The production of the Lincoln Monogram coins	153
4.4.3: The production of the St Martin's coinage	158
4.4.4: The production of the 'national' Anglo-Saxon coinages at Lincoln before c. 973 AD	164
4.4.5: The production of the 'national' Anglo-Saxon coinages at Lincoln after c. 973 AD	166
4.4.6: Coin production and settlement development	170
4.4.7: Lincoln's mint: conclusions	172
4.5: The use of money in late ninth- and tenth-century society	172
4.6: Conclusions	174
CHAPTER 5: THE METALWORK	175
5.1: Introduction	175
5.2: The metalwork: existing research	175
5.3: The metalwork from a spatial perspective	186
5.3.1: The metalwork from a spatial perspective: introduction	186
<u>5.3.2.1: 'Foreign' treasure: the Upper City in its regional context</u>	188
<u>5.3.2.2: Lincoln as production centre: the Lower City and Wigford</u>	190
<u>5.3.2.3: 'Scandinavian' brooches and 'Hiberno-Norse' pins: the spatial distribution of 'ethnic' styles across Lincolnshire</u>	201
5.3.3: The spatial distribution of 'Norse' bells	205
5.3.4: Equestrian equipment: dress-accessories for horses	208
5.3.5: 'Viking' warriors and craftsmen: evidence for the use of weapons and knives in tenth-century Lincoln and Lindsey	212
5.3.6: 'Viking' traders: balances and weights	214
5.3.7: 'Other' objects	216
5.3.8: The metalwork from a spatial perspective: conclusions	217
5.4: The socio-economic dimensions of production and consumption	218
5.4.1: The socio-economic dimensions of production and consumption: introduction	218
5.4.2: The production of fashion	220
5.4.3: Treasure and 'trashy dress fittings': the Anglo-Saxon smith and the use of different materials	224
5.4.4: The production and consumption of the metalwork from Lincoln and Lindsey: conclusions	229
5.5: Conclusions	229

CHAPTER 6: POTTERY	231
6.1: Introduction	231
6.2: The pottery: existing research	231
6.3: The pottery from a spatial perspective	240
6.3.1: <i>The pottery from a spatial perspective: introduction</i>	240
6.3.2: <i>Pottery from Lincoln and Lindsey: c. 870 and before</i>	241
6.3.3: <i>Pottery from Lincoln and Lindsey before c. 870 AD: imported wares</i>	245
6.3.4: <i>Pottery from Lincoln c. 870-950</i>	247
6.3.5: <i>Pottery from Lindsey, c. 870-950</i>	252
6.3.6: <i>Pottery from Lincoln and Lindsey: c. 950-1000</i>	255
6.3.7: <i>The pottery from a spatial perspective: conclusions</i>	260
6.4: Conclusions	260
CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION	261
Bibliography	267
Figures	297
Appendices	343

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1: Location of Lincoln within the British Isles.	297
Fig. 2: Map of Lincolnshire showing the location of the districts, main rivers and main settlements mentioned in the text.	298
Fig. 3: Sites in Lincoln.	299
Fig. 4: The area immediately surrounding Lincoln, with contour lines and the location of Stamp End.	300
Fig. 5: The area of Lindsey and location of placenames mentioned in <i>Domesday Book</i> , organised per <i>wapentake</i> .	301
Fig. 6: Possible tenth-century sculpture fragments produced in or near Lincoln.	304
Fig. 7: Tenth-century sculpture fragments from Lindsey that do not belong to the main typological groups.	305
Fig. 8: Sites with sculpture in Lincoln.	306
Fig. 9: Possible tenth-century sculpture fragments from the Kesteven quarries (Ancaster and Barnack).	307
Fig. 10: Possible tenth-century sculpture fragments produced of Yorkshire stone (Millstone Grit), and of unidentified stone type.	308
Fig. 11: The main sculpture types that occurred in Lindsey in the tenth century.	309
Fig. 12: Relative distribution of possible tenth-century funerary sculpture fragments from the Lindsey- and Kesteven-based quarries.	310
Fig. 13: Plan of sites with possible middle and late Anglo-Saxon burial sites in Lincoln	311
Fig. 14: Location of possible and definite middle- to late Anglo-Saxon burials in Lindsey and Kesteven.	312
Fig. 15: Photographs of coins mentioned in the text (1).	313
Fig. 16: Location of coin finds predating c. 880 AD in Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland.	314
Fig. 17: Photographs of coins mentioned in the text (2).	315
Fig. 18: Location of foreign coin finds in Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland.	316
Fig. 19: Location of coin finds dedicated to saints (and related issues) in Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland.	317
Fig. 20: Location of coin from the period of Athelstan's and Edmund's reigns in Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland.	318
Fig. 21: Location of coin finds dating to the period c. 946-73 AD in Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland.	319
Fig. 22: Photographs of coins mentioned in the text (3).	320
Fig. 23: Location of coin finds and mints post-dating c. 973 AD in Lindsey,	321

Kesteven and Holland.

Fig. 24: Photographs of coins mentioned in the text (4).	322
Fig. 25: Photographs and drawings of hooked tags from Lincoln and elsewhere in Lindsey.	323
Fig. 26: Distribution of hooked tags in Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland.	324
Fig. 27: Various objects from Lincoln, Lindsey and Kesteven (1).	325
Fig. 28: Various objects from Lincoln, Lindsey and Kesteven (2).	326
Fig. 29: Distribution of flat disc-brooches in Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland.	327
Fig. 30: Various objects from Lincoln, Lindsey and Kesteven (3).	328
Fig. 31: Distribution of domed brooches in Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland.	329
Fig. 32: Various objects from Lincoln, Lindsey and Kesteven (4).	330
Fig. 33: Distribution of ring-headed pins and other objects of 'Irish' manufacture in Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland.	331
Fig. 34: Distribution of finds of typical 'Scandinavian' character in Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland.	332
Fig. 35: Various objects from Lincoln, Lindsey and Kesteven (5).	333
Fig. 36: Various objects from Lincoln, Lindsey and Kesteven (6).	334
Fig. 37: Distribution of weights across Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland.	335
Fig. 38: Location of ninth- and tenth-century pottery production sites in Lincoln.	336
Fig. 39: Qualitative distribution of main mid to late ninth-century pottery types in Lincolnshire.	337
Fig. 40: Qualitative distribution of main late ninth- to tenth-century shell-tempered pottery types in Lincolnshire.	338
Fig. 41: Qualitative distribution of main late ninth- to tenth-century sand-tempered pottery types in Lincolnshire.	339
Fig. 42: Qualitative distribution of main late tenth- to eleventh-century pottery types in Lincolnshire.	340
Fig. 43: Qualitative distribution of Stamford ware (EST and ST) in Lincolnshire.	341
Fig. 44: Qualitative distribution of Torksey-ware (TORK), Torksey-type ware (TORKT) and Horncastle Lincoln kiln-type ware (HLKT).	342

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS IN LINCOLN WITH EVIDENCE FOR MIDDLE AND LATE ANGLO-SAXON ACTIVITY	343
APPENDIX 2: ARCHAEOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS IN LINDSEY (EXCLUDING LINCOLN) AND STAMFORD WITH EVIDENCE FOR LATE ANGLO-SAXON ACTIVITY	363
APPENDIX 3: SCULPTURE FROM LINCOLN	427
APPENDIX 4: SCULPTURE FROM LINDSEY, KESTEVEN AND HOLLAND	433
APPENDIX 5: BURIAL DATA FROM LINCOLN	445
APPENDIX 6: BURIAL DATA FROM LINDSEY AND KESTEVEN	447
APPENDIX 7: COIN PRODUCTION IN LINCOLN C. 880-1000	455
APPENDIX 8: GAZETTEER OF COIN FINDS FROM LINCOLN	457
APPENDIX 9: GAZETTEER OF COIN FINDS FROM LINDSEY, KESTEVEN AND HOLLAND	461
APPENDIX 10: COIN FINDS OF DEFINITE LINCOLN-MINTED COINS, C. 850-1000	485
APPENDIX 11: GAZETTEER OF METALWORK FINDS FROM LINCOLN	491
APPENDIX 12: GAZETTEER OF METALWORK FINDS FROM LINDSEY, KESTEVEN AND HOLLAND (per artefact type)	509
APPENDIX 13: GOLD AND GILT ARTEFACTS FROM LINCOLNSHIRE	581
APPENDIX 14: SILVER(ED) OBJECTS FROM LINCOLNSHIRE	587
APPENDIX 15: LEAD OBJECTS FROM LINCOLNSHIRE	591
APPENDIX 16: TABLE SUMMARISING EVIDENCE FOR METALWORK PRODUCTION IN LINCOLN (850-1100)	595
APPENDIX 17: LATE NINTH- AND TENTH-CENTURY POTTERY TYPES FOUND IN LINCOLN AND LINDSEY	597
APPENDIX 18: ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE TEXT TO INDICATE DIFFERENT FABRIC TYPES (AFTER YOUNG AND VINCE 2005: APP. 1)	609
APPENDIX 19: LATE ANGLO-SAXON PRODUCTION SITES AND THEIR FABRICS (AFTER PHILLIPS AND YOUNG 1994)	611

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AHRC	Arts and Humanities Research Council
APS	Archaeological Project Services
ASC	<i>Anglo-Saxon Chronicle</i>
ASH	Anglo-Saxon Horizon (used to denote a period of ceramic use based on the study of the urban assemblages from Lincoln (Vince and Young 2005))
BAR report	British Archaeological Research report
BMA	British Museum Acquisitions.
BMC	British Museum Catalogue
CLAU	City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit
CASSS	<i>Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture</i>
DB	<i>Domesday Book</i>
EH	English Heritage
EMASPP	<i>East Midlands Anglo-Saxon Pottery Project</i>
EMC	<i>Early Medieval Corpus of Coin Finds</i>
HE	<i>Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum</i> (written by Bede)
HER	Historic Environment Record
IFA	Institute of Field Archaeologists
LAS	Lindsey Archaeological Services
LDB	<i>Lincolnshire Domesday Book</i> . (eds P. Morgan and C. Thorn, 1986)
LUB	Land Use Block (an area of land that has a specific function for a given length of time)
NLPTS	<i>North Lincolnshire Pottery Type Series</i>
PAS	<i>Portable Antiquities Scheme</i>
PCA	Pre-Construct Archaeology
PPG16	<i>Planning and Policy Guidance Note 16</i>
RCHME	<i>Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England</i>
SCBI	<i>Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles</i>
SMR	Sites and Monuments Record
UAD	<i>Urban Archaeology Database</i>
VASLE	<i>Viking and Anglo-Saxon Landscape and Economy</i> project
YAT	York Archaeological Trust

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks must go to my supervisor, Dawn Hadley. Without her, this project would not have been possible. Thanks must go as well to John Moreland, my advisor, who made me consider coming to Sheffield in the first place. Mick Jones, City Archaeologist of Lincoln, was kind enough to share his knowledge about the archaeology of Lincoln by giving me an archaeological tour of the city, and allowed me to read the drafts of the forthcoming Lower City volume. David Stocker gave me a big pile of books, and invited me to his house where I spent the best part of a day exchanging ideas about sculpture with him and Paul Everson. Mark Blackburn (Fitzwilliam Museum) and Gareth Williams (British Museum) both extensively commented on various drafts of the coinage chapter, and spent significant time answering my queries about numismatics and monetary history. Without Jenny Mann and her never-ending patience and endless help in our quest for the metal artefacts I would never have been able to write the metalwork chapter. Kevin Leahy of the *PAS* and Gabor Thomas of the University of Reading both gave a second opinion on the identification of the metal artefacts, whilst Gabor also allowed me to read his contributions to the Flixborough volumes ahead of publication. Finally, Alan Vince and Jane Young spent several hours explaining their work on the Lincoln pottery, whilst Gareth Perry gave me a crash course in Anglo-Saxon pottery from West Halton.

The Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) provided the funding for this project. Other grants and awards that have contributed to this research included an AHRC/Library of Congress scholarship, which provided the opportunity to spend three months at the John W. Kluge Center in the Library of Congress (Washington DC, USA), and a Petrie Watson Exhibition, which facilitated participation in the Sixth World Archaeology Congress in Dublin (Ireland) in 2008.

I would also like to thank, in alphabetical order:

Marcus Abbott, for creating an inspiring 3D-reconstruction of late Anglo-Saxon Lincoln that came useful in many presentations; Martin Allen, Fitzwilliam Museum, for his kind permission to reproduce the coin images; Steve Ashby, University of York, for the information about combs and comb-making; Justine Bayley, EH, for the metalwork-reports; Mark Bennet and other staff of the Lincolnshire HER; Roger Bland of the *PAS*, for his encouragement and permission to reproduce the images from the *PAS* database; Paul Blinkhorn, for sending me a copy of his 2005 TAG paper; Rebecca Boyd, University College Dublin, for her ideas about Viking Age houses; Hannah Brown, for granting me permission to read and use her dissertation on the Torksey-material; Jayne Carroll, University of Nottingham, for allowing me to read the Lincolnshire-entries for her and David Parson's forthcoming volume on English mint-names ahead of publication; Derek Craig, *CASSS*, for arranging permission to reproduce the sculpture images; Roger Doonan, University of Sheffield, for his suggestions for approaches to the metalwork; Marina Elwes, formerly FLO for North Lincolnshire, for her permission to reproduce her pencil drawings of objects listed on the *PAS* website; Andrew Gardner, University College London, for his inspiring thoughts about time and agency; Kathryn Goldsack, Graduate School Secretary during the second, third and fourth years of my studies; Mike Hemblade and other staff of the North Lincolnshire Museum and SMR; John Herridge, Lincoln *UAD*, for providing information about the *Urban Archaeology Database*; Dawn Heywood, *The Collection*, Lincoln, for giving permission to access the museum's metalwork collection; Ana Jorge, University of Sheffield, for her inspiring thoughts about pottery technology and social change; Jane Kershaw, University of Oxford, for sharing her thoughts on metalwork; Kevin Leahy of *PAS*, for his help with the metal artefacts; Steve Malone of *APS* for permission to reproduce images from the report on the recent Collection/Danesgate investigations; Deirdre McAlister,

National University of Ireland, Maynooth, for sending me her thoughts on 'Norse' bells; Jo Mirfield, Graduate School Secretary during the first year of my studies; John Naylor, *VASLE*-project, for his help and enthusiasm, and advice regarding the metalwork data and the PAS database; Edward Oakley, University of Nottingham, for sharing his ideas on Viking Age Norwich; Dominic Perring, for his information about the 1970s Flaxengate excavations; Dan Pett, ICT adviser to the *PAS*, for providing me with a user ID and password for the *PAS* database; Kris Poole, University of Nottingham, for sharing his ideas about horses; Andrew Reynolds, University College London, for use of his office and flat; Julian Richards, University of York, for arranging access to Hannah Brown's work on the Torksey data; Michael Shapland, University College London, for his feedback on parts of my thesis relating to materiality; Kirsty Stonell Walker of EH, for her help and free provision of AML reports; Rob White, Lincolnshire County Council, for his kind help on the Flaxengate technology, and access to his unpublished work on the technological finds; Hugh Winfield, North-East Lincolnshire HER, for the site reports; and anyone else I may have forgotten to mention. Ultimately, however, responsibility for the views expressed in this thesis remains with the author.

Many thanks as well to the postgraduate community at Sheffield, in particular Sally Smith, and the research community from the John W. Kluge Center for creating a stimulating work environment. Andy Seaman, who organised the first EMASS conference, deserves a special mention. Everyone involved in EMASS for the last three years greatly contributed to the provision of a stimulating and intellectually challenging countryside (and hopefully soon international) research context. My two ex-landlords from Sheffield, Dave Cowling and Dr Graham McElearney (and, of course, BJ the dog), and my 'roommates' Marc Teren, Kevin Arnett and Anthon Ivarsson from Washington DC, provided frequent and welcome distractions, as did my various friends from Sheffield, Washington DC, Cambridge, London and Utrecht. Special thanks must go to my parents, Marry en Thom, for their unwavering support over the years, and to Marcus and Andrew for periodically distracting and supporting me.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1: Aims and objectives

This thesis investigates the changing identities of late ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln (fig. 1) and its inhabitants. It places the development of Lincoln in the context of the Scandinavian settlement, which took place from c. 870 onwards. Taking a regional approach, and placing Lincoln within the wider context of the historic region of Lindsey (fig. 2), this thesis addresses the questions how and why Lincoln developed into a 'town', and how 'urban', or how different from the 'rural', the settlement was during this period.

The origins and growth of Anglo-Saxon 'towns' have received a large amount of scholarly attention, as have the effects of the Scandinavian settlement on Anglo-Saxon society. The relationship between these two subjects, however, remains under-explored. A contributing factor to the continuing divide is the fact that the (sub-)disciplines of urban archaeology and viking studies in Britain are characterised by different theoretical concerns. Urban archaeologists often place emphasis on the economic and political aspects of urban development, portraying the 'growth' of towns in evolutionary or hierarchical terms (e.g. Astill 1991; Aston and Bond 2000; Biddle 1974; 1976a; 1976b; Davis 1982; Haslam 1987; Hodges 1982; 1988; Postan 1972: 236-40; Vince 1994; for a review article, see Astill 2009; Horden 2000). However, few studies place the development of Anglo-Saxon towns within the context of rural settlement development (a notable exception is Astill 2006), or treat the subject from a social perspective (but see Hadley and Ten Harkel forthcoming).

The field of viking-studies in Britain, on the other hand, has recently focused on the formation of new regional or ethnic identities as a result of the Scandinavian settlement (Graham-Campbell *et al.* 2001; Hadley and Richards 2000). Although the development of towns in the wake of the Scandinavian settlement is usually acknowledged (Hadley 2006; O'Donnabháin 2001; Richards 2004b), the impact of the Scandinavian settlement on town development in England is either portrayed in military terms, as a catalyst for the emergence of defended sites in the south, or, again, in economic terms, as the direct stimulus for the re-emergence of towns in the east and north (Aston and Bond 2000: 71-72; Clarke and Ambrosiani 1991; Hadley 2006; Postan 1972; Roesdahl *et al.* 1981). The positive contribution of the Scandinavians to urban development is sometimes seen as surprising, as the Scandinavians themselves were from a non-urban background. Thus Hadley (2006: 145) has acknowledged that "little of the Scandinavian contribution to urbanism can be described as being characteristically Scandinavian ... [but] a diverse range of influences from within English society and further afield can be identified". Excavations carried out in 'viking' towns might explain why the non-urban vikings

had a positive effect on urban development, but, although the results of such excavations are increasingly being published (Mahany *et al.* 1982; Jones *et al.* 2003), most work has a multi-period focus and a descriptive approach (exceptions are Hall's (1978; 1984; 1994) studies on Viking Age York).

In brief, there are no period-specific studies to date that focus on the social aspects of the development of a single 'viking' town, placed within the context of contemporary developments in rural settlement patterns. In this respect, the early medieval period stands out within the field of urban archaeology (e.g. Alston 2001; Liebeschuetz 2001; MacMahon and Rice 2005; Parkins 1997; Patterson 2006; and Woolf 1998 for the classical period; Attreed 2001; Hall 2002 for the later medieval period; Gottdiener and Hutchinson 2006; and Storey 2006 for a multi-period approach that includes the classical and (post-)medieval but nothing before 1000 AD). This thesis will take a step towards resolving the discrepancy. Focusing on the 'viking' town of Lincoln, it will combine the debates on the so-called 're-urbanisation' of tenth-century England with that on the Scandinavian settlement, and rural settlement in general. Where appropriate, comparison with other regional centres within the area of Scandinavian settlement will be included.

Central to this thesis stands the analysis of four different categories of material culture that were produced and consumed in and around Lincoln, to allow for a comparison between the urban and rural spheres. Incorporating both portable and monumental artefacts, these comprise funerary deposits including sculpture (chapter 3), coinage (chapter 4), metalwork (chapter 5), and pottery (chapter 6). As the various retrieval methods for the different types of evidence vary widely, a general chapter on methodology (chapter 2) will precede the data chapters. The focus on material culture rather than on 'structural' remains (or stratigraphy) allows for a comprehensive engagement with the more social aspects of urban development. As such, this thesis will move beyond the traditional perspective, in which material culture is employed as dating evidence, or as a means to assess the network of contacts or 'trade links' with other settlements or regions. The conclusions from each chapter will be drawn together in chapter 7 (conclusion). First, however, the remainder of this opening chapter will set out the current state of knowledge with regards to the political situation in Lincoln and Lindsey in the later ninth and tenth centuries AD, and summarise previous research on urban and rural settlement patterns. Finally, it will introduce the overarching theoretical framework that this thesis will adopt.

1.2: The political background

The political situation in Lincoln and Lindsey prior to the tenth century AD is not entirely clear. There has been considerable debate, in particular, about the question whether Lindsey was ever an independent kingdom (for a summary of the debate,

see Foot 1993: 128; Yorke 1993). It is likely that Lindsey was independent until the early seventh century, as the royal dynasty of Lindsey was included in the collection of a group of surviving royal pedigrees known as the *Anglian Collection*, first compiled in the later eighth century (Foot 1993: 129-33). Another argument in favour of Lindsey's early independence is the fact that it was important enough to have its own bishop (Foot 1993: 136-37). By the 620s, however, Lindsey had become part of Northumbria. After 642 Northumbria itself was split between Deira and Bernicia, ruled separately by Oswiu and Oswine, and Lindsey probably passed into the hands of Penda of Mercia. Penda died in 655, and Oswiu subsequently became overlord of the southern kingdoms, including Lindsey.

A few years later at least part of Lindsey had reverted back to Mercia, as there is a reference in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* (IV: 3) that Wulfhere of Mercia granted 50 hides of land of the monastery *æt baruwe* (widely regarded as being at Barrow-upon-Humber in Lindsey) to bishop Chad in 669 (Blair 2005: 360; Everson and Knowles 1993; but also see Everson 1984; Stocker 1993: 114). In the 670s Lindsey fell back into Northumbrian hands (*HE* IV: 12), but was finally reoccupied by the Mercians in 679 under Æthelred (*HE* IV: 21). The southern parts of what became Lincolnshire (Kesteven and Holland) had probably been part of Mercia continuously from the mid-seventh century onwards (Foot 1993: 133-36; Yorke 1993: 143-44). The impact of regional differences that pre-dated the Scandinavian settlement has often been overlooked, but it is likely that they were instrumental in the subsequent development of these regions (Buckberry 2004: 53).

Some possible inferences about regional administration can be made on the basis of written sources. The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (*ASC*) refers to Lindsey on a number of occasions, from the near-contemporary ninth-century entries of the A-manuscript to the later entries in the twelfth-century E-manuscript.¹ The first references to the Districts of Kesteven and Holland (fig. 2) are also late tenth-century in date, Kesteven being referred to as "thickets of the wood which is commonly called Kesteven" in Æthelweard's *Chronicle* (Keynes and Lapidge 1983: 190), whilst Holland is referred to in a charter of Thorney Abbey in 973. The term *Lincolnescire* (presumably also including Kesteven and Holland) does not appear until the *ASC*-entry for 1016 in the twelfth-century E-version, and the *ASC*-entry for 1065 in the mid-eleventh D-version. This suggests – as has been done by Everson and Stocker (1999: 7) – that Lindsey, Holland and Kesteven were not treated as a unity until the eleventh century.² Chapters 3-6 will analyse the

¹ *ASC* E 627, 678, 993, 1013, 1014; *ASC* A 838, 873, 874. Version E was written in the twelfth century at Peterborough; it is the latest of all manuscripts, derived from a lost northern version. Version A was the earliest version, dated to the late ninth century, written in Wessex at Winchester, and is thus a contemporary account, but written from a West Saxon perspective. Version D is mid eleventh-century in date, and compiled at Worcester, but based on the same northern example as E.

² Before 1974, when the administrative unit of South Humberside was created, Lincolnshire

separate identities of these three regions, which gradually diminished towards the end of the tenth century, in more detail.

The eleventh-century *Domesday Book* (*DB*) is the first documentary source to refer to the three *Ridings* of Lindsey, consisting of north, south and east, but they seem already of some antiquity, as the term comes from ON *thridjung* or OE *thriding*, a division into three (Morgan and Thorne 1986).³ Morgan and Thorne (1986: *Index of Places*) have suggested that at the time of *DB*, Kesteven and Holland were grouped together in a 'fourth' Riding. When referring to settlements, *DB* makes a distinction between the *civitas* of Lincoln, the *burgis regis* of Stamford and the *villa* of Torksey on the one hand, and 'the rest', manors, *berewicks* (outlying estates) and *sokeland* (tributary holdings), organised per landowner and parish, on the other.⁴ This distinction, as well as the terminology employed for Lincoln, Stamford and Torksey, will be further discussed in chapter 4.

It is generally held that *after* the Scandinavian settlement, Lincoln became one of five 'viking' towns, commonly known as 'the Five Boroughs', and also including Leicester, Derby, Nottingham and Stamford. This assumption is based in part on the *ASC* entry for AD 942, which celebrates the conquest of these five boroughs (*Burga fife* (ms. A) or *burga fife* (mss C-D)) by the West Saxon king Edmund. In this entry, the names of the five *burga* are listed explicitly, and it was this passage, together with a reference to "the court of the Five Boroughs" (*on Fif burga gepincða*) in the late tenth or early eleventh-century *Wantage*-code of King Æthelred (978-1016) (*III Æthelred* 1.1) (Robertson 1925: 65; Whitelock 1955: 402-05), that lay behind the invention of the term "the confederation of The Five Boroughs", which Stenton first applied in 1943 to the five towns of Lincoln, Leicester, Nottingham, Stamford and Derby (see Stenton 2001: 358). Stenton (2001: 510) considered the assembly of the Five Boroughs *not* as "the court of an urban confederation", but rather believed that "the Five Boroughs had been the fortified bases of five Danish armies, which had settled down upon the land and developed what they remembered of their native law into a common body of custom", whilst "the general assembly of the Five Boroughs was the court of highest authority in the application of this custom".

Stenton's (2001: 510) interpretation can be questioned. First, as will be argued throughout subsequent chapters, there is very little evidence that Lincoln

was England's second largest county. Everson and Stocker (1999: 7) argue that "the county's boundaries are all ancient, and that its various components were probably only grouped together for the first time in the eleventh century. The county was even then divided into three divisions, the 'parts' of Kesteven, Holland and Lindsey ... each of which has a longer history as an administrative unit".

³ *DB* sheds light on the situation in the rural areas of Lincolnshire in the immediate post-Conquest period, and thus reflects at least part of the outcome of the developments that took place in the preceding two or three centuries (Loyn 1987: 2; Roffe 2000: 20-22; 2007: 287; *LDB*: 337b).

⁴ Although in *LDB* 336d 14 Stamford is referred to as a *villa* again.

ever had a military character. Instead, the earliest evidence is economic and funerary in nature. Second, the ASC entry for 942 does not refer to any common factors between the five boroughs listed, other than the fact that the West Saxon King Edmund conquered them all, whilst the law-code *III Æthelred* 1.1 does not specify the names of the five boroughs it refers to. Although the absence of definite articles in the ASC entry for 942 is meaningless (it does not use any definite articles throughout, which is probably a result of the metric restrictions imposed by its poetic format), it is possible (if not more likely) that the correct translation of *burga fife* is 'five boroughs' rather than 'the Five Boroughs'.

Elsewhere within the ASC an indication can be found that this identification of Lincoln, Leicester, Derby, Stamford and Nottingham as a confederation known as the Five Boroughs may not be as straightforward as it seems. The ASC entry for 1013 (mss C-E, copied and composed between the eleventh and twelfth centuries), which describes the invasion of England by the Danish king Svein Forkbeard, relates how "Earl Uhtred and all Northumbria immediately submitted to him [*i.e.* Svein], and all the people in Lindsey (*eall þæt folc on Lindesige*), and afterwards the people of the Five Boroughs (*7 sibban þæt folc into Fifburgum*)" (ms. D). The term *Fifburga* (or *Fifburingha*) (mss C, E) from these eleventh- and twelfth-century manuscripts betrays a much stronger sense of perceived political or social unison between the five boroughs than the description *burga fife* from the 942-entry, which already occurred in the contemporary A version. Yet at the same time the 1013 entry suggests that Lindsey and the *Fifburga* were two separate entities, which either means that Lincoln was not perceived to be part of Lindsey, or that Lincoln was not perceived to be part of the 'confederation' of the Five Boroughs.

The entry for 1015 (ASC C-E) confuses the situation even more. This entry relates how Eadric, the ealdorman of Mercia, betrayed and killed Sigferth and Morcar, the most important men of the *Seofonburhga* (or Seven Boroughs) (ms. D).⁵ According to the *Chronicle*, the atheling Edmund subsequently married Sigferth's widow, and went *þanon wæstan norð into Fifbur\h/gum* (from the west, north into the Five Boroughs) (ms. D), and took possession of Sigferth's and Morcar's estates.⁶ This suggests that the territory of the Seven Boroughs also included the territory of the Five Boroughs. Stenton (2001: 388 n. 2) tentatively identified these 'seven boroughs' as Lincoln, Leicester, Nottingham, Derby, Stamford, Torksey and York. Whether or not his interpretation is correct, the fact that the same entry in the ASC refers twice to roughly the same territory by a different name suggests that the supposed political unity of the 'Five Boroughs' should be taken with some caution.

⁵ Mss C and E give *Seofonburga*.

⁶ Ms. C gives *þanon westan norð into Fifburgum*, and ms. E gives *wæstan norð into Fifburgum*.

No other historical references that can shed light on the political situation in Lindsey prior to the Norman Conquest have survived, but the issue will be revisited in subsequent chapters, drawing on sculptural and numismatic material. Chapter 3 will address the evidence for the ecclesiastical power structures that were in place in later ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln (highlighted in Astill 2009: 266-67 as an area of research deserving further attention), whilst chapter 4 will look in more detail at the possible identities of Lincoln's secular elite through an analysis of the coinage that was produced in Lincoln during the later ninth and tenth centuries.

1.3: Lincoln and the study of Anglo-Saxon towns

The information that can be gleaned from the surviving documentary sources regarding late Anglo-Saxon Lincoln is limited. However, since the 1950s, Lincoln has been home to a large number of developer-funded excavations, revealing a wealth of archaeological data, spanning the prehistoric to modern times (see chapter 2). The findings are increasingly being published in the *Lincoln Archaeological Studies* series, which provides the chronological framework for this thesis.⁷ The following section will provide a brief introduction to the current state of knowledge about late Anglo-Saxon Lincoln (the archaeology of the settlement will be discussed in more detail in chapter 2), and place this within the context of the study of late Anglo-Saxon towns in general.

The established chronology of Lincoln's development echoes that of many other ninth- and tenth-century towns in England. After a period of near-abandonment during the fifth and sixth centuries (appendix 1), Lincoln became primarily an ecclesiastical centre in the seventh century. It was not until the late ninth century that "an *urban profile* begins to emerge in the archaeological evidence from Lincoln" (Hadley 2006: 163; my emphasis). Jones *et al.* (2003: 159) have suggested that an active policy was in place to ensure that "the period from the late 9th to the mid 12th centuries saw the re-establishment of Lincoln as a town", whilst maintaining that it is "not controversial to say ... that the city was re-founded towards the end of the 9th century as an urban location". The issue whether or not the growth of Lincoln was a conscious effort to revive urbanism will

⁷ The major synthesis on Lincoln's archaeology, *The City by the Pool* (Jones *et al.* 2003: 1) aimed to "'sum-up' existing knowledge of the city's archaeology and to make it accessible for professional townscape managers as well as for the academic and general public alike". As such, it provides a full archaeological and historical account of the city's archaeology from prehistory to c. 1945, and guidelines for future work to be carried out in Lincoln and its immediate surroundings. In addition to the *City by the Pool*, separate volumes have been (or will be) published for the Upper City (Steane *et al.* 2006), Lower City (Steane *et al.* forthcoming), and Wigford (Steane *et al.* 2001). Each of these provides a chronological account of the archaeology of all sites excavated before 1987 (the cut-off date being determined by the absence of reports summarising the results of these pre-1987 excavations at the Lincolnshire HER). In addition to the above-mentioned volumes that focus on the stratigraphy of the settlement, the *Lincoln Archaeological Studies* series and its predecessor, the *Archaeology of Lincoln* series, include a number of volumes that focus on various thematic, site-specific or artefact-based issues.

be treated in more detail in subsequent chapters. There was, in any case, an explosion of activity in the southeast corner of the Lower City, in particular in the Flaxengate/Silver Street area. Wheel-thrown pottery, based on continental prototypes, was produced from the second half of the ninth century onwards (chapter 6), whilst non-ferrous metalworking took place from a similarly early date, increasing in intensity in the course of the tenth century (chapter 5). The excavations at Flaxengate and elsewhere revealed evidence for planned house plots dated to before 900 AD, and Stamford-ware crucibles associated with the earliest layers indicate regional trade links. A small silver coinage bearing the Lincoln mint signature is traditionally assigned to the 880s or 890s, although only a handful has survived (Jones *et al.* 2003: 284) (chapter 4). In the tenth century, the evidence for manufacturing activities in the Lower City increased, and stretched into other parts of the city (Jones *et al.* 2003: 282-92).⁸ The population density increased exponentially, and by the end of the tenth century, Lincoln's mint was amongst the most productive in England (Jones *et al.* 2003: 159, 287) (chapter 4).

The 'growth' of Lincoln was roughly contemporary with that of many other so-called 'urban' settlements. This development is commonly regarded as witnessing the (re-)urbanisation of Anglo-Saxon England, even if studies of Anglo-Saxon urban development have been rather varied in their theoretical grounding. Many are characterised by the assumption that 'the town' is "a social entity *sui generis*": an "autonomous urban reality" (Abrams 1978b: 9; also see Horden 2000: 481-82), a market place dependent on long-distance trade for its survival (see Maxwell 2007: 7). This approach was based on the work by Pirenne (1925) and Postan (1972: 239), who, influenced by Weber's (1958) argument that the city was characterised by an absence of feudal relations, described the early medieval towns as "non-feudal islands in the feudal seas". Another important aspect of their work was the idea that towns developed as a result of man's striving towards protection (Pirenne 1925: 57-59; Postan 1972: 236-37; also see Kleniewski 2002: 4; Maitland 1987: 186-89). The influence of Weber (1958) and Marx (see Arthur 1992) furthermore ensured a focus on the economic aspects of urban development.

The urban historian Abrams (1978a: 3) predicted that the approach advocated by Pirenne and Postan was on its way out some three decades ago (also see Astill 2009: 256). He would turn out to be largely correct in the context of classical and (post-)medieval urban archaeology, but the discipline of Anglo-Saxon urban archaeology, noticeably absent from Abrams and Wrigley's 1978 collection of essays that formed the context for his predictions, remained untroubled by these

⁸ Leaded glass jewellery was also produced, whilst iron smithing, bone, antler and horn working, leather working and textile production now also took place (Jones *et al.* 2003: 282-92). The Upper City has yielded some evidence for non-ferrous metalworking, whilst Butwerk revealed evidence for pottery production, antler working and textile production. Finally, in Wigford metalworking, small-scale antler working and textile production took place.

developments. Thus Hodges (1988: 6, 130; also see Biddle 1976b; Haslam 1987; Kleniewski 2002: 4) viewed the emergence of the late Anglo-Saxon towns as a centralisation of economic activity into defended sites under the auspices of strong, centralised kings, instigated as a response against the viking attacks, and subsequently copied by the Scandinavians themselves.⁹ However, archaeological excavations in Lincoln have indicated that, even if the re-occupation of Lincoln was roughly contemporary with the construction of the first West Saxon *burhs*, the boom in economic activity took place from an earlier stage than in the West Saxon south (see Astill 2000: 37-38; Jones *et al.* 2003). Regarding the situation from a northern perspective, and basing their view on the ASC-entries that refer to these settlements as *burhs* (see ASC A-D 942; C-E 1013, 1015) (also see above), Roesdahl *et al.* (1981: 95) have argued that the later Danelaw towns grew out of the military camps of the viking 'great army'. However, as will be discussed in subsequent chapters, the archaeological evidence suggests that religious, political and economic factors played a more important role for the development of the Danelaw towns than military factors did.

Another aspect of Pirenne's and Postan's influence was visible in the work of the early medieval urban archaeologist Biddle, who in 1976 had published an article which did exactly that which Abrams had believed was on its way out: provide a generic definition of 'the town' as a social entity *sui generis*. According to Biddle (1976b: 99-100), a settlement could be classed as a town when it could boast the presence of at least three or four of the following criteria: defences, a planned street-system, a market, a mint, legal autonomy, a role as a central place, a relatively large and dense population, a diversified economic base, plots and houses of 'urban' type, social differentiation, a complex religious organisation, and a judicial centre.¹⁰

In the field of Anglo-Saxon archaeology, Biddle's list became a focus for much debate, being alternately emulated and slated (Roskams 1996: 264; Wickham

⁹ Arguing within the same theoretical vein, Hodges (1982: 65) considered the earlier *wics* as "an expression of administered long-distance trade, which ... was also an expression of imperial needs", and argued that "the model [of the type B emporia] was imported and interpreted by a king [Offa] who was seeking to develop kingship by generating increased resources" (Hodges 1988: 5). Hodges's model has been criticised for various reasons, including his highly individualist standpoint. For example, Roskams (1996: 267-68) has pointed out how in Scandinavia, beach markets seem to have evolved without royal interference, and argues that the *wics* were "less the innovation of an energetic king, than ... an attempt to control a pre-existing system of exchange involving both the Channel and the North Sea, initially focused on Scandinavia".

¹⁰ Biddle's definition showed much similarities to that of Childe (1950: 9-16), which involved a large population; specialisation of occupations and indirect dependency on rural surpluses; taxation of and control over rural food production; monumental buildings; a ruling class with absolute control over the rest of the population; numerical/alphabetical notational systems for information processing; cultural forms that were "refined", such as art and music; and regional and long distance trade contacts that enabled craftsmen to reside in a town rather than be itinerary. To Childe, the ancient city was "the cradle of civilization" (summarised in Gottdiener 1994: 27). The frequent depiction of the tenth-century growth of Lincoln as a "re-urbanisation" process would suggest a return (or attempted return) to classical urbanism.

2006: 591-96). Much of the criticism focused on the growing realisation that "towns carry different meanings to different people at different times" (Perring 2002: 9), and some ten years after the publication of Biddle's (1976b) definition, Reynolds (1987: 296; my emphasis) suggested the following adaptation:

When we talk of a place as a town, or as urban, we ... assume without thinking about it that we are talking about a permanent human settlement in which a significant proportion of the population is engaged in non-agricultural occupations ... A town therefore normally lives off the food of the surrounding countryside ... and supplies this countryside with other goods and services in return. Its functions as a market centre make it also a convenient centre for religious, administrative and legal purposes, though which of these functions came first in any particular case will vary. *Because of the distinctive functions of towns their inhabitants normally regard themselves, and are regarded by outsiders, as a different sort of people. However deeply they are divided among themselves they tend to be united at least in regarding themselves as united in their urbanity against the country bumpkins around.*

Reynolds regards towns as places whose inhabitants *consider themselves* as town-dwellers. In other words, the existence of an *urban identity* is inherently related to, and essential for, the existence of any town itself (also see Astill 2009: 256).

A different scholarly tradition, with its origins in the work of Marx (Arthur 1992; Mignione 1981: 20; Roskams 1996: 268, 280) and to a lesser extent Weber (1958), promoted a move away from the treatment of these settlements as a *type* of site, instead arguing for a more historically and geographically specific approach, with a greater emphasis on the relationship between towns and their surrounding countryside. Such approaches are still rare.¹¹ However, a lasting influence of this Marxist school of thought is the prevailing dominance of economic and political frameworks for the study of early medieval urban archaeology (Gottdiener 1994: 28, 122-24; Horden 2000: 484).

A third approach, promoted by Carver (2000), has attempted to move away from the emphasis on economic and military factors (also see Astill 2009: 259-61). Carver (2000: 374) regards the early medieval towns as expressions of political ideology: "The town was not a type of site but a type of idea, argued for on political grounds and only partially realised in most cases". Arguing from a semiotic perspective, Carver (2000: 376) maintains that not only the town itself but also its material culture was made up of signs and symbols that conveyed a political and/or cultural message. Thus the re-occupation of Roman cities such as Lincoln, and the renewed production of wheel-thrown pottery that displayed similarities to Roman

¹¹ In 1996, Roskams (1996: 280) stated that "a mature project where both a single central place and its hinterland have been examined over a whole period is entirely lacking". In the twelve years since the publication of his article, not much has changed, although a few studies have attempted such an approach. One of these is a study of pottery production in Lincolnshire by Symonds (2003a), who also works on the assumption that towns were the outcome of rural economies and social practices, but unfortunately does not manage to substantiate this claim with solid evidence.

wares, such as in Stamford (see chapter 6), was evidence that people tried to emulate the Roman empire (Carver 1987: 56).¹² Carver's model has been met with scepticism, largely because the idea that ideology alone could determine such changes was not generally accepted, whilst his model did not allow for an explanation why these changes in ideology occurred either (summarised by Carver 2000: 378; Roskams 1996: 279). The question whether the re-occupation of the former Roman settlement at Lincoln can be viewed as a conscious revival of the Roman past will be revisited in subsequent chapters.

Finally, recent work by Astill (2006) has treated the emergence of the West Saxon *burhs* in the context of their rural surroundings, with an emphasis on material culture, questioning existing (socio-economic) preconceptions about the origins of these settlements. An important aspect of Astill's (2006: 248) work consists of a comparison of finds assemblages from *burhs* and rural centres (such as thegnly manors), in a similar way to that carried out in this thesis. He concluded that until the eleventh century,

The loss rate of coins in *burhs*, for example, is most similar to that from 'thegny' rural residences, suggesting that until the late tenth century *burhs* were barely differentiated from rural estate centres in terms of trading. A further similarity between these locations can be seen in industrial activities, especially metalworking ... In both rural and urban locations the scale and character of the metalworking indicates a craftsman working to satisfy the demands of a patron rather than mass production for a wider clientele.

Astill (2006: 236, 243, 254) argues that the *burhs* were essentially military and political foundations that acquired their urban attributes only later, and whose economic success depended on the degree of integration within pre-existing trade networks, in other words, on their relationship with the surrounding countryside.¹³

Also relevant in this context are the so-called 'proto-urban' or 'pre-urban' settlements in Scandinavia and the Baltic region, which have been studied in their

¹² Carver was not entirely alone in his ideas. Arguing independently, and focusing on an earlier time period, Hodges (1996) eventually put his views on the development of the emporia into an ideological light as well. The fact that most of these sites were located outside the empty shells of former Roman towns, such as *Hamwic* near Winchester, and *Lundunwic* outside London, is to Hodges (1996: 300) a conscious choice "to step outside the shadow of Classical Antiquity". What is more, "they pertain to a secular ideal, diametrically opposed to the prevailing ideals of the Church" (Hodges 1996: 301), and finally, they were "dreams brought to life" (Hodges 1996: 302).

¹³ With 'urban', Astill (2006: 248) means that "the *burhs* ... were gaining a variety of occupations and a dense population, and were interacting with the surrounding area in a much more intense and reciprocal way". The pre-existing trade networks were those determined by the seventh- to ninth-century 'productive sites' that seemingly disappeared in the course of the later ninth and tenth centuries (Astill 2006: 238). Another important element in his arguments is the evidence from Anglo-Saxon lawcodes, which stipulate that trade can take place in the *burhs* from the reign of Athelstan onwards (Astill 2006: 243). Astill (2006: 244) considers this evidence that the *burhs* were only slowly being integrated as places of significance into people's lives, which created the need for an active attempt to entice people to go there to collect coins and buy goods.

hinterland context more frequently (for a critique of the term 'proto-urban', see Astill 2009: 258). For example, Ulriksen (2004: 25) distinguishes between sites like Ribe and Hedeby in Denmark, royal imitations of the European *emporium*, characterised by minting, fortification and organised layouts, and other coastal sites ("coastal landing places"), such as Aggersborg and Karby on Jutland, and Fyns Hoved on Fynn, which were production sites and landing places supported by the aristocracy in order to help them trade surplus goods for prestige goods. Ulriksen (2004: 25) denies that these latter sites represent 'mercantilization', instead arguing that they were part of rural power networks, and suggests that 'mercantilization' only took place in the later tenth and eleventh centuries, after the spread of Christianity caused society to change, and these coastal places disappeared or became agrarian sites, often incorporating a manor and a church.

Other relevant studies include that by Müller-Wille and Tummuscheit (2004: 27), who have addressed the so-called 'proto-urban' centres in the Baltic (Ribe, Hedeby and Grosz Strömkendorf). A comparison of finds assemblages from these settlements with those of their hinterlands led to the conclusion that "it is obvious that all three sites were integrated into local networks consisting of various settlement types serving different functions" (Müller-Wille and Tummuscheit 2004: 39). In stark contrast to the above, a study of the finds of 'Scandinavian' character from the earliest 'urban' centres in Russia has led to the conclusion that the earliest phases of these settlements *did* depend largely on long-distance trade, representing a type of site that was somewhat distanced from the rural landscape, and taking no part in agricultural activity, which only gradually changed after their initial stimulus (Pushkina 2004: 53).

The approach adopted in this thesis is founded in Marxist approaches, in the sense that it adopts a historically and geographically specific approach to the development of late Anglo-Saxon Lincoln, as seen from a regional perspective. Although much of the discussion in subsequent chapters will be presented as a straightforward comparison between 'town' and 'country', it must be emphasised that it does not presuppose that the two exist in "binary opposition" (Astill 2009: 265), but assesses the data on its own merits, allowing for the reconstruction of both similarities and differences. This thesis also takes on board aspects of the approaches advocated by Carver (1987; 2000) and Astill (2009), in the sense that it considers economic factors to be only partially relevant for the development of towns, placing equal emphasis on secular and religious ideology. However, rather than merely blaming ideological factors for any changes that occurred in Lincoln's development, it will analyse the material culture produced and used within the settlement and its surroundings – adopting an approach that is not dissimilar to that applied by Astill (2006; 2009) to the West Saxon *burhs* – in order to shed light on the question *why* such changes in ideology may have occurred.

1.4: Lindsey and the study of late Anglo-Saxon rural settlement

The study of rural settlement patterns has a different history to that of urban archaeology. Rather than being influenced by sociologists such as Marx and Weber, it owed much of its early legacy to the discipline of geography. In the first half of the twentieth century, research was often carried out on a regional scale, following Darwin in the belief that "man's actions were determined by the physical environment" (for an overview, see Gilg 1985: 1). From the 1950s, however, the emphasis shifted away from the regional (Gilg 1985: 1-2), and made way for a tradition of logical positivism, which focused largely on the testing of theories against empirical data (Gilg 1985: 2). From the 1970s onwards, the sub-disciplines of behavioural geography, cultural geography, humanistic geography and radical geography developed out of this approach (Gilg 1985: 2). This resulted in the realisations that human actions are not always rational, and that local situations are unique, reviving the interest in local rural geography (Gilg 1985: 2-3). In 1980, the geographer Cloke (1980: 182-217) drew attention to a question that is also central to this thesis: "What is 'rural' and how is it different from 'urban'?" (paraphrased in Gilg 1985: 7). As stated above, however, the relationship between 'urban' and 'rural' has remained understudied within the field of Anglo-Saxon settlement studies.

The positive identification of Anglo-Saxon rural settlements is often impossible in the absence of intrusive investigation methods, and the number of large-scale open area excavations remains low in Lindsey, which has a strong agricultural character (see chapter 2; Everson *et al.* 1991: 1-2, 6-8, 56; Kershaw 1998: 20). Nevertheless, as will be discussed in chapter 2, developer-funded archaeology has contributed significantly to the state of knowledge, even if often only through keyhole investigations. Occasionally larger excavations are carried out, such as those at Flixborough in Lindsey, which drew attention to the difficulty of distinguishing between high-status secular and monastic sites (Blair 1996; Dobney 2007; Loveluck 1998; 2001; 2007; Reynolds 1999: 112-13).¹⁴ The general lack of stratified deposits on rural sites results in the need to refer to the stratified, urban contexts from the Lincoln excavations to date rural deposits by typology (Everson 1993: 101), whilst the size, internal organisation and relative hierarchy of rural settlements often cannot be established because the lifespan of buildings is unknown (Everson 1993: 92-93; but see Gardiner 2004) (chapter 3).

A general model for rural settlement development has begun to emerge, although the picture is still not entirely clear. In 1999, Reynolds argued that from the later ninth century, nucleated villages began to appear, in particular a type of

¹⁴ For example, Cheddar is considered to be a royal palace site, but there were far fewer gilt and silver(ed) metal objects from this site than from Flixborough (Reynolds 1999: 119).

settlement that combined a high-status dwelling with a small church and cemetery, often associated with a number of regular house plots for peasants. These kinds of settlements, of which 'Goltho' in Lindsey is an example,¹⁵ would have been associated with the beginnings of parish formation, as the boundaries of secular and ecclesiastical jurisdiction often coincide (Bassett 2006: 117; Reynolds 1999: 134; also see below).¹⁶ Some years later, however, Reynolds (2003: 131; also see Jones and Page 2006; Reynolds 2009b) returned to this model in the light of more recent investigations in eastern England. Referring to the Lindsey-based example of the settlement at 'Goltho', which had traces of middle Anglo-Saxon dwellings underneath the later manor house associated with the tenth-century 'village', he suggested instead that "'village' origins (with regard to individual settlements) can be found across a period of at least 400 years".¹⁷ Indeed, as will be argued in chapter 6, the origins of nucleated settlements can be found over an even longer period of time, as rural settlements were continuously founded (and sometimes abandoned) throughout the Anglo-Saxon period.

Everson and Stocker (2006) have addressed the relationship between parish fragmentation and village formation, focusing on the central role of the church within most village plans. Although the Scandinavian raiders had been pagans when they first set foot on Anglo-Saxon soil, the evidence suggests that they rapidly converted to Christianity once they decided to stay. Other aspects of the effects of the Scandinavian settlement on the Church are still debated. There is not much direct historical or archaeological evidence for churches going out of use; however, it has been noted that they did not have much land at the time of *DB*, raising the possibility that the Scandinavians confiscated at least part of the church lands (Hadley 2006: 209-11). In the tenth century a process of parish fragmentation takes place through the foundation of multiple 'daughter' parishes, often on the property of a secular lord. This occurred to a much greater extent in areas of Scandinavian settlement than elsewhere (Bassett 2006: 118; Hadley 2006: 211). The suggestion is raised, therefore, that the structure of the landscape was indeed affected to a significant extent by the conversion of the Scandinavian settlers (*i.e.* a change in ideology), and the subsequent consolidation of power between the new landholding elite and the Church. This point will be revisited in chapter 3, which will also highlight the importance of the Church for the development of Lincoln itself (see Astill 2009: 266-67).

¹⁵ The placename is given in quotation marks because the identification of the excavated remains with the historically attested settlement of Goltho has been called into question (Everson 1988; 1990).

¹⁶ Other examples include Portchester Castle (Hamps.) (Reynolds 1999: 124).

¹⁷ Reynolds (2003: 131), quoting a previous statement by Hamerow, suggested that the traditional model was overly rigid as a result of the limited scale of rural excavations in England, which did not allow for the same "degree of comparative analysis enjoyed by continental colleagues".

Other considerations of settlement patterns have focused on the role that rivers and wetlands played in the landscape. There was no firm coastline at this time, but rather a marshy zone between the sea and the dry land (Sawyer 1998: 12). The Humber estuary was not a boundary but a major communication route in the period of Scandinavian settlement, which accounts for a strong connection between north Lindsey and east Yorkshire at this point in time (Sawyer 1998: 101; also see Van de Noort and Davies 1993; Van de Noort and Ellis 1998; 2000). A passage from Æthelweard's *Chronicle* suggests that the York elite controlled parts of Lincolnshire (Sawyer 1998: 101). This passage recounts how in 894 a West Saxon ealdorman visited York, where he encountered

The enemy, who possessed large territories in the kingdom of the Mercians, on the western side of the place called Stamford. This is to say, between the streams of the River Welland and the thickets of the wood called Kesteven.

What is more, *DB* mentions ferries across the Humber at Grimsby, Barton-upon-Humber and South Ferriby, but there were probably more (Sawyer 1998: 17). In addition there are the *-ford* placenames which obviously also refer to crossings, and those from ON *vadh*, meaning 'ford', such as Waithe, Langworth and Rasen, which is from OE *raesn* meaning plank (Sawyer 1998: 18).

In contrast to the Humber, the Witham had a band of freshwater fen and peat on its right bank all the way to the fenland basin, and formed an almost impenetrable boundary (Sawyer 1998: 16). The Ancholme was a tidal inlet of the Humber Estuary (Neumann 1998: 75), and functioned as an internal boundary dividing *wapentakes*, parishes, archdeaconries and the North and West Ridings of Lindsey (Van de Noort *et al.* 1998: 129). Pottery scatters suggest that the Upper Ancholme Valley was first occupied in the later ninth century (Sawyer 1998: 27). The tidal Trent marked the western boundary of Lindsey, and was a major communication and trade route, especially for sea-going craft, linking the inland with international ports (Middleton 1998: 16; Van de Noort *et al.* 1998: 129).

Palaeo-environmental research has provided an indication for the settlement date of certain areas. A survey of the Lower Trent and Ancholme Valleys has indicated that, although by the end of the Roman period much of the region had been deforested, the amount of clearance herb pollen decreased sharply during the fifth to ninth centuries, whilst the amount of tree pollen showed a comparable increase. Herb pollen increased somewhat only in the tenth or eleventh century, indicative of small-scale agricultural expansion in this period (Lillie and Neumann 1998: 28-29). A similar pattern was visible in the Lincolnshire Marsh, where herb pollen typical of open terrain increased again only in the thirteenth century (Lillie and Geary 2001: 27). During the Anglo-Saxon period, occupation in this region was mostly restricted to its margins and the higher parts, above 10 m OD (Fenwick *et*

al. 2001: 66). In the Lower Trent valley, on the western side of the Trent, pollen analysis has shown that a mixed woodland and herbaceous plant community developed until c. 1100 AD (Lillie 1998: 68). The eastern margins of Thorne Moors were not colonised until after c. 1000 AD (Lillie 1998: 68). Additional information from *DB* suggests that woodland in Lincolnshire was scarce compared to other regions of England, comprising only half the average (Sawyer 1998: 22). Farming was predominantly pastoral. Sheep were the most important animal in the later tenth century, which contributed to Lincoln's developing textile trade (Sawyer 1998: 25-27).

Placename studies have traditionally been used in the discussion of rural settlement as well, but it has become increasingly clear that they cannot be used for dating purposes, even if their use to establish settlement hierarchies is generally accepted.¹⁸ For example, Roffe (2007: 286) has stated that

District names, like Hatfield, and so-called tribal names in *-ingaham* and *-ingas*, like Folkingham and Hastings, are said to point to early central places. Subordinate elements of their estates then identify themselves in functional or directional names, such as Barton, 'the barley farm', and Norton, Sutton, Easton and Weston, while personal names combined with the element *-tun*, indicate settlements that have been hived off.

The relative lack of Scandinavian-derived placenames around Lincoln and Stamford (as well as other 'Danish' centres), is frequently commented upon, and has been interpreted as possible evidence that these regions remained in English hands (Sawyer 1998: 102). What is more, the pre-viking monasteries at Bardney and Barrow, which seem to have survived the Scandinavian incursions, also have few Scandinavian names in the areas directly surrounding them (Sawyer 1998: 104). However, the equation of language and ethnicity is problematic (Abrams and Parsons 2004: 392-93; Hadley 2006: 92-99). Chapter 5 will address this issue in more detail.

Finally, a recent phenomenon is the study of unstratified finds assemblages, most noticeably metalwork (Leahy 2007; Leahy and Paterson 2001) but also pottery from fieldwalking (Leahy 2007). It is proving increasingly possible to identify settlement types through these non-intrusive methods, as has been done for example at Torksey in Lindsey, which was identified as the site of the viking winter camp of AD 872-73 (Blackburn 2002; Blackburn and Atherton 2007; also see the *North Lincolnshire Pottery Type Series (NLPTS)*, the *Early Medieval Corpus (EMC)* of coin finds, and the *Viking and Anglo-Saxon Landscape and Economy* project (*VASLE*)). *VASLE* was an AHRC-funded project, which was carried out by the Department of Archaeology at York from 2004 to 2007. Its primary aim was to map

¹⁸ Most of them occur for the first time in *DB* (only 13 placenames from Lincolnshire in total occur in pre-Conquest sources). In addition, Old English and Old Norse are closely related, which might lead to Scandinavianization (Sawyer 1998: 103).

national distribution patterns of metal-detected artefacts, and combine this information with material retrieved through other types of archaeological investigation in order to study the development of (rural) site hierarchies across Anglo-Saxon England. Although the sites where targeted fieldwork was carried out were mostly situated in the Yorkshire Wolds, one of the sites that was included in the study was Torksey in Lindsey, albeit investigations were mostly limited to a desktop assessment (Brown 2006). The use of surface assemblages for the study of rural settlement patterns will be discussed in more detail in the context of chapters 2, 5 and 6.

1.5: Lincoln and Lindsey, or the study of Anglo-Saxon towns in their regional context: towards a new approach

This thesis aims to combine the debates on late Anglo-Saxon urban and rural settlement in the context of Lincoln and Lindsey through an explicitly theoretical approach, drawing extensively on work carried out in other time periods, geographical regions, and disciplines.¹⁹ In essence this approach creates a kind of *middle range theory* in the sense advocated by Trigger (1995).²⁰ Trigger (1995: 449-50) argued in favour of the combination between processual and post-processual methods within archaeology, and the development of *culturally specific* middle range theories, arguing how “the goal of middle-range theory is not to explain human behaviour but to infer it from archaeological contexts”.

The questions that stand central to this research, as stated above, are whether and how an urban identity emerged in Lincoln in the course of the tenth century AD, what such an identity entailed, and how this was related to the Scandinavian settlement. This set of questions can only be answered through an analysis of urban development on two levels, that of *urbanisation*, or history of towns, and that of *urbanism*, or history *in* towns (Horden 2000: 483). To quote a definition proposed by the American urban sociologist Gottdiener (1994: 102):

Urbanization refers to the city formation or building process. It studies the way social activities locate themselves in space and according to interdependent processes of societal development and change. Its analysis is often historical and comparative. Urbanization charts and tries to understand the rise and fall of great cities ... *Urbanism* in

¹⁹ This thesis will not pick one approach over others, as “one of the most fruitful ways forward in archaeological theory is to recognize that all the approaches are useful and they all have something relevant to contribute” (Bentley and Maschner 2008: 5).

²⁰ Middle Range Theory has variously been defined as “an attempt to strengthen a way of gaining knowledge of the past” (Leone 2007: 21), or as “a body of knowledge about the relations between material culture and human activities within various behavioral settings, warranting translation of static archaeological data to cultural and cultural processual dynamics” (Watson 2008: 31). Binford invented the term in the context of the scientific emphasis of the New Archaeology of the 1960s and 1970s, and used it primarily in the context of ethno-archaeological research. For a discussion of the problematic role of analogy within the discipline of archaeology, see Graves and Zubrow 2007: 13-17.

contrast takes the city formation process as given and seeks instead to understand the ways of life that transpire within this container. Urbanism deals with culture, with meanings, symbols, patterns of daily life, adjustment processes to the environment of the city, but also with conflicts, with forms of political organization at the street, neighbourhood, and city levels.

As demonstrated above, the study of *urbanisation* has played a major part in the study of early medieval towns in England. The study of *urbanism*, on the other hand, has received little attention: most British work that deals with medieval urbanism has been predominantly empirical in character (Horden 2000: 483; see Lincoln series; but see contributions to Hadley and Ten Harkel forthcoming). The study of *urbanism* has been more influential in the United States, mostly as a result of the greater influence of early twentieth-century urban sociologists such as Simmel, whose work "was concerned with the way urban life transformed individual consciousness" (Wolff 1950; also see Gottdiener 1994: 101, 122-24; Kleniewski 2002: 4, 37), or Durkheim (1964: 70-132) and Tönnies (2002), which focused on the macro-social level, or the effect that urbanisation had on human interaction in general.²¹ Tönnies regarded urbanisation as the demise of traditional community values, giving rise to a school of thought that researched the link between community and the individual in terms of everyday life and self-perceptions (Kleniewski 2002: 26-27). Durkheim regarded urbanisation as the process whereby the *mechanical* solidarity of the village made way to the real, *organic* solidarity of the city, whereby increased specialisation made people dependent on each other as if they were different parts of a single organism (Kleniewski 2002: 27).

The ideas of Simmel, Durkheim and Tönnies, as well as that of Marx and Weber, were based on an analysis of capitalist society. However, the American urban sociologist Gottdiener (1994: 28) has pointed out that "it was not until the seventeenth century with the rise of capitalism in Western Europe that urban life appeared to be propelled by forces emerging from within cities themselves", a statement that is intended to caution against the literal application of these theories in a pre-capitalist context, whilst questioning the validity of treating early medieval towns as separated from their regional, 'rural' contexts. As Palat (1991: 19) remarks, "medieval cities functioned not as centers of opposition to the feudal order, but as integral elements of that order". What is more, "patterns of urban evolution ... should be analyzed within the context of their distinctive socio-historic trajectories, rather than as imperfect copies of a universal model drawn from the

²¹ In the United States, these ideas were taken up by the so-called Chicago school, which focused predominantly on the development of the modern American metropolises (Gottdiener 1994: 105-119; Kleniewski 2002: 28-35). The development of the European early medieval city is often all but ignored in this context (Kleniewski 2002 devotes a total of 3 pages (64-67) to the phenomenon, basically summarising the Pirenne-thesis (1925); Gottdiener 1994 completely ignores the period between the demise of the Roman empire and AD 1000).

specific experience of [capitalist] Europe" (Palat 1991: 34), or, indeed, as a first stage in an otherwise linear development ending in the here and now (also see Astill 2000: 28; 2009: 258-59).

This thesis will focus on the socio-spatial approach advocated by Gottdiener (1994), which focuses on the relationship between the manipulation of space and social and cultural identity (also see Astill 2009: 267), and place this within the context of the established economic and political frameworks reviewed above.²² A number of different themes are relevant in this respect. Urbanisation can be seen as an aspect of settlement *differentiation*, or "the process by which the incorporation of small communities into wider social systems leads previously self-sufficient units to become more specialised and hence interdependent" (Woolf 1998: 132-33; also see Astill 2000: 28; Aston and Bond 2000: 58; Konvitz 1985: 6-7). Differentiation typically occurs on two inter-related levels, the functional and the spatial; in other words, the concentration of individual *functions* in one particular *place* affects the character of the entire surrounding area, and *vice versa* (Gottdiener 1994: 59-62).

Almost diametrically opposed to the idea of settlement differentiation is the idea that urbanisation is a form of settlement *nucleation*. Seen from that perspective, the question arises how 'real' perceived differences between 'towns' and other forms of nucleated settlement really are, especially at their embryonic stage.²³ Put briefly: what made the organised layout of the late ninth- and tenth-century houses along Flaxengate any different in intention from the organised layout of the late ninth- and tenth-century houses along, for example, the main street in 'Goltho'?²⁴ To refer back to Reynolds's (1987) definition, which factors ensured that one had an *urban* identity, and the other did not? Was it perhaps because 'Goltho' should be regarded as a *nucleated* settlement, whereas Lincoln, on the other hand, may have been a *multinucleated* settlement, encompassing several closely situated settlement cores that had grown together into one single larger

²² Kleniewski (2002: 43-44) has identified three main trends within the recent study of urban development: 1) a Marxist approach that focuses on the connection between cities and the economy; 2) an approach that views cities as "growth machines", shaped and maintained by social elites; and 3) a socio-spatial framework, advocated by Gottdiener, which takes the analysis and understanding of urban life beyond the political and economic, and creates room for the (culturally specific) way in which (the manipulation of) physical space affects people's cultural and social understanding of urbanism, using symbols and various levels of (cultural) meaning.

²³ Konvitz (1985: 7) has argued that "the town did not yet look so very different from the countryside. It had more buildings arranged in patterns of greater density and complexity, but most urban and rural buildings were roughly comparable, many urban residents kept small plots and raised animals, and townspeople did not yet pretend to be superior socially and culturally to country folk. Cities were marked off from the countryside by walls which came to symbolize political and legal differences, because urban and rural economies, social organizations, and political structures were qualitatively different".

²⁴ Traditionally the settlement at 'Goltho' was assigned an earlier, eighth- or ninth-century date (Beresford 1975a; 1975b; 1981; 1987), but on the basis of a retrospective analysis of the pottery it seems more likely that the settlement dated to the late ninth or tenth century (Stocker 1989; Symonds 1999; Young *pers. comm.*).

settlement (see Gottdiener 1994: 5)? And how would such a model affect our understanding of the so-called extra-mural *suburbs* Wigford and *Butwerk*, whose development is traditionally regarded as a symptom of a population increase that culminated in the overspill of human occupation outside the old Roman city walls? These issues will be returned to in chapter 7.

The relationship between settlement nucleation/differentiation and group formation will play a central role in subsequent chapters. The process of group formation has traditionally been explained in evolutionary terms: human beings flock together to ensure their survival (Davies 2006: 5). However, the work of Simmel, Durkheim and Tönnies (see above) highlights the close connection between changes in settlement patterns and communal and individual identities. The formation of communal identities in particular is affected by issues of territoriality, or the manipulation of space in the context of social or political conflict (sometimes as a result of large-scale immigration) in order to exercise power and create social inequality; yet conflict itself is also a manifestation of existing differences between social, ethnic, political or religious groups (Acuto 2005: 212-14; Davies 2006: 5-6; Kleniewski 2002: 11; Konvitz 1985: 4-5; Perring 2002: 1; Tilley 2006: 14).²⁵ In other words, the formation of an urban identity in tenth-century Lincoln had as much to do with perceived similarities between Lincoln's inhabitants, as with a shared feeling of 'being different' from the (hugely variable) rural countryside.

The manipulation of space was not restricted to the formation of nucleated settlements. Astill (2006: 237) has pointed out that rural 'communities' in Wessex, which were based on administrative arrangements such as parishes or secular estates, were necessarily *imposed* identities that may or may not reflect existing communities. What is more, there is evidence that in some cases urban house plots were quantitatively related to the amount of land that the town owned, implying that urban space manipulation could have a direct effect on the formation of rural communities and identities (O'Keeffe 2005: 17).²⁶ In the case of early medieval Lincoln, such a direct relationship between urban and rural landholdings is apparent in *DB*, which mentions several individuals with landholdings both inside and outside the city walls.²⁷

An important and frequently mentioned aspect of the processes of space manipulation and identity formation is that they are subject to constant negotiation

²⁵ Space manipulation by a dominant elite could also result in a *lack* of available space, which in return could lead to the need for certain individuals who previously depended on working the land for their sustenance to find an alternative income, which in turn could lead to industrial-scale craft specialisation.

²⁶ A clear albeit much later example of this is the medieval town of Fethard in Ireland (O'Keeffe 2005: 17).

²⁷ For example, "Toki son of Auti had 30 residences in the City besides his Hall and 2½ churches" (*LDB*: 336a), but he also possessed one residence *extra muru-* (outside the city wall), "from which he has the land tribute" (*LDB*: 336a).

(Acuto 2005: 212; Perring 2002: 1; Konvitz 1985: 1; Trafford 2000: 26), and that their understanding is necessarily subjective (Kleniewski 2002: 51; Konvitz 1985: 14; Perring 2002: 9; Tilley 2006: 7). Yet the fluidity of identities can be over-emphasised:

Identities are "fixed" through social, institutional, and governmental practices that are often beyond the effective reach of individual agency. That those who cross such boundaries are frequently subject to harassment, persecution, and violence exposes the way in which power is deployed to stabilize hierarchies of social difference (Voss 2008: 16).

The notion of constraint is important, and forms the *lebenswelt* (lifeworld), or "the collection of behaviours, expectations, norms, and communicative acts that comprise daily life and serve to link individuals" (Wilkie 2001: 111). Individuals interpret these aspects of their *lebenswelt* through observation and analysis, which is based on the succession of personal experiences that started in childhood (Wilkie 2001: 111-12). Material culture is one of the media through which such social meaning is expressed and shaped, and it is for that reason that its analysis lies at the heart of this thesis.

Finally, the understanding of both space and identity exist on a number of levels. As Casella and Fowler (2005: 2) have pointed out, "social actors belong to multiple identity groups at any moment in their life" (also see O'Keeffe 2005: 29), including that of the individual, the community, the regional, the ethnic or the religious. Much work in the field of viking studies has focused on *ethnic* identities;²⁸ however, "constructs such as race, gender, and ethnicity are not independently constructed and can only be understood together" (Wilkie 2001: 108; also see Hadley 2002b). Nevertheless, ethnicity remains an important topic when dealing with the Scandinavian settlement. This thesis will partially follow Stovel's (2005: 145-46) approach, which identifies two models of ethnic identity construction: *Ethnic identification*, which involves the active adoption of "ethnic" characteristics by a socially inferior group, and *ethnic attribution*, which involves the imposition of "ethnic" characteristics *onto* a socially inferior group. As Voss (2008: 1) puts it, "the power to name oneself is ... quite different from the power to assign a name to others" (also see Wilkie 2001: 108-09). In particular the process of *ethnic identification* will stand central to much of the subsequent chapters in the context of 'typical Anglo-Saxon' (or 'typical Irish' or 'typical continental') aspects of the material culture produced and consumed by the Scandinavian settlers (see in

²⁸ Lucy (2005: 87) has characterised *ethnicity* as a forms of identity whereby social origin is the primary reference to classify people, and makes a distinction with other forms of group identity based on for example locality or territoriality, and highlighted the need to study issues of identity "with greater subtlety and a greater regard for issues of action, interaction and practice".

particular chapter 5).²⁹ However, as Woolf (1998: 13-14; my emphasis) has demonstrated, cultural change cannot simply be regarded as an adaptive strategy:

Although it is true that the beliefs and artefacts of a culture are to some degree associated in a systematic way, it is misleading to think that watertight cultures exist in such a definite sense that they, rather than individuals and communities, can be treated as the primary unit of analysis. *The stability of cultures tends thus to be overstressed when the real problem is not why do some cultures change, but rather why, given the cultural creativity of humans, do other cultures appear to have remained relatively fixed for long periods of time.*

The degree to which individual identities existed in the past is sometimes questioned because "people in past societies were not necessarily individualized in the same way as those of modern people, and past identities may have been temporary, contextual, and community concerns ... [however] we can reasonably assume that all people in the past were self-aware" (Fowler 2004: 3-4). In the current context, the possible effect of the emerging mass-production of dress accessories on individual identities deserves consideration.³⁰ But how can archaeologists reach an understanding of individuality? A number of approaches have been suggested, including the study of past individuals, or a focus on the development of personhood through analysis of pictorial and textual evidence (summarised in Fowler 2004: 18). Neither of these interpretations lends itself for inclusion in the current context. Instead, I follow the idea of the individual as "being in the world" (Tilley 1994: 12; see Ingold 1993: 152-53), which investigates "the way that human experience is immersed in relationships with other people, with things, and place, through tasks and activities" (Fowler 2004: 18).³¹

Central to the analysis of such relationships is the concept of *agency*, or "the creative potential of human subjects" (Shanks 2008: 136). As Gardner (2008: 95) has stated, "the ideas behind what is commonly referred to as agency theory are fundamental to everything archaeologists do, and yet it remains notoriously difficult

²⁹ In Stovel's (2005: 145-46) definition, these represent a form of *ethnic identification* on the part of the Scandinavian colonists, implying that despite their assumed or in some cases proven political superiority, on a social level they may have been considered (or considered themselves) inferior, resulting in identification with the 'dominant' Anglo-Saxon or 'acceptable' Irish and continental cultures.

³⁰ The emphasis on the individual is atypical of culture-historical as well as processual approaches, the former being more concerned with ethnicity, race, and culture, and the latter with social identity and status (Fowler 2004: 4).

³¹ As Tilley (1994: 12) explained: "Phenomenology involves the understanding and description of things as they are experienced by a subject. It is about the relationship between Being and Being-in-the-world. Being-in-the-world resides in a process of objectification in which people objectify the world by setting themselves apart from it. This results in the creation of a gap, a distance in space. To be human is both to create this distance between the self and that which is beyond and to attempt to bridge this distance through a variety of means – through perception (seeing, hearing, touching), bodily actions and movements, and intentionally, emotion and awareness residing in systems of belief and decision-making, remembrance and evaluation".

to define".³² Gell (1998: 16) suggested that agency

Is attributable to those persons (and things...) who/which are seen as initiating causal sequences of a particular type, that is, events caused by acts of mind or will or intention, rather than the mere concatenation of physical events. An agent is one who 'causes events to happen' in their vicinity.

Thus agency can only exist and be perceived in the relationships that exist between various *agents*, which can be either human or non-human (Knappett 2002: 100, 115; also see Gardner 2008: 95). The archaeological record, or *material culture* in the widest sense of the word, including artefacts, monuments, landscapes and any combination thereof, constitutes the non-human element of these networks. This raises the question, how do we interpret material culture? The New Archaeology of the 1960s and 1970s viewed change in material culture first and foremost as being determined by ecological and adaptive factors (Guarinello 2005: 20). Since the 1980s, however, "the meaningful character of material culture has come to the foreground of archaeology, and "objects are no longer considered simple and passive reflections of technology or social organization" but form "an active, structuring dimension of human societies" (Guarinello 2005: 20). Since then, a number of different approaches have been explored.

In the 1990s it was often argued, most noticeably by Tilley, that material culture can be 'read' like a text. Tilley (1991: 16), in a discussion of prehistoric rock art, drew attention to the concept of *archewriting*, a primordial human practice that underlies how we structure and understand patterns in language as well as material culture. The archaeological record, like speech, was made up of *signs* or *signifiers*, which could be either words or objects, and which were diacritically related to the *signified*, which was "not a thing but a mental representation of it" (1991: 20). According to Tilley (1991: 20), "the relationship between the two remains arbitrary, a matter of historical and social convention". Within the field of early medieval urban archaeology in Britain, these ideas have had little impact, with the possible exception of some of Carver's (e.g. 1993; 1996) (see above) work. More recently, the notion that semiotic theory can be directly imposed onto archaeology has received severe criticism (Gell 1998: 6-8; MacDonald 2006: 109).

Another book by Tilley (1999: 7), written several years later, introduced the

³² Gardner (2008: 96) identifies five main themes that are frequently explored under the banner of *agency theory*, none of which are mutually exclusive. These include 1) power, or "the ability of humans to create meaningful lives for themselves in the face of material and social *constraints*, as well as the way those constraints can also become *opportunities* to shape and transform social structures; 2) action, which ranges from the "intentional and meaningful" to the "habitual and routine", the latter being regarded "crucial to the maintenance of structure"; 3) time, or the choice "deliberately or not, to keep doing things in this way, or to start doing them in that way"; 4) relationships (also see Knappett 2002: 100, and above); and finally 5) humanity, or issues of cross-cultural human variability such as differences in self-understanding between various cultures.

literary concept of the *metaphor* as "the simplest or most parsimonious means of communication between socialized individuals in the same culture". In this context, the meaning of the term *metaphor* encompasses every aspect of everyday life, including material culture:

Metaphor is not so much a matter of language in general, and literary use of language in particular, but a matter of *thought* ... We do not just employ and construct metaphors but live through them. Our ordinary conceptual system by means of which we live, think and act is fundamentally metaphorical in nature. Metaphorical concepts structure perception, action and social relationships (Tilley 1999: 16; also see 268).

In other words, material culture *transcends* the limitations of semiotic interpretation, and, as metaphors are imbued with agency as well, has become a cognitive phenomenon that plays an active role in the communications between individuals and groups. Yet none of this is ever static, as even the meaning of metaphors might shift. As Casella and Fowler (2005: 2) have stated, "different forms of material culture may be employed as affiliations shift, and the connotations of any given set of artefacts may change".

A final school of thought, also known as the *chaîne opératoire*, focuses on the whole process of production and consumption as being socially meaningful, and an inherent part of the creation and maintenance of identities (Lucy 2005: 102). Thus the production-process itself, rather than being the final product, becomes an indication of ethnicity, gender, status, regionality, *et cetera*. However, although Casella and Fowler (2005: 8) regard the *negotiation* of identity as standing central to archaeological observation, they also highlight the difficulty in distinguishing between *practice* and *identity*: "Practices are not identities, and while people may adopt practices affiliated to one group, that does not signal their automatic membership of that group" (Fowler 2005: 7). These ideas will stand central to chapters 5 and 6, where they will be discussed in the context of the possible effects of the increased specialisation of craft activity and the potential rise of mercantile identities. Also, the idea that the entire process of commission, production and consumption is a social and political investment, and as such can shed light on the various regional and local strategies concerning power and ideology, will be explored in chapter 3.

At the start of this chapter, it was stated that this thesis investigates the development of Lincoln as a 'town' in the later ninth and tenth centuries AD. Yet as the intervening discussion demonstrates, what exactly constitutes an *urban* identity is not at all clear. This thesis will therefore *not* take any definition of the concept of *urban* as its starting point in the same way as more traditional studies of contemporary 'towns' have done, but holds that such definitions are meaningless *per se*. Instead, this thesis will assess the archaeology of Lincoln on its own merits,

through the application of a number of different theoretical models and methodological approaches. Only through such an approach will it be possible to reconstruct contemporary perceptions and identities of the settlement at Lincoln, and to assess its significance for changes in settlement patterns in general. As O’Keeffe (2005: 31) has pointed out in the context of a study of the urban identity of the medieval town of Fethard in Ireland:

Rather than start our enquiries with identity as a pre-defined category or set of categories, we must define the retrieval or recognition of its complexity as a goal; rather than bring our check-list of identities to the body of material in which we are interested, we wait for the material to illuminate what notions of identity are at work.

However, the use of certain terminology does come with preconceived associations, and this chapter will therefore continue with a brief comment on the interpretations of the use of terminology as understood in the context of this thesis.

1.6: Terminology

As all research is necessarily expressed through language, a few words on the terminology that will be employed within this thesis cannot be avoided. Every investigation of urban or rural settlement patterns, and each study of foreign settlement and cultural assimilation, has to deal with a well-established jargon, often used loosely, which in many cases confuses rather than enlightens the discussion. What is more, even where a clear definition of terms like ‘urban’ and ‘rural’, or ‘viking’ and ‘Anglo-Saxon’ is included, these necessarily become *prescriptive* concepts, which this thesis considered to be in direct conflict with any attempt to reconstruct contemporary perceptions of any settlement, place, or people involved.

For that reason, this thesis will avoid *where possible* the use of the words *town*, *village*,³³ *countryside*, *city*, and *hinterland*, unless referring to the context in which archaeological investigations have taken place, when a distinction will be made between ‘urban’ (*i.e.* deeply stratified sites in Lincoln) and ‘rural’ (*i.e.* ‘the rest’). In addition, the terminology of ‘town’ and ‘village’ may also be used in the context of discussions pertaining to existing research on ‘towns’ and ‘rural’ settlement patterns. In general, however, this thesis will refer to places and regions by their toponymic name, broadly following the same geographic divisions (and chronological framework; see above) as the *Lincoln Archaeological Studies* and the

³³ The term ‘village’ is defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as “a self-contained group of houses and associated buildings, usually in a country area ... larger than a hamlet but smaller than a town” (Roberts 2008: 2), which serves to demonstrate the uselessness of many such definitions. Roberts (1996: 1; also see 9, fig. 1.4) defined rural settlement as “that part of the settlement hierarchy most closely concerned with working the land”, and based his distinctions between the various elements in the settlement hierarchy also largely on population size.

Archaeology of Lincoln series. Within the context of these series and this thesis, *Lincoln* encompasses the area within and just outside the walls of the Roman *colonia* (subdivided, where necessary, into the intra-mural *Upper City* and *Lower City*, and the extra-mural suburbs *Wigford* and *Butwerk*). The historical area of *Lindsey* denotes the geographical space that is bounded by the Humber estuary on the north, the Rivers Trent and Witham to the west and south, and the North Sea to the east. Whenever this thesis adopts a comparative approach, the phrase *the rest of Lindsey* (or *other parts of Lindsey*) will be used to denote all of Lindsey except Lincoln itself. Finally, *Kesteven* and *Holland* denote the geographical areas occupied by the two remaining districts in the county of Lincolnshire, both to the south and east of the River Witham (fig. 2).

Similar care will be taken to avoid the use of potentially confusing terminology on a 'cultural' or 'ethnic' level. Throughout this thesis, the terms 'Anglo-Scandinavian' and 'Hiberno-Norse' will be avoided for its culture-historical and ethnic overtones, and the suggestion that it creates of a 'blend' between two 'cultures', which the author believes to be an over-simplification of the situation, as continental influences are also apparent in the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England. Likewise, the term 'continental' will be preferred to 'Frankish' or 'Carolingian'. Other 'ethnic' terms can unfortunately not be avoided altogether. This thesis will use 'Anglo-Saxon' rather than 'English' or 'Saxon' when describing the 'native' inhabitants or culture of ninth- and tenth-century England, unless specifically referring to the inhabitants or culture of the kingdom of Wessex, when the term 'West Saxon' will be employed. The settlers will be referred to as 'Scandinavians' and their cultural influence as 'Scandinavian' to avoid branding them as pirates and raiders (the contemporary meaning of the Old English word *wicing* was 'pirate': Clark Hall 2000: 407). However, when referring to 'viking' activity in the Old English sense of the word, the term 'viking' will be used. When referring to Scandinavian raiders from Ireland, the term 'Irish vikings' may be employed, whilst settlers from those regions may be described as 'Scandinavian settlers from Ireland/western Britain'. Finally, where possible this thesis will specify the century (or year) AD in which events took place, although the terms 'early Anglo-Saxon', 'middle Anglo-Saxon' and 'late Anglo-Saxon' may be used, in a strictly chronological sense, to denote the periods c. 400-650, c. 650-870 and c. 870-1066 respectively.

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

2.1: Introduction

This chapter addresses the methodological problems that are associated with the approach adopted in this thesis. As mentioned in chapter 1.3, urban and rural sites are rarely studied together (Roskams 1996). This is caused by the fact that the two types of site require different methods of investigation, and are typically studied by different people, which has resulted in a different development of the two (sub-) disciplines. The study of rural settlement patterns in Lindsey enjoyed a surge of attention during the 1950s and 1960s. During this period, archaeological investigations of settlement remains focused on surviving earthworks at, for example, Somerby (appendix 2.6.22), Nettleham (appendix 2.12.22), Snarford (appendix 2.12.4), Normanby le Wold (appendix 2.8.7) and Salmonby (appendix 2.16.8). At that stage, not many archaeological investigations had been carried out in Lincoln. Exceptions included the excavations at Flaxengate (appendix 1.2.1.15), the first and second phases of which took place in the 1940s and late 1960, and investigations at Cottesford Place and East Bight (appendix 1.1.1.5; 1.1.1.7), which took place in the 1950s.

The late 1960s and 1970s witnessed a surge in interest in urban archaeology in England (Carver 1987: 105). The City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit (CLAU) was particularly prolific in carrying out large-scale open area excavations during the 1970s, many of which yielded evidence for late Anglo-Saxon activity. These included the excavations at St Paul-in-the-Bail, Flaxengate (main phase), Dickinson's Mill and Holmes Grainwarehouse, all started in 1972 (appendix 1.1.1.4; 1.2.1.15; 1.3.1.3; 1.3.1.4); excavations at Saltergate, Silver Street and Broadgate, all started in 1973 (appendix 1.2.1.18; 1.2.1.22; 1.4.1.1); and the investigations at St Mark's Church, started in 1976 (appendix 1.3.1.7) (for a discussion of urban archaeology in England in the 1970s, see Carver 1987: 105-10). A number of important rural excavations in Lindsey also belong to the 1970s. These include the remains at Fiskerton (appendix 2.12.27), the church at Holton le Clay (appendix 2.4.16) and the settlement remains at 'Goltho' (appendix 2.13.29).

Interest in the archaeology of Lincoln did not abate during the 1980s, although fewer large open area excavations took place. Nevertheless, investigations that produced evidence for late Anglo-Saxon activity included the excavations at Chapel Lane (appendix 1.1.1.1); The Lawn (appendix 1.1.2.1); the first phase of investigations at Hungate (appendix 1.2.1.9); the Waterside investigations (appendix 1.2.2.1; 1.3.1.2); Brayford Wharf East (appendix 1.3.1.6); the first phase of excavations at St Mark's Station (appendix 1.3.1.8); and investigations at St Mary's Guildhall (appendix 1.3.1.16). Investigations of rural settlements in Lindsey included the settlement remains at Cherry Willingham (appendix 2.12.26),

excavated in the 1980s; St Peter's Church in Barton-upon-Humber (appendix 2.3.2); and the remains at Great Cotes (appendix 2.4.6), excavated in 1989.

Since the publication of *Planning and Policy Guidance Note 16 (PPG16)* in 1990 (currently in the process of being turned into the *Heritage Protection Bill*),³⁴ the emphasis within archaeology has shifted to preservation *in situ* rather than excavation, unless the archaeology is threatened by destruction through building development (Drewett 1999: 78-79). The majority of archaeological excavations that have taken place in Lincoln and Lindsey since then have been carried out in a developer-funded context. The only exceptions are the English Heritage-funded excavations at Flixborough (appendix 2.2.15), carried out in the 1990s, and the research excavations of the University of Sheffield at West Halton (appendix 2.2.5), Whitton (appendix 2.2.1) and Fillingham (2.7.12), all carried out in the 2000s.

Excavations in Lincoln since 1990 have contributed significantly to the current state of knowledge about the development of the settlement. They included the majority of investigations in Butwerk (appendix 1.4.1.2; 1.4.1.3; 1.4.1.4); the investigations at 116 High Street (appendix 1.3.1.13) in Wigford that yielded evidence for pottery production; excavations at 1-8 Mill Lane (appendix 1.3.1.18) and Park Street (appendix 1.2.1.4); the second phase of investigations at Hungate (appendix 1.2.1.9); and, last but not least, the investigations at The Collection/Danesgate (appendix 1.2.1.14), across the road from the main Flaxengate site. Developer-funded excavations in Lindsey have been more numerous still, and include the investigations at Belton (appendix 2.1.8); Alkborough (appendix 2.2.3); Bottesford (appendix 2.2.26); Barrow (appendix 2.3.3); Stallingborough (appendix 2.3.25); Aylesby (appendix 2.4.4); Grimsby (appendix 2.4.9); Brigsley (appendix 2.5.7); North Thoresby (appendix 2.5.21); Kirton in Lindsey (appendix 2.6.4); Covenham (appendix 2.9.6); Manby (appendix 2.10.25); Donington on Bain (appendix 2.14.1); Minting (appendix 2.14.15); Wood Enderby (appendix 2.15.18); Theddlethorpe (appendix 2.17.1); Huttoft (appendix 2.17.27); Cumberworth (appendix 2.17.23); Halton Hologate (appendix 2.18.10); Driby (appendix 2.19.1); Addlethorpe (appendix 2.19.12); Orby (appendix 2.19.17); Riby (appendix 2.3.22) and Burgh le Marsh (appendix 2.19.18).

Although developer-funded archaeology clearly has made a major contribution to our knowledge of late Anglo-Saxon Lincoln and Lindsey, there are downsides too. The location of developer-funded excavations are determined by planning departments and developers rather than by archaeologists. Budgetary restrictions do not leave much scope for contextualised interpretations, and the majority of sites are never published, but are discussed as isolated entities in unpublished 'grey' reports (a situation that holds true for all the developer-funded excavations

³⁴ For a discussion why the Heritage Protection Bill has been put on hold, see <http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.20038>.

in Lindsey that are listed in the previous paragraph).

Archaeological deposits are often sampled, especially during 'rural' excavations (see for example the investigations at Bottesford; appendix 2.2.26). Sampling is not restricted to commercial archaeology. However, whereas sampling strategies during research excavations are built around archaeological concerns (Roskams 2001: 31-32), in developer-funded archaeology they are based around budgetary and time restrictions (O'Neil 1993; also see Barker 1993: ch. 6-7 for a discussion of financial and time concerns *prior* to PPG16; for a discussion of the pros and cons of partial vs. total excavation, see Barker 1993: ch. 5-6; Drewett 1999: ch. 5-6; Roskams 2001: 30-34).³⁵ Only on deeply stratified urban sites are deposits often removed in their entirety, because otherwise the underlying archaeology cannot be reached. However, deep stratification is not always an advantage (from an archaeological perspective): the continuous occupation of settlements like Lincoln has not only caused much truncation of early features by later activity (as was observed during the investigations at St Mary's Guildhall (appendix 1.3.1.15)), but has also ensured that the ninth- and tenth-century deposits now exist at great depth, which cannot always be reached during routine investigations (as happened during the investigations at Danes Terrace (appendix 1.2.1.13) and Broadgate East (appendix 1.4.1.1)).

Excavation is not the only technique that can be used to obtain archaeological information. The 1980s witnessed a growing appreciation of non-intrusive methods, such as field walking, metal detecting, earthwork survey and aerial photography (Dobson and Denison 1995; Drewett 1999: ch. 3; Haselgrove 1985; Haselgrove *et al.* 1985; Hey and Lacey 2001; Lewarch and O'Brien 1981).³⁶ At this point targeted programmes of field walking with volunteers were already organised by the North Lincolnshire Museum (Leahy *pers. comm.*). The first comprehensive non-intrusive study of archaeological remains in Lindsey, which focused on its western half only, was Everson *et al.* 1991. More recent investigations have included a series of surveys that focused exclusively on the wetlands (Ellis *et al.* 2001; Lane 1993; Van de Noort and Ellis 1997; 1998; 2000), whilst non-intrusive methods have also been applied in a developer-funded context (Gardner and Bunn 2006; Hatt undated; Wragg and Trimble 2000). Through these means, a wealth of data has become available for the ninth and tenth centuries, but only for the rural parts of Lindsey: the built-up nature of Lincoln itself renders the settlement unsuitable for such investigations (the only exception being standing building survey (Everson and

³⁵ The IFA has set out guidelines for archaeological investigations. Relevant in this context are the *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation*; the *Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation*; and the *Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials*. All sources are available on <http://www.archaeologists.net/modules/icontent/index.php?page=15>.

³⁶ For a recent discussion on the problems associated with illegal metal detecting, see the recent report on *Nighthawks and Nighthawking* by Oxford Archaeology.

Stocker 1999: 194-221; Gilmour and Stocker 1986; Stocker 1991). This thesis represents the first comprehensive study that combines the available evidence from a wide variety of rural investigations, both intrusive and non-intrusive, with the results from the urban excavations that have been carried out in Lincoln itself.

If urban and rural settlement patterns are rarely studied together, the integrated study of different types of material culture is less exceptional within the field of early medieval archaeology (e.g. Hadley 2006; Jones *et al.* 2003; Richards 2004b; Vince 2006). After all, the fact that people *in the past* expressed their identities through a variety of different means implies that the joint study of different artefact types is the best approach to reconstructing those past identities (Woolf 1998: 181). Nevertheless, as different methodologies lead to the retrieval of different types of archaeological evidence, methodological considerations also play a role in bringing together various types of material culture. Funerary sculpture is typically found either *in situ*, or re-used in later building fabrics, both on urban and on rural sites. Its study therefore does not usually require excavation, *unless* sculptural fragments are incorporated in the foundations of buildings, as was the case for a significant number of sculptural fragments from St Mark's Church (Gilmour and Stocker 1986). Burials, on the other hand, can by definition *only* be investigated through excavation; yet at the time of their primary deposition burials and funerary sculpture were part of the same, composite deposits (see Hadley 2004b; 2006: ch. 6; 2008 for a joint discussion of burials and funerary sculpture).

Coinage and metalwork represent two types of material that are often casually lost, and as such are usually found in unstratified contexts. The above-mentioned *Early Medieval Corpus (EMC)*, hosted by the Department of Coins and Medals of the Fitzwilliam Museum (Cambridge), comprises a comprehensive list of known early medieval single coin finds from the British Isles, and the *Portable Antiquities Scheme (PAS)*, launched in 1997 with the help of a Heritage Lottery Fund grant, lists all metal artefacts, including coins, that have been reported by metal detectorists and other members of the public. Lincolnshire was one of the six regions included in the original pilot scheme of the *PAS (Portable Antiquities Annual Report 1997-1998)*, and as a result the amount of available evidence for the rural parts of Lincolnshire is relatively detailed. However, the built-up nature of urban settlements, like Lincoln, does not lend itself to metal detecting activities, and here, metal artefacts are typically only found during excavations.

The final category of material culture to be discussed in this thesis, pottery, is a form of material that is usually deposited after it has been discarded as waste, both in urban and rural contexts. Still, pottery is only found rarely in securely stratified contexts. Whereas waste deposits in urban contexts may be used and re-used as levelling or foundation layers for structures, thus causing high levels of residuality (Young and Vince 2005), waste deposits from rural sites have often

since been disturbed by later ploughing activity, creating unstratified 'pottery scatters' that can be recognised during field walking surveys (as was the case for an unidentified site near Northorpe; appendix 2.6.8).

The remainder of this section will discuss the methodological considerations that have to be borne in mind when bringing together a wide variety of different material from a wide variety of different contexts, focusing on a number of archaeological sites from Lincoln and Lindsey that have produced evidence for activity during the ninth and tenth centuries. The first part of this chapter will discuss investigations carried out in Lincoln itself, and associated methodological and interpretative problems. The second part of this chapter will highlight some of the issues associated with archaeological investigations in rural areas, focusing on Lindsey. The final part of this chapter will discuss the methodological issues that are relevant to the deposition and retrieval of the various types of material culture that form the basis for the subsequent chapters in this thesis.

2.2: The archaeology of Lincoln

2.2.1: The archaeology of Lincoln: introduction

The archaeological evidence for the development of Lincoln in the Anglo-Saxon period is entirely retrieved in the context of developer-funded excavations and, in a few cases, building survey, usually prior to demolition (see for example Gilmour and Stocker 1986). As stated in section 2.1, the majority of large open-area excavations took place in the 1970s, some twenty years before *PPG16* was published. Although their results have been invaluable for our understanding of the development of the settlement, and have provided a framework for subsequent investigations, the lack of existing guidelines had in many cases negative consequences. For example, on a number of sites in the Lower City, including Saltergate (appendix 1.2.1.18), the Anglo-Saxon layers were machined off, because the excavations were aimed at recording the preceding Roman settlement (Steane *et al.* forthcoming).

Although *PPG16* has ensured since that such drastic 'solutions' are no longer allowed, other issues have affected more recent investigations. As *preservation in situ* has become the preferred approach for dealing with archaeological deposits (*PPG16; Heritage Protection Bill*), new developments in construction techniques that do not require deep foundations, but use alternatives such as piling, have decreased the need for archaeological investigations (see *Piling and Archaeology* for a discussion of the impacts of this technique on archaeological deposits). Keyhole excavations are still carried out on lift shafts and service trenches, but the limited scale of such investigations often renders the interpretation of structural remains problematic (see Malone 2009). Finally, although archaeological investigations have now become a standard part of the construction process, and the Lincoln HER

ensures that reports of these investigations are routinely filed, there is still a lack of available funds for post-excavation analysis and preservation (Mann *pers. comm.*).

The remainder of this section discusses the established archaeological sequence for the various parts of Lincoln, with special attention for areas where methodological issues may have affected (or still affect) the current understanding of the site(s). The archaeological sequence will be discussed only in the most general of terms, as it is in the process of being comprehensively published in the *Lincoln Archaeological Studies* series (Jones *et al.* 2003; Steane *et al.* 2001; Steane *et al.* 2006; Steane *et al.* forthcoming). Appendix 1 provides a more detailed site-by-site overview of the discoveries that pertain to the late ninth and tenth centuries, based on the discussion in the various volumes of the *Lincoln Archaeological Studies* series.

One issue that needs pointing out, first, is related to the use of site codes in post-excavation analysis and publications. In some cases, the conventions for using these site codes have changed over time. This particularly affects excavations on the same site that continued for more than one season, such as the excavations at the main Flaxengate site (fig. 3: 18), which took place between 1972 and 1976 (Perring 1981). Initially, each year was given a different site code. Thus the 1972 investigations were known as f72, whilst investigations the following year were referred to as f73. During this period, the numerical sequence for finds and contexts was started from the beginning for each consecutive year. As a result, in older reports, including White's (1982) analysis of the metalworking scrap (summarised in appendix 11.2.14), it is common to see finds referred to by site code and then finds number, for example f72 <102> or f74 <169>. Within this system, it is possible to duplicate finds numbers; thus f72 <102> and f74 <102> would refer to different artefacts excavated during different excavation seasons. However, during the writing phase for the *Lincoln Archaeological Studies* series, which placed the emphasis more on site stratigraphy than on the artefactual evidence, it was decided to amalgamate the various seasons under one site code (usually the one used for the first season) (Jones *pers. comm.*). Thus the Flaxengate site *as a whole* is now known as f72. Occasionally, however, when older reports are integrated into the general discussion, this might cause some confusion, especially if finds from different seasons have identical numbers (one example from appendix 11.2.14 is <ae151>, which both refers to a possible copper-alloy ingot found during one excavation season (White 1982: 40, F59), and to a piece of scrap metal found during a different season (White 1982: 30, F31)).

Some confusion may also occur (even *within* the published record) when a number of excavations have taken place on a number of adjacent sites along the same street(s). The sites along East Bight in the Upper City provide a good example. Here, excavations took place in 1953 (eb53); 1966 (eb66); 1970 (on two

different sites, known as eb70 and ebs70); 1979 (eb79); and 1980 (eb80) (variously indicated on Jones *et al.* 2003: fig. 1.1 and Jones *et al.* 2003: 146, fig. 8.3). In this case attempts to simplify the situation were also made, as Jones *et al.* (2003: 145) jointly refer to “three different excavations along the defences at East Bight” as eb80, which was presumably the most significant of the investigations, whilst the figure on the following page (Jones *et al.* 2003: 146, fig. 8.3) places these at eb53, eb70 and eb79.

Finally, some variety exists in the use of site *names*. This happens mostly when sites are wedged between different streets, as was the case for the burials at Saltergate (lin73def; fig. 3: 23-25). These are sometimes also referred to as the Silver Street burials, even if the forthcoming volume on the Lower City (Steane *et al.* forthcoming) refers only to lin73abc (fig. 3: 29-31) as ‘Silver Street’, which is also the convention that will be adhered to in this thesis. Likewise, the earliest investigations at Flaxengate (flax45-47 and flax69; fig. 3: 16-17) were situated to the east of the street, roughly opposite the main Flaxengate investigations at f72 to the west of the street, but directly adjacent to the investigations at The Collection (fig. 3: 15), on the corner of Flaxengate and Danes Terrace, which are generally speaking referred to as the Collection or Danesgate investigations, using either the name of the museum, or that of the street that runs parallel to Flaxengate but one block to the east. Confusion may also occur when investigations took place on the same site but were carried out by different units, as increasingly occurred since the CLAU was disbanded in 2004. The discussion in this thesis will mostly refer to sites by their site name rather than their site code, as this tends to avoid the majority of the confusion. However, where a number of different *sites* (as opposed to excavation seasons) are grouped together under a single site name (and in the *Lincoln Archaeological Studies* series therefore also under a single site code), the figures in this thesis will distinguish between the various site codes. See fig. 3 for their locations.

2.2.2: The archaeology of Lincoln: the Upper City

The Upper City is situated on the highest point in the surrounding landscape, on top of the Lincoln Edge, a Jurassic limestone ridge overlooking the junction of the Rivers Witham and Till, which form a natural ‘pool’ known as the Brayford Pool (fig. 4). Although archaeological evidence for human activity in this location dates back to prehistoric times, the first significant evidence for permanent settlement dates to the first century AD, when a Roman fortress was built. Its walls created a lasting boundary within the landscape, and are still visible in the shape of the modern town plan, and form the boundary of the Upper City as indicated in figs 3 and 4 (Jones *et al.* 2003: 13, 33, 38-40). In the course of the next three to four centuries, Lincoln developed into a prosperous *colonia*, now also incorporating the (also walled) Lower

City (see section 2.2.2) and the 'suburb' of Wigford (see section 2.2.3) (Jones *et al.* 2003: 141). These three parts of the settlement also had a different character in the late ninth and tenth centuries.

The post-Roman development of the Upper City is less well understood. This is partially caused by the density of listed and historic buildings (its southern half is almost entirely taken up by the Norman Castle and Cathedral), causing a dearth of modern building development and developer-funded excavations. Where archaeological investigations did take place, they yielded little evidence for early medieval activity, suggesting that the Upper City remained largely deserted until the Norman Conquest (Jones *et al.* 2003: 141). The evidence for early and middle Anglo-Saxon activity from the Upper City predominantly consists of unstratified pottery scatters. These were found on a number of sites, both inside and outside the walled area. The study of unstratified finds assemblages is not straightforward (for a discussion of the problems associated with surface assemblages, which constitute one type of unstratified finds assemblage, see Lewarch and O'Brien 1981: 311-19). Although unstratified finds indicate activity of some sort, it is not always clear what kind of activity, especially if the sherds retrieved are few in number. Rather than permanent domestic occupation, unstratified pottery may indicate seasonal or periodic occupation. These considerations certainly have to be borne in mind when addressing the unstratified evidence for early Anglo-Saxon activity in Lincoln, which is extremely scarce. No more than ten early Anglo-Saxon sherds have been found on sites located inside the Roman walls, at East Bight (appendix 1.1.1.7) and West Bight (appendix 1.1.1.2), and another seven from sites outside the Roman walls, at The Lawn (appendix 1.1.2.1) and Langworthgate (appendix 1.1.2.3) (Jones *et al.* 2003: 145-47) (fig. 3).

The quantity of middle Anglo-Saxon pottery from Lincoln is slightly larger. The most significant assemblage has been found at The Lawn (appendix 1.1.2.1) and Cuthbert's Yard (appendix 1.1.2.2) (Jones *et al.* 2003: 152; Steane *et al.* 2006: 107-08) (fig. 3). Nearly 70 sherds of middle Anglo-Saxon pottery were found in this area, an amount not dissimilar to that found on the majority of excavated middle Anglo-Saxon rural settlement sites in Lincolnshire (an exception being Flixborough (appendix 2.2.15), which yielded over 5,000 middle Anglo-Saxon sherds (Young and Vince 2009)) (Jones *et al.* 2003: 152). Consequently, the pottery from The Lawn and Cuthbert's Yard is usually interpreted as evidence for the existence of an extra-mural settlement core (Jones *et al.* 2003: 152). As neither site produced any evidence for the late ninth century or later, when occupation of the walled area of the Lower City began (see below: 2.2.3), it has been suggested that a settlement shift occurred around this time (Jones *et al.* 2003: 145-47). However, as a separate middle Anglo-Saxon settlement core may have existed in the southeastern corner of the Lower City and outside its eastern wall (section 2.2.3), it is unclear whether

the settlement core outside the Upper City had a direct relationship to the later settlement in the Lower City.

The only structural evidence from the Upper City that predated the eleventh century came from a small site at St Paul-in-the-Bail, although the exact dating of the earliest archaeological deposits is open to debate (for the most recent summary of the sequence, see Gilmour 2007) (appendix 1.1.1.4). Excavations produced evidence for a cemetery whose earliest burials were dated, using ¹⁴C techniques, to the prehistoric, late Roman and post-Roman periods (appendix 1.1.1.4). Three successive buildings – a timber structure, a timber apsidal-ended building with stone packing in its foundation trenches, and a single-celled stone-footed building – were identified as possible churches. In their centre was an empty cist-grave with a seventh-century hanging bowl that showed signs of repair inside its stone packing (Bruce-Mitford 1993), but the stratigraphic relationship between the cist grave and the buildings could not be determined, nor could the relationship be determined between the cist burial and the other burials (Gilmour 2007). It was originally suggested that the cist grave was the earliest burial on the site, as all the other burials seemed to respect it. However, radiocarbon dating has since suggested that the cist grave was *not* the earliest burial on site, creating the possibility that it occupied the location of an earlier focal point (see appendix 1.1.1.4 for a detailed discussion of the stratigraphy).

The dating of the first two building phases remains unclear as well. Gilmour (2007) prefers a late Roman or early post-Roman date for both (also see Jones *et al.* 2003: 144-45, 149-50; Steane 1991), although a middle Anglo-Saxon date has also been suggested for the apsidal-ended structure, partially on the basis of a reference in Bede's *HE* (II: 16), in which he relates how Paulinus, a seventh-century missionary, "built a stone church of remarkable workmanship" at *Lindocolinae civitas* (the city of Lincoln) (see Sawyer 1998: appendix 4).³⁷ Despite the fact that Bede gave no indication that this church was located in the Upper City, and despite the fact that he explicitly referred to a *stone* church, it has been suggested that the apsidal-ended timber structure from St Paul-in-the-Bail should be identified as Paulinus's church (Sawyer 1998: appendix 4).³⁸ This interpretation

³⁷ Paulinus was part of the second wave of missionaries sent by Pope Gregory to reinforce Augustine's mission. He was consecrated as bishop of York in 625, which he remained until 633. After his consecration he was sent to Northumbria. Amongst other things, he is said to have converted the kingdom of Lindsey to Christianity, and established a church at Lincoln (Lapidge 2001: 359).

³⁸ Although attempts to identify archaeological remains in the historical record are no longer accepted practice within historical archaeology, the site at St Paul-in-the-Bail was excavated in the early 1970s, before the debate on the relationship between history and archaeology had reached the discipline of medieval archaeology in Britain (Driscoll 1984; Rahtz 1981; 1984). Several alternative identifications for Paulinus's church have also been offered, including the church of St Mary, supposedly located underneath the present cathedral, as well as the two churches of St Peter in the Lower City, and the church of St Mary-le-Wigford (Jones *et al.* 2003: 144-45). Other suggestions could be made as well (such as a late Roman

was strengthened by the evidence of the seventh-century hanging bowl found within the stone packing of the empty cist grave (published in Bruce-Mitford 1993; Gilmour 2007: 240-45; Jones *et al.* 2003: 149, fig. 8.7), which was assumed to be contemporary with the apsidal-ended building. However, the stratigraphic relationship between the cist grave and the building is unclear. Besides, the fact that the hanging bowl was found *in* the stone packing of the cist, and showed signs of repair, suggests that the bowl was of significant antiquity when it was deposited (Jones *et al.* 2003: 150). Although Gilmour (2007) accepts an early seventh-century date for the hanging bowl, and a mid-seventh-century date for the burial on the basis of the assumption that the intervening fifty years would have provided enough time for the hanging-bowl to have been damaged and repaired, the hanging bowl merely provides a *terminus post quem* for the cist grave.

After the apsidal-ended building went out of use, the site continued to be used for burial activity, with several graves now cutting the robbed foundation trenches of the apsidal-ended building (Gilmour 2007; Jones *et al.* 2003: 150, fig. 8.8). Radiocarbon dating suggested that the apsidal-ended building was demolished in the seventh century at the latest, rendering a post-Roman or early Anglo-Saxon date for the apsidal-ended structure more likely (Gilmour (2007: 247-48) presents the most up-to-date list of obtained radiocarbon dates). Some time after c. 650 AD, and probably in the late Anglo-Saxon period, a single-celled stone building was constructed on a slightly different alignment, but still keeping the cist burial at its centre (Gilmour 2007: 234-45, 249-51). From the middle of the tenth century, stratified pottery assemblages begin to occur, whilst a sunken-featured metal-working workshop, which encroached upon the cemetery, was in use in the later tenth and earlier eleventh centuries (Gilmour 2007: 235; Jones *et al.* 2003: 194, 196; Steane *et al.* 2006: 154, 162-63, 170-71). The sequence at St Paul-in-the-Bail will be revisited in more detail in subsequent chapters.

Jones *et al.* (2003: 192, 201) have pointed out that there is no evidence from the Upper City to rival the evidence for economic activity from the Lower City (see below: 2.2.3). This should not come as a surprise, as the Upper City was situated on top of the steep slope of the Lincoln Edge, and was difficult to access from the river. Nevertheless, the Upper City may have functioned as a strategic and ecclesiastical centre (Jones *et al.* 2003: 192, 201). Stocker and Vince (1997) have argued, on the basis of a reassessment of historical sources, such as *DB* and the *ASC*, and the architectural development of Lincoln Cathedral (fig. 3), that an earlier minster church was located underneath the present cathedral (appendix 1.1.1.6). As the present Cathedral is dedicated to St Mary, this postulated minster church is

stone apsidal building from Flaxengate that showed evidence for re-use in the middle Anglo-Saxon period; appendix 1.2.1.15), although the fact that a decisive conclusion will never be obtained renders the discussion rather meaningless.

commonly referred to, in the *Lincoln Archaeological Studies* and *Archaeology of Lincoln* series, as the church of St Mary. Excavations at the Cathedral have not produced any structural remains predating the Norman Conquest (appendix 1.1.1.6), but two pieces of pre-Conquest sculpture from this site tentatively confirm the existence of the underlying church of St Mary. These ideas will be revisited in chapter 3.

There is no unequivocal evidence for the existence of a secular power centre in the Upper City prior to the Norman Conquest. In fact, little is known about Lincoln's late Anglo-Saxon secular elite. As will be discussed in chapter 4, in contrast to the coinages from York and East Anglia, Lincoln's early coinages do not mention the names of any rulers. No middle or late Anglo-Saxon high-status dwellings have been identified in Lincoln. Lincoln is no exception in this respect: none of the other regional centres within the Scandinavian-controlled territories have produced any evidence for high-status residences. Although *DB* leaves little doubt that the late eleventh-century secular elite *owned* a significant number of land plots in Lincoln, this does not necessarily imply that they *lived* within the settlement. Although a small group of high-status middle Anglo-Saxon dress accessories and coins were found at St Paul-in-the-Bail (appendices 8.1.2 and 11.1.2), these have been alternatively interpreted as viking loot or grave goods (Jones *et al.* 2003: 151) (chapters 4 and 5). These issues will be revisited in chapters 3 and 5.

2.2.3: The archaeology of Lincoln: the Lower City

The Lower City is situated on the steep slope leading down from the Upper City to the floor of the river valley (figs 3 and 4). Its walls were constructed in the second century AD, when the fortress at Lincoln had been turned into a *colonia* (Jones *et al.* 2003: 82). Due to the steepness of the slope this part of the settlement had to be terraced, and as a result large quantities of soil were frequently redeposited throughout its Roman and later occupation history, resulting in high levels of residuality. Roman occupation within the Lower City came to an end in the same period as that in the Upper City. Evidence for early Anglo-Saxon activity is again restricted to a limited quantity of residual potsherds, found at The Park (appendix 1.2.1.3) and Michaelgate (appendix 1.2.1.5) (Colyer *et al.* 1999: 135; Jones *et al.* 2003: 146 fig. 8.3, 152-53).

The majority of evidence for middle Anglo-Saxon also consisted of unstratified pottery assemblages, recognised in the southeastern quarter of the walled area, at Hungate (appendix 1.2.1.9); Steep Hill (appendix 1.2.1.11); Danes Terrace (appendix 1.2.1.13); Flaxengate (appendix 1.2.1.15); Saltergate (appendix 1.2.1.18); Silver Street (appendix 1.2.1.22); and outside the walled area, at Waterside North and Woolworth's basement (appendix 1.2.2.1) (fig. 3). Finds of

middle Anglo-Saxon metalwork were limited to a buckle found at Michaelgate (appendix 1.2.1.5), and a pinhead found at Steep Hill, although the latter may also belong to the late Anglo-saxon period (appendix 1.2.1.11). Broadgate East in Butwerk, located just to the east of the Lower City (appendix 1.4.1.1; fig. 3), also produced middle Anglo-Saxon pottery. It has therefore been suggested that another middle Anglo-Saxon settlement core existed here, straddling the Roman town wall (Jones *et al.* 2003: 153).

A possible middle Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical foundation has been postulated, on the basis of five inhumations of possible seventh-century date, at Saltergate (lin73e) (appendix 1.2.1.18). Jones *et al.* (2003: 143, 154-56; 204; also see Lincoln HER 70559-MLI89659) have suggested that these burials were associated with the two nearby churches of St Peter-at-Pleas and St Peter-at-Arches, which were both mentioned in *DB* and may represent a middle Anglo-Saxon double foundation (appendix 1.2.1.18). This alleged double foundation has also been interpreted as another contender for the church that Paulinus built in the seventh century (Jones *et al.* 2003: 144-45) (section 2.2.2). An alternative name for the church of St Peter-at-Pleas, only known from later post-Conquest sources but retaining a memory of an earlier significance of the site, is St Peter at Mootstone, which suggests that a meeting place was nearby (Lincoln HER 70559-MLI89659). The geographical location of the site, at a junction of the old north south Roman road (Ermine Street) and the River Witham, fits well with this suggestion.

The earliest evidence for late ninth-century occupation, including pottery production (chapter 6) and non-ferrous metalwork production (chapter 5), also comes from the area around Flaxengate (appendix 1.2.1.15), Saltergate (appendix 1.2.1.18) and Silver Street (appendix 1.2.1.22). The fact that the earliest late Anglo-Saxon evidence from the Lower City was found in the same area where the only stratified middle Anglo-Saxon evidence was found confirms Astill's (2006) suggestion that the majority of ninth- and tenth-century settlements were firmly embedded within pre-existing networks (also see Hadley 2006: 162) (chapter 1). The association of the earliest settlement activity with the possible location of an ecclesiastical foundation suggests that the Church was a driving force behind these developments (also see chapters 3 and 5). Craft production activities in Lincoln did not take place on an 'industrial' scale until the later tenth century, which has led Perring (1981: 45) to suggest that this 'industrialisation' was connected to the Anglo-Saxon conquest of Lindsey, when Lincoln became more integrated in 'national' transport networks. In the tenth century, settlement was limited to the southeast corner of the Lower City, but in the eleventh century it grew out into other parts of the Lower City.

Although the archaeological sequence for the Lower City is better understood than that for the Upper City, the circumstances under which the evidence for the

Anglo-Saxon period was retrieved were not always ideal. The emphasis of the investigations at Silver Street, Saltergate and Grantham Street (appendix 1.2.1.17) lay entirely with the preceding Roman period, and in all three cases the medieval and Anglo-Saxon layers were machined off, and recorded in section (Steane *et al.* forthcoming) (section 2.2.1). Recent investigations at the site of The Collection (appendix 1.2.1.14) were also problematic. In this case, the issues were the result of the decision to preserve the archaeology *in situ*, which resulted in the size of the trenches being so limited that no structural remains could be identified (Malone 2009). The main Flaxengate site (f72) was the best-preserved and most extensively excavated site in Lincoln that produced evidence for the late ninth and tenth centuries (Mann 1982: 1). However, the nature of the archaeological deposits was extremely uniform, making it difficult to distinguish between different contexts, and during at least one season the site was excavated in spits (for an overview of the relevant issues, see Perring 1981: 4-5). This caused lasting problems for the interpretation and exact dating of, in particular, the later tenth- and early eleventh-century phase of the site, which was exacerbated by the high levels of residuality as a result of frequent landscaping activities, and a lack of secure stratification of objects (most were from levelling and demolition layers) (Mann 1982: 4).

Despite the problems listed, it was still clear that the the main Flaxengate site was in single ownership. Substantial levelling layers covered the entire site between each building phase, suggesting that all the buildings, some of which revealed evidence for metal- and glass-working, were periodically levelled and rebuilt at the same time. This has led Perring (1981: 44-45) to assume that Lincoln was a planned settlement, not dissimilar to the West Saxon *burhs*. He (1981: 44) concluded that

The lay-out of the streets of Lincoln ... is not so precise as those of Winchester and comparable Alfredian *burhs* with their rectilinear street grids ... [but] the topography of the city, especially the steep hill, would have made so regular a street plan impractical at Lincoln, and the pre-Danish nuclei ... combined with a number of relict Roman features may have had considerable effect on any attempt at later town planning.

Perring's assumption that Lincoln was a planned town is based entirely on the evidence of one excavated plot, and should be treated with caution, as should his comparison between Lincoln and the West Saxon *burhs*, not least because many of the West Saxon *burhs* were military foundations that developed their economic functions at a later stage (Astill 2000: 37-38; Carver 1987: 47), whilst the character of the earliest phases of activity at Flaxengate was economic in character, with evidence for pottery production stratigraphically preceding the earliest evidence for domestic activity (Jones *et al.* 2003: 275-75; Stocker 2006: 66). As Carver (1987: 47-58) has argued, no single model for the development of 'towns'

exists, and use of the same location does not necessarily imply continuity of function. What is more, a planned street-grid, often quoted as an 'urban' characteristic (Biddle 1976b: 100-01), does not exclusively occur in 'urban' settlements, as is for example demonstrated by the planned layout of the house-plots at 'Goltho' (Beresford 1975b) (appendix 2.13.29). The similarities between the late ninth- and tenth-century settlements at Lincoln and 'Goltho' went beyond their planned layouts, as the houses themselves were apparently also similar (Perring 1981: 36), as were the pottery and metal artefacts retrieved during the excavations (chapters 5 and 6).

In general, it is clear that the settlement in the Lower City had a domestic and industrial character, although it is unclear whether any markets existed at the time (Jones *et al.* 2003: 205).³⁹ A number of churches did exist, but the majority cannot be dated with any precision as no or little archaeological or documentary evidence is available. The church of St Martin (appendix 1.2.1.8) is generally speaking considered to be early on the basis of its dedication, which also occurs on the early tenth-century St Martin's coinage (chapter 4). Consequently, it has been cited as another contender for the church that Paulinus built (Jones *et al.* 2003: 144-45), but no archaeological investigations were carried out when the church was demolished in the early twentieth century.

2.2.4: The archaeology of Lincoln: Wigford

Wigford is situated on the low-lying terrain of the valley through which the River Witham flows out to sea. In the tenth century, the Brayford Pool would have extended quite close to Ermine Street, whilst on its eastern side Wigford was bounded by low-lying marshy terrain (Jones *et al.* 2003: 187). It was first occupied in the Roman period, but subsequently abandoned until the tenth century AD (Jones *et al.* 2003: 156). The limited occupation of the Lower City implies that the modern suburb of Wigford, whose continuous occupation also dates back to at least the tenth century, was originally a separate settlement core, rather than an 'overspill' area for the walled Lower City. The archaeological evidence for middle Anglo-Saxon occupation seems to agree with this, as the only unstratified middle Anglo-Saxon pottery came from three sites in the south of Wigford, St Mark's Church (appendix 1.3.1.7), St Mary's Guildhall (appendix 1.3.1.15) and Monson Street (appendix 1.3.1.12), furthest removed from the Lower City, on a relatively high point in the surrounding low-lying terrain (Jones *et al.* 2003: 156) (fig. 3).

³⁹ The evidence from later medieval cartographic and documentary sources places the skin-market at the northern end of Hungate, the thread-market between Clasketgate and Silver Street, the corn market near the western end of Danes Terrace, the hay market around St Martin's Church, and the malt market in the southeastern corner of the Lower City. Jones *et al.* (2003: 206-07) have commented on the possible significance of the fact that these markets were all located around the known location of the tenth-century settlement core within the Lower City.

The latter element of the placename, *-ford*, can be translated as 'a shallow river crossing', but the first element of the placename, derived from *wic*, can have a number of different meanings. It can refer to a 'dairy farm', and it is that meaning which is often found in relation to villages in river valleys (Jones *et al.* 2003: 242). Alternatively, the *wig*-element could refer to an industrial or trading settlement, such as the mid-Saxon *wics* at *Hamwic*, *Lundenwic* or *Eoforwic* (later Scandinavianised to *Jorvik*), or the eleventh-century settlement of *Schleswig* in Denmark (Jones *et al.* 2003: 242).⁴⁰ However, Cameron (1985: 46) suggests that the *wig*-element refers to a Roman site (possibly derived from *vicus* (Jones *et al.* 2003: 242)), and identifies this as the walled Roman settlement of Lincoln.

The evidence for late Anglo-Saxon occupation in Wigford is slightly later than that for the Lower City. It dates from the early or middle of the tenth century, and followed the line of the north south Roman road known as Ermine Street (Jones *et al.* 2003: 192-93). Initially only 'Upper' Wigford, the area north of the Great Gowt, was occupied, and it is therefore not surprising that the excavations at 1-8 Mill Lane (fig. 3) suggested that throughout the tenth century this area was still primarily agricultural in character, and used for refuse dumping (appendix 1.3.1.18). By the end of the eleventh century, however, occupation stretched further south as well (Jones *et al.* 2003: 192, 242-45).

The nature of the sites along Ermine Street was not that different from sites in the Lower City, with evidence for domestic as well as limited industrial activity. Some evidence for pottery production was identified at 116 High Street (appendix 1.3.1.13) and Anchor Street (appendix 1.3.1.9). Metalworking occurred at Holmes Grainwarehouse (appendix 1.3.1.4), and textile production took place at St Mark's Station (appendix 1.3.1.8) (fig. 3), which also yielded evidence for beer brewing activities (Trimble 1998). However, as the majority of the archaeology in Wigford was waterlogged, which ensured better preservation of organic remains than can be expected for sites in the Lower City, this was not necessarily restricted to Wigford.

The sites along the waterfront (including Dickington's Mill (appendix 1.3.1.3), Brayford Wharf East (appendix 1.3.1.6) and St Benedict's Square (appendix 1.3.1.1) (fig. 3)) showed extensive evidence for flood control, whilst other sites also produced evidence for the artificial raising of the ground. It was clearly not an ideal location for settlement, which means that there must have been some considerable benefit to the location to warrant the continuous effort. This was almost certainly the fact that Wigford was located at the junction of a number of transport routes, including the River Witham and Ermine Street, connecting Wigford by land to Kesteven and the Humber coast, and by sea to East Anglia and (via the

⁴⁰ The example of *Schleswig*, whose name may not have come into existence until the foundation of the town in the eleventh century, shows that this specialised use of the *wic* element was not restricted to the period between the seventh and early ninth centuries (Jones *et al.* 2003: 242).

Humber) to York. The collection of stone sculpture from Wigford, especially from St Mark's Church (appendix 1.3.1.7), indeed included a number of examples that belonged to the Kesteven tradition (Everson and Stocker 1999); however, this was also the case for the sculpture from the Upper City. The various regional influences on the Lincoln sculpture will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3.

The importance of trade via the Trent is unclear during the earliest tenth-century settlement phase, as the Fossdyke may not have been navigable yet (Jones *et al.* 2003: 241; Leahy *pers. comm.*) (appendix 1.2.2.1). However, Jones *et al.* (2003: 241-42) have suggested that Wigford's later tenth- and eleventh-century growth was stimulated by the construction of a dam or weir at Stamp End. This would have improved the water levels in the Fossdyke sufficiently to make it suitable for navigation to the Trent, connecting Lincoln to York and to the south, whilst removing the need to go out to sea. This is confirmed by the evidence from the Waterside North excavations in the Lower City (appendix 1.2.2.1), which suggest that the quayside south of the Lower City, which would have been cut off from the route to the North Sea by the Stamp End dam or weir, went out of use roughly at the same time (Jones *et al.* 2003: 237-38). At the same time, 'hards' were laid out along the River Witham in Wigford, suggesting that riverine trade now focused on Wigford (Jones *et al.* 2003: 241-42).

2.2.5: The archaeology of Lincoln: Butwerk

A small number of sites have been excavated to the east of the Lower City, in the suburb of Butwerk (Jones *et al.* 2003: 230) (fig. 3). The earliest structural remains that could be identified were of tenth-century date, but, as mentioned above, there was a limited amount of residual middle Anglo-Saxon pottery from Broadgate East (Adams 1977; Jones *et al.* 2003: 148, fig. 8.5, 194, 230-35), suggesting another middle Anglo-Saxon settlement core may have existed in this location. The identification of this area as a 'suburb', implying a degree of overspill from the Lower City, is therefore probably incorrect, as occupation in Butwerk may have predated the period when occupation of the Lower City became so dense that it did not 'fit' within the walled area anymore (also see section 2.2.4).

The only excavations that yielded evidence for tenth-century activity were those at Broadgate East (appendix 1.4.1.1), the Sessions House (appendix 1.4.1.2), Cathedral Street (appendix 1.4.1.3) and the Greestone Centre, Lincoln University (appendix 1.4.1.4) (fig. 3). Unfortunately the late ninth- and tenth-century layers at Broadgate East existed at a depth of c. 4 m, and a combination of Health and Safety regulations and time restrictions resulted in a situation whereby only a small percentage of the archaeological deposits could be excavated (Jones and Jones 1977: 5; Jones *et al.* 2003: 230-35). However, it has been surmised that the activity here must have been contemporary with the occupation along Silver

Street in the Lower City, as this is the only plausible explanation for the existence of Silver Street itself, which connects the south and east gates of the Lower City (Jones *et al.* 2003: 230). Towards the end of the tenth century industrial activities were carried out, including metalworking (Steane *et al.* forthcoming).

Further north, at the Sessions House site (appendix 1.4.1.2), evidence for late ninth- or tenth-century pottery production was found (Jones *et al.* 2003: 230-31; Young and Vince 2005: 238-39). The period of activity of the Sessions House kilns thus overlapped with that of the Silver Street kilns in the Lower City (Jones *et al.* 2003: 276). Young and Vince (2005) have argued that several pottery production centres existed simultaneously at Lincoln. The dynamics of pottery production in Lincoln will stand central to chapter 6.

2.2.6: The archaeology of Lincoln: conclusions

It is clear that the archaeological study of ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln has not been without problems. On many sites, the archaeological evidence for the late Anglo-Saxon period was too limited to provide conclusive answers, or was not excavated at all, either because it existed at great depth or because it was machined off. Still, the late Anglo-Saxon period has been interpreted as a period of re-urbanisation, a conscious attempt to turn Lincoln into a 'town' once more (Jones *et al.* 2003: 159) (chapter 1). To a large extent, this assumption is derived from a comparison to the preceding Roman and later medieval settlements of Lincoln, rather than based on the archaeological evidence itself.

After more than four decades of excavations, enough archaeological data is available to reconstruct the identity of the late ninth- and tenth-century settlement on its own merits. Lincoln was not a uniform settlement, but a conglomeration of three or four separate settlement cores (the Lower City and Butwerk potentially representing a single settlement core), each with their own separate identities. There is no evidence that the Upper City was anything but an ecclesiastical enclave throughout the ninth and tenth centuries. As will be argued in subsequent chapters, throughout the ninth and tenth centuries, the power of the secular elite was still firmly based on the possession of land (their 'rural' estates), whilst the 'urban' settlement of Lincoln was firmly in the hands of the Church. This only changed after the Norman Conquest, when the construction of the castle and cathedral visibly changed the function of the Upper City into a centre of aristocratic, military *and* religious power. The role of the Church for the development of Lincoln will be explored in more detail in chapter 3.

2.3: The archaeology of the rest of Lindsey

The chronology for the development of the rest of Lindsey during the late Anglo-Saxon period is only gradually becoming clear. For many years a general lack of

available archaeological data ensured that few definitive statements could be made with regards to the development of the area as a whole. Over the years, however, the number of archaeological investigations, both intrusive and non-intrusive, has steadily increased. The efforts of hobbyist metal detectorists have made an important contribution as well, especially since the establishment of the *PAS* (section 2.1). However, the study of such a wide range of different sources of information retrieved under different circumstances is not straightforward, and a large number of factors need to be considered before the data can be used to its full potential.

The evidence for late ninth- and tenth-century activity from Lindsey (excluding Lincoln) is summarised in appendix 2. The data is organised per *wapentake*. The placenames listed within each *wapentake* are taken from the *Lincolnshire DB (LDB)* (eds Morgan and Thorne 1986), the oldest surviving written source that provides detailed information about estates and landholdings in Lincolnshire. Although *DB* is a post-Conquest source, the situation that it records is the outcome of developments that were set into motion in previous centuries (Roffe 2000: 20-22; 2007: 287). The locations of the various manors and estates recorded in *DB* are indicated on fig. 5 (redrawn from Morgan and Thorne 1986). Information from archaeological investigations that yielded evidence for the later ninth and tenth centuries has been added to the list of placenames. In some cases, spatial information of individual finds was only recorded or will only be released on a parish level. This is the case in particular for the finds listed in the *PAS* database and the *EMC* (section 2.1), because both the *PAS* and the *EMC* prefer not to publicise detailed spatial information out of concern that such data could be abused by 'nighthawks' (illegal metal detectorists) (Bland *pers. comm.*; Blackburn *pers. comm.*).⁴¹ In these cases, finds are listed under (one of) the estates or manors that have lent their name to the parish where the finds have been recorded.

As stated at the beginning of this chapter, an increasing number of excavations in 'rural' Lindsey are carried out in a developer-funded context, which means that the area of excavation is dictated by the extent of the building development. In a rural context, this is often limited to a single dwelling or garage, as was the case at Brigsley (appendix 2.5.7), or a pipeline, as at Hallington (appendix 2.10.18). At Hallington, a suspected site lay outside the line of the pipe trench (Tann 1997: 20), but it was not possible to extend the trenches beyond the pipeline requirements to investigate further. Similar issues occurred at Belton (appendix 2.1.8), where a possible middle Anglo-Saxon structure could only be partially excavated because the trenches could not be extended as part of the agreed investigations (Young *et al.* 2001). Sometimes the limited size of the

⁴¹ Bland is currently Head of Scheme and Treasure at the *PAS*. Blackburn is currently Keeper of Coins and Medals at the Fitzwilliam Museum, from where the *EMC* is hosted.

investigations leads to incorrect dating of the deposits. This happened after the first phase of investigations at Bottesford (appendix 2.2.26), which was mistakenly identified as medieval, although subsequent investigations revealed that the site dated back to the middle Anglo-Saxon period (Morris and Holmes 2002; Tibbles 2001). Finally, in some cases, and despite the fact that it is illegal, developers fail to contact or involve archaeologists, as happened at South Willingham (appendix 2.13.18), where ground works for a new office block were largely carried out without the presence of an archaeologist. Although this may have been another Anglo-Saxon settlement site, none of the remains were positively identified or recorded (Tann 2002).

Other archaeological investigations in Lindsey, including those at West Halton (Hadley and Willmott forthcoming) (appendix 2.2.5), take place in a research and training context. Research and training excavations come with their own set of issues. The methods employed may be more rigorous – for example, often all the excavated soils are sieved for finds, which almost never occurs during developer-funded investigations – but then again, the work may be carried out by students with limited archaeological experience. Consequently, research and training excavations often progress slowly, a situation which is exacerbated by the fact that they usually only take place for a few weeks a year. However, despite these caveats the quality of evidence retrieved during research and training excavations is often better than that retrieved during developer-funded excavations: developer-funded watching briefs in West Halton revealed no archaeological remains at all, a situation which exists in stark contrast to the wealth of material retrieved during the research excavations only a few metres away (Hadley *pers. comm.*).

In recent decades, a number of non-intrusive investigations have been carried out that offer a more landscape-based and geographically extensive perspective. The study of surface materials plays an increasingly important role within archaeological research (Lewarch and O'Brien 1981). In some respects, these methods have a methodological advantage over excavation: whereas excavations necessarily focus on sites, and thus create keyholes into the archaeological landscape, collection of surface materials over an extended geographical area results in a more balanced understanding of the archaeology of an entire region (Dunnell and Dancey 1983). Yet non-intrusive methods are not problem-free either. First, the results of non-intrusive investigations, in particular those retrieved through aerial photography and earthwork survey, can be impossible to date, especially where a site has been occupied over a prolonged period of time (see Everson *et al.* 1991). Second, as has been stated above (section 2.2.2), unstratified assemblages do not always allow for a positive identification of the *nature* of activity. Finally, not all of the investigative programmes that have been carried out in Lindsey include *all* of Lindsey. A good example is the Humber Wetlands Project

(Ellis *et al.* 2001; Van de Noort *et al.* 1993; Van de Noort and Ellis 1997; 1998; 2000), which, as the name of the project suggests, encompassed a comprehensive survey of the Lincolnshire and Yorkshire wetlands surrounding the Humber, but did not look at different types of regions. Likewise, the rural settlement project carried out by Everson *et al.* (1991) only looked at northwest Lindsey as it was defined before the abolishment of the unitary authority of Humberside. In some cases the partial coverage was not intentional, but caused by a lack of available funding, as happened in the case of the *East Midlands Anglo-Saxon Pottery Project (EMASPP)* (Vince and Young 1991a) (section 2.4.6). As a result, comparison between various parts of Lindsey is hampered by the fact that different types of data are available from different regions, rendering quantitative analysis of individual categories of material culture almost meaningless. This thesis will therefore take a qualitative approach to the data throughout.

Despite the considerations outlined above, certain patterns with regards to the development of Lindsey have begun to emerge. In the middle Anglo-Saxon period, Lindsey was the most prosperous region in Lincolnshire. Holland remained under-developed until the medieval period, probably due to its low-lying terrain that necessitated reclamation, whilst Kesteven also produced fewer artefacts and 'productive sites' than Lindsey (Leahy 2007: 130-33, fig. 46). Leahy (2007: 130) suggests that the lower number of artefacts and productive sites from Kesteven was caused by the fact that the area was landlocked and located in a more isolated position, on the border of East Anglia, whilst its soils were generally heavier, and large parts of the region were covered with dense woodlands.

The majority of seventh- and eighth-century evidence from Lindsey consists of unstratified finds assemblages, mostly pottery and metalwork. Excavated middle Anglo-Saxon sites include Flixborough (appendix 2.2.15; chapter 6.2.3), Riby (appendix 2.3.33; chapter 6.3.2), Barton-upon-Humber (appendix 2.3.2; chapter 6.2.3), Belton (appendix 2.1.8), Brigsley (appendix 2.5.7), Cumberworth (appendix 2.17.33) and Halton Hologate (appendix 2.18.10). In the ninth century, contemporary with the first evidence for significant activity at Lincoln, there is evidence for a general settlement shift at each of the above-listed settlement sites. The fact that this shift occurs contemporaneously with the period of Scandinavian settlement could be taken to mean that the settlement caused a significant degree of social disruption. However, in a number of instances the Church seems to have been the driving force behind this 'shift', as both at Barton-upon-Humber and Cumberworth there is evidence of seventh- to ninth-century domestic activity underneath the late ninth- to tenth-century parish church.

The Church was also a driving force behind the organisation and fragmentation of the landscape. The majority of parishes had been established before the end of the tenth century. In Lindsey, these were laid out on a regular

pattern to either side of Ermine Street to ensure equal distribution of resources (Hadley 2000b: 43; Stocker *pers. comm.*). Elsewhere in Lincolnshire, parishes were formed around the same time, often as a result of the subdivision of larger parishes into several smaller ones. This development has been linked to the increased involvement of the Church in secular affairs, and changes in secular landownership as a result of the Scandinavian settlement, as the ecclesiastical and new secular elites joined forces to their mutual benefit (Everson and Stocker 1999; Hadley 2006; 2008).

In addition to the evidence for settlement sites that were abandoned in the ninth or tenth centuries, there are also a number of nucleated settlements whose *origins* can be dated to this period. These include Waterton (appendix 2.1.2); Risby (appendix 2.2.18; chapter 6.3.5); Aylesby (appendix 2.4.4); Horkstow (appendix 2.3.5; chapter 6.3.5); Somerby (appendix 2.6.22); Donington on Bain (appendix 2.14.1); Theddlethorpe (appendix 2.17.1); Orby (appendix 2.19.17) and Sawcliffe (2.2.17; chapter 6.3.5). Examples of settlement continuity also exist, in particular the settlement at West Halton (appendix 2.2.5; chapter 6.3.2) (Hadley *et al.* 2004: 24; Hadley and Willmott forthcoming). The evidence for settlement shifts, settlement abandonment and settlement foundation during the ninth and tenth centuries will be discussed in more detail in chapter 6.

The close relationship between secular and ecclesiastical activity is particularly visible at Flixborough, which was initially assumed to be a documented middle Anglo-Saxon monastic centre, founded by Æthelthryth, wife to Ecgfrith king of Northumbria, when she was on her way to Ely after crossing the Humber in c. AD 670 (Loveluck 2001: 104; 2007: 142, n. 87). Flixborough's monastic significance was supposedly confirmed by the archaeological findings, which revealed a number of *styli*, which are usually associated with religious foundations in this period, and an inscribed plaque, which was thought to contain the word *nunna*, or 'nuns' (Loveluck 1997: 8). However, post-excavation analysis (Brown and Okasha 2009) altered the initial interpretation of Flixborough's significance. The lead plaque turned out to contain a list of both male and female personal names, possibly related to the dynasty of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Lindsey, whilst the translation of *nunna* turned out to be erroneous (Brown and Okasha 2009). The revised interpretation of the settlement viewed it as an aristocratic manorial centre (Loveluck 1997: 8; 2007). On the basis of this re-interpretation, Loveluck (2001: 106-15; 2007: 152-54) has called into question whether the so-called 'monastic' features at Flixborough are all necessarily monastic, and questioned whether such a thing as a 'real' monastic finds assemblage even exists. If 'secular' settlements sometimes had ecclesiastical or ritual significance as well, 'secular' activities (such as craft-production and food preparation) also took place on ecclesiastical sites (Loveluck 2007: 152-54; also see Blair 2005: ch. 5).

The possibility that a single site can have a multi-layered identity sheds a new light on any attempts to classify settlements according to their function. Another example of a complex settlement with a variety of functions was Barton-upon-Humber. The tenth-century settlement at Barton-upon-Humber was a polyfocal settlement (Bradley 2002: 26). In addition to a settlement core that focused on the tenth-century church of St Peter, then possibly a manorial centre with associated graveyard (Bryant 1994; Greenhalf 1981a; 1981b; Rodwell and Rodwell 1982; Rodwell 2007), recent developer-funded excavations have identified at least two other settlement cores (*Archaeological Field Evaluation: 4*; Bradley 2000; 2002; Gardner and Bunn 2006; Tibbles and Steedman 1990). One of these was situated less than 1 km to the southeast of the settlement identified at St Peter's Church, at 91 Barrow Road, and was supposedly of lower status, yielding significant evidence for ironworking (Bradley 2002: 26). More settlement remains were identified to the west of the church of St Peter, along Soutergate and Priestgate (for a summary of the recent fieldwork carried out in this area, see *Archaeological Field Evaluation: 4*). Finally, *DB* refers to a market at Barton-upon-Humber, leading one of the excavators recently involved in fieldwork at Barton-upon-Humber, Bradley (2002: 26), to characterise Barton-upon-Humber as a 'proto-urban' settlement, although he also draws attention to the likelihood that a significant proportion of the population would have been involved in agricultural activities.

Regardless of the validity of the 'proto-urban' label for the settlement at Barton-upon-Humber, it is clear that the tenth- and eleventh-century settlement was at once ecclesiastical, manorial, industrial, mercantile and possibly agricultural in character. As such, it had much in common with Lincoln itself, likewise a polyfocal settlement that took up a comparable geographical area, housed a number of ecclesiastical foundations, and whose inhabitants were involved in agricultural, industrial and mercantile activities. According to Biddle's (1976b: 99-100) definition of 'the town' (chapter 1), both settlements technically speaking qualified as 'towns': both could boast defences, a planned street-system, a market, a relatively large and dense population and a diversified economic base. Yet whereas Lincoln was classed separately as a *civitas* in the later eleventh-century *DB*, and its inhabitants were described as *burgesses*, Barton was regarded as just another manorial centre with a church, a priest, two mills, a market, and a ferry. To the eleventh-century officials who drew up the *Domesday* survey, Lincoln and Barton were two very different settlements indeed. The remainder of this thesis will address the question why Lincoln was perceived to be different from other settlements in Lindsey, based on a detailed analysis of the material culture that was produced and consumed both within and outside the settlement. First, however, the methodological issues that come with each of the datasets need to be considered.

2.4: The datasets

2.4.1: The datasets: introduction

As mentioned in chapter 1, this thesis focuses on five different types of material culture that form the basis for the following four chapters. Chapter 3 looks at the funerary deposits from Lincoln and Lindsey, comprising burial data and funerary sculpture. Chapter 4 analyses the coinage, and chapter 5 the remaining metalwork from Lincoln and Lindsey. Finally, chapter 6 looks at the pottery from Lincoln and Lindsey. The remainder of this section discusses the main methodological considerations associated with their study.

2.4.2: The burials

The excavated Anglo-Saxon burial data from Lincolnshire (and Yorkshire) has been comprehensively catalogued and studied by Buckberry (2004). Review of records held by the Lincolnshire SMR and the North Lincolnshire and Northeast Lincolnshire HERs by the current author revealed that no subsequent discoveries of late ninth- to tenth-century burials have since been made in either Lincoln or Lindsey.

Burials are the only type of evidence included in this thesis that are typically still found in their original, primary context. The most important exceptions to this rule are skeletons that have been re-buried or (in the context of saintly burials) *translated*, as happened at St Paul-in-the-Bail in the Upper City (appendix 5.1.1); charnel deposits, as were found in Fillingham in Lindsey (appendix 6.1.9) and Threkingham in Kesteven (appendix 6.2.6); and disturbed burials, which often result in fragments of human bone being found throughout the grave fills of other, undisturbed burials, as was the case at, again, Fillingham (appendix 6.1.9). As this thesis is to a significant degree concerned with the formation and expression of identities, as well as the spatial development of settlement patterns (which were inherently related to the location of burial sites; chapter 3), it will focus on burial *custom* rather than on osteological aspects, which have been covered in Buckberry's (2004) thesis.

Despite the fact that burials are typically stratified deposits, their dating still causes significant issues. Although bones can be dated through the application of the ¹⁴C dating technique, the date range can be very broad.⁴² What is more, as is shown by the examples from St Paul-in-the-Bail (appendix 1.1.1.4), radiocarbon dates often give a time period that spans at least two, usually three, centuries (see Gilmour 2007: 247-48). Although such differences may be negligible in the study of prehistoric remains, in the case of historic time periods this may severely affect the interpretation of a site. Graves may be dated by the occurrence of particular rites, but many funerary rituals occurred in a number of different time periods.

⁴² For a more basic discussion of some of the problems associated with C14 dating, see <http://www.archaeologyexpert.co.uk/RadioCarbonDating.html>; www.c14dating.com.

Differences occur over time in the positioning of the body, but extended supine burials, which were the norm in the late Anglo-Saxon period, also were the norm in the middle Anglo-Saxon and medieval periods (for a discussion of these issues, see Buckberry 2004). Dress-accessories or other datable artefacts barely occur in the late Anglo-Saxon periods. The most reliable dating method for coffined graves is undoubtedly dendrochronology, as was applied at Barton-upon-Humber (Waldron 2007). However, coffined graves were usually the minority and, even where they occurred, the wood often does not survive (see, for example, the evidence from the cemetery at St Paul-in-the-Bail (appendix 1.1.1.4), where only coffin fittings survived). For these reasons, all burials that Buckberry (2004) assigned to the middle/late or late Anglo-Saxon periods will be included in the discussion, whilst middle Anglo-Saxon burials will be included in the appendices for comparison. Undated burials have been excluded.

As appendix 6 indicates, there are significantly more middle to late Anglo-Saxon excavated burials from Lindsey than from Kesteven, whilst there are none from Holland. The discrepancy may be to an extent caused by a real absence of pre-Conquest burials, especially in the case of Holland, whose low-lying terrain was not occupied on a significant scale until after the Norman Conquest (Leahy 2007: 131, fig. 46; 130-33) (section 2.3). However, as there are a significant number of sites with funerary sculpture from both Lindsey and Kesteven where excavations have not taken place (compare appendices 4 and 6), it is clear that the number of recognised burial sites is far from complete.

Even where burials sites have been excavated, investigations usually cover only a small area of the entire cemetery, and the choice of the area that is excavated is usually dictated by building development that threatens the burials, rather than by archaeological concerns. This means that any comprehensive analysis of cemetery layout is often severely hampered. Only in rare instances has a boundary feature been recorded, as at St Mark's Church in Wigford (Gilmour and Stocker 1986: 16) (appendix 1.3.1.7; section 5.3.4), and at Torksey (Barley 1964: 172; Brown 2006: 19; Palmer-Brown 1995: 22, apps 2, 5) (appendix 6.1.25). The location of an associated church is more commonly known, and sometimes conclusions can be drawn on the basis of the location of the burials in relation to the church, as was the case at Barton-upon-Humber (Buckberry 2004: 227) (appendix 6.1.2; chapter 3). However, in many cases even the location of the earliest church (or, indeed, its stratigraphic relationship to the earliest burials) remains unclear, as was the problem at St Paul-in-the-Bail (Buckberry 2004: 378; Jones *et al.* 2003: 149).

A different issue that can affect the treatment of human remains is the fact that their excavation is subject to ethical concerns (Mays 2004; 2005; McKinley and Roberts 1993). When human burials are found in the context of developer-funded

evaluations, the preferred option is often to leave the skeletons *in situ*, as happened initially at Fillingham (Buckberry 2004: 360-61) (appendix 6.1.9). In other cases, human remains are re-buried, sometimes before scientific tests were carried out to establish the date of the skeletons, as happened at North Kelsey (Buckberry 2004: 387-88) (appendix 6.1.15). Finally, in exceptional cases, time restraints and inadequate budgeting for developer-funded excavations cause potential burial sites to be destroyed, as may have happened at Scotter (Buckberry 2004: 392) (appendix 6.1.17).

Finally, a brief note on the post-excavation analysis of the cemetery of St Mark's Church in Lincoln is in place. Here, initially the burials were subdivided into different phases, and all burials belonging to phases VIII-IX were assigned a mid tenth- to mid twelfth-century date (Gilmour and Stocker 1986). However, subsequent post-excavation analysis in the context of the *Lincoln Archaeological Studies* series (Jones *et al.* 2003; Steane *et al.* 2001) divided the burials per LUBs or Land Use Blocks (LUBs being areas of land that have a specific function for a given length of time (Jones *et al.* 2003)). This causes significant issues for any study that focuses on a limited time period, such as the late ninth and tenth centuries AD. For example, although LUBs 42 and 43 only include Anglo-Saxon burials, LUBs 45 to 54 and 59 include burials that range in date between the Anglo-Saxon and post-medieval to modern periods, depending on the length of the LUB sequence. For that reason, Buckberry's (2004) analysis of the burials followed Gilmour and Stocker's (1986) phasing, as their use of phases rather than LUBs excludes any later burials from being incorporated into the phasing (Buckberry 2004: 29). Following Buckberry's (2004) analysis, which represents the most recent comprehensive study of the material, this thesis will also follow Gilmour and Stocker's (1986) phasing.

2.4.3: The sculpture

The Anglo-Saxon stone sculpture from Lincolnshire has been comprehensively catalogued in the context of a nationwide British Academy and AHRC-funded project to catalogue all known Anglo-Saxon stone sculpture fragments from England in a *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture (CASSS)* (Everson and Stocker 1999; Everson and Stocker in prep.). Detailed and comprehensive in its approach, this series is an important source of information. However, it has one downside: the different volumes within the series are written by different authors, resulting in a different emphasis between the various volumes. For example, the material from York and East Yorkshire, as well as the material from North Yorkshire, was published by Lang (1991; 2001), who, as an art-historian, was primarily interested in the iconography of the carvings (in particular the analysis of 'pagan' and 'Christian' elements in figural carvings) and the identification of decorative parallels

and 'schools' or production centres. In fact, a preoccupation with art-historic approaches permeates the majority of work on Anglo-Saxon stone sculpture (see Bailey 1980; Bailey 1996; Coatsworth 2008; Karkov *et al.* 2006). What is more, although the stone types for the York and East Yorkshire sculpture were separately studied by the geologists Higgitt (1991) and Senior (1991), this was not done with the aim to identify quarry sources. As a result, the geological information presented in Lang (1991) is actually too detailed for non-geologists to reconstruct where the stone was quarried (Stocker *pers. comm.*).

The material from Lincolnshire, which is comprehensibly listed in appendices 3 and 4, does not lend itself to art-historic interpretation because of its largely uniform and non-figurative decoration. Instead, the material was studied by Everson and Stocker (1999), two archaeologists, whose interest in the material focused largely on the processes of production and use, and the relationship between the dynamics of sculpture production on the one hand, and changes in existing power relations and settlement patterns on the other. In this context, the various stone types were studied exclusively with the aim to identify quarry sources (Everson and Stocker *pers. comm.*), rendering the description of the stone types less detailed but more comprehensible to non-geologists. Although both approaches certainly have their own merits, they are sufficiently different to cause significant problems whenever a direct comparison between the stone sculpture traditions from Lincolnshire and Yorkshire is attempted (Stocker *pers. comm.*).

Another issue that needs consideration when dealing with stone sculpture is the dating of the material. Unlike burial data, which is typically still found *in situ*, sculpture is almost never found in its original context (exceptions being provided by the eleventh-century *Lincoln St Mark 18* (Everson and Stocker 1999: 209); the architectural fragments from St Peter's Church in Barton-upon-Humber (appendix 4.1.3); and *Stow 3* (appendix 4.1.30) (ref.), which has unfortunately been lost). Instead, they were typically re-used as building or foundation stones in later, post-Conquest churches. The fact that most sculpture occurs in at least a secondary or tertiary location may not create difficulty in terms of their interpretation from a spatial perspective (it is generally considered that stone sculpture is too heavy to be transported over large distances after it ceases to serve its primary function), but it does create issues from a dating perspective, providing, at best, a *terminus ante quem* in the shape of the church fabric in which it may be incorporated. Scientific dating methods would merely provide the geological date of the stone itself, and in the near-absence of any surviving inscriptions from Lincolnshire (the only exception being provided by, again, the cross from Crowle (Everson and Stocker 1999: 147-52) (appendix 4.1.11)), the dating of the Lincolnshire sculpture depends largely on art-historical grounds. In the case of Lincoln, additional dating evidence was retrieved during the excavation of St Mark's Church in Wigford

(Gilmour and Stocker 1986), which provided invaluable stratigraphic information to create a broad framework for the various monument types and their decorative elements (Everson and Stocker 1999: 14). In addition to the single eleventh-century marker that was found *in situ* (*Lincoln St Mark 18*), the excavations yielded a total of 28 pieces of late Anglo-Saxon stone sculpture that were re-used as foundation stones or incorporated into the church fabric, providing a *terminus ante quem* for their production and primary use (Everson and Stocker 1999: 14).

This thesis follows the dating of the sculpture as proposed by Everson and Stocker (1999). Stocker himself was involved in the above-mentioned excavations at St Mark's Church in Wigford (Gilmour and Stocker 1986), and the relative chronology that the excavation results established was further refined by comparative stratigraphic material from other locations in Lindsey and Kesteven (such as the incorporation of sculpture fragments into surviving eleventh-century masonry, which occurred, for example, at the church of St Michael in Glentworth (appendix 2.7.9), or the church of St Giles in Scartho (appendix 4.1.29)). Other fragments were classed into broad typological groups based on their decoration, and a detailed assessment of the development of the different decorative elements was used to add further detail to the dating of the Lincolnshire stone sculpture (Everson and Stocker *pers. comm.*). In general, pieces that conform in their entirety to the established prototype of a monument type, such as *Stow 1* and *5*, typical examples of a tenth- or eleventh-century Lindsey-type cover and marker (appendix 4.1.30), are assigned an earlier date than pieces that deviate from the established prototype, such as the eleventh-century Lindsey-type cover *Northorpe 1* (appendix 2.6.8), and the eleventh-century Lindsey-type marker *Glentworth 1* (appendix 2.7.9).

A third issue that needs to be considered is how much of the sculpture that was produced in the tenth and eleventh centuries has survived until the present day. Stocker (2000: 183) has argued that in most cases the number of surviving fragments is fairly representative of the number of monuments that were produced in the tenth and eleventh centuries. For example, the church of St Mark in Wigford yielded over twenty pieces of sculpture (some fifteen of which may belong to the tenth century). Although this was often explained by reference to the fact that the church had been fully excavated, Stocker (2000: 183) has drawn attention to some twenty other Lincolnshire churches that were fully excavated, such as the churches at Cumberworth, Healing, Fotherby and Keelby, none of which produced similar amounts of sculpture (also see Everson and Stocker 1999: 71). What is more, sculpture is difficult to destroy, as it cannot be melted down like metalwork can, and does not rot like organic materials do. Unlike portable artefacts, monumental sculpture is difficult to lose: a conscious effort is required to remove a piece of sculpture from its original position. Finally, stone as a building material is a

valuable commodity, and a piece of sculpture may be re-used as a building block or a foundation stone for later stone churches. The discussion of the sculpture in chapter 3 will follow Stocker's (2000) arguments that the surviving body of tenth-century sculptural material found in Lincolnshire is fairly representative of the number of sculptural pieces that were actually erected in tenth-century Lincolnshire.

2.4.4: The coinage

Stratified coins are often regarded as the most precise dating evidence one could ever hope to find on an archaeological site. This is partially based on a misunderstanding of the argument proposed by Dolley and Metcalf (1961: 148-55), who argued that, following Edgar's coin reforms of c. 973, a coin only circulated for c. 6 years before it was reminted, a model that became known as the 'six-year cycle' (Blackburn *pers. comm.*; Williams *pers. comm.*). The model was never intended to be applied to the period *before* the 973 reforms, and in recent years it has also increasingly been questioned in relation to coins produced *after* c. 973 AD (Stewart 1990; Williams 2006). It is now acknowledged that a single coin find alone cannot date the archaeological sequence, but rather, that the deposition of a coin can only be dated by its stratigraphic context (Williams 2006: 145).

In addition to coins found during archaeological excavations, coins are frequently found as surface finds. The joint efforts of archaeologists and metal detectorists have culminated in the construction of databases such as the above-mentioned *EMC* and the *PAS*. The two databases overlap, but the *EMC* is more complete with regards to single coin data. In the context of this thesis, the *EMC* is taken as starting point; where coins are accompanied by a *PAS* reference, they do not (yet) occur on the *EMC*. Coins from hoards or antiquarian collections are sometimes accompanied by a *SCBI* number, which refers to their ID in the on-line version of the *Sylloge of Coins from the British Isles*, also available through the on-line search engine of the *EMC*. The on-line *SCBI* excludes any coins held in the collection of the British Museum, which were accessed during a visit to the British Museum in 2007. These have been referred to separately where relevant.

There are different reasons why coins entered the archaeological record. It is commonly assumed that all single coin finds indicate casual loss, and are representative of a monetised society (Blackburn 1989b; 2001a). If single coin losses were both widespread and from a high number of different mints, Metcalf (2007: 3) has argued that this represents casual coin loss by all levels of society. It should be kept in mind, however, just as other forms of precious metals could be used as 'money', coins could also fulfil non-monetary functions in society (Williams 2007: 178-80; also see Metcalf 2007: 5). An example of this is the function of money to store wealth, rather than support an exchange economy, which was

presumably a consideration in the deliberate deposit of coin hoards (Kruse 1993; Williams *pers. comm.*).

Hoards occur predominantly in periods of social unrest, and peaks in the amount of hoards are visible during the late Roman period, the period of Scandinavian raids and settlement, the 'anarchy' period during the reign of King Stephen in the mid-twelfth century; and the English Civil War in the 1640s (Blackburn *pers. comm.*; for the Anglo-Saxon period, see the *Checklist of Coin Hoards*). Consequently, it is generally held that they were buried with the intention of being retrieved at a later stage (Besteman 2004). However, hoards vary in character, and care should be taken to avoid blanket explanations for the entire phenomenon. Mixed hoards, including coins as well as hackmetal, are usually regarded as a phenomenon of a non-monetary economy (Sheehan 2004), and as such, the coins they include can vary enormously in date and provenance, and are *not* representative of the coinage that was considered legal tender. In England, mixed hoards, such as the Cuerdale hoard from Lancaster, or the newly discovered Vale of York hoard (Williams in prep.; Williams and Ager 2010), recently acquired by the British Museum, occur primarily in the early period of Scandinavian raids and settlement (*Checklist of Coin Hoards*). Later tenth-century hoards, such as the Tetney hoard from Lindsey (Gunstone 1981; Walker 1945), usually contain exclusively or predominantly coins. Hoarding may also occur for ritual purposes, in which case the coins that are deposited are intentionally taken out of circulation altogether. Examples of this may include some of the Viking Age hoards from Scotland, which were deposited inside hollow cow horns but with gold rings on the *outside* of the container (see Graham-Campbell 1993).

Any attempt at comparison between urban and rural coin data is hampered by several factors. Metcalf (2007: 2-3) lists as variables the potential differences in land use and settlement patterns, both now and then, as well as discrepancies in retrieval methods and intensity of investigations (also see Barford 2006; Dobinson and Denison 1995). As Dunnell and Dancy (1983) have pointed out, 'siteless' surveys, which can only be carried out in areas that are not built-up, result in a relatively unbiased finds profile for an entire region. The retrieval of urban coin data, on the other hand, can only occur in excavation trenches. This may result in an over-representation of coins in certain parts of a settlement, and a complete absence of coins in others, even if these patterns may be entirely unrepresentative of the distribution of coins in the archaeological deposits under ground. In the case of Lincoln, a further problem is the fact that the majority of coin finds were found during rescue excavations in the 1970s and 1980s, when the use of metal-detectors on site was not yet standard practice (Perring *pers. comm.*).

Even when dealing exclusively with metal-detected data, the analysis of coin distribution patterns is still not straightforward. Blackburn (1989b: 15) has drawn

attention to the importance of considering factors of site use, retrieval methods and soil composition when assessing the nature and extent of monetisation on any particular site. Metcalf (2007) states that

There is a problem of method, in that our impressions of the degree of monetisation tend to be based on the relative numbers of stray losses from this region and that. Although the chances of coins being accidentally lost are most likely to have been in direct proportion to the number of occasions on which they changed hands (rather than, for example, the size of the accumulated currency in a region), there are so many other unknown variables that the conclusion may be deemed unsafe, unless the margins of difference are very substantial.

Although the number of single coin finds from Lincolnshire is limited (see appendices 8 and 9), chapter 4 will nevertheless draw attention to some general trends in their distribution patterns that reflect changes in political and economic relationships with other regions, in as far as the conclusions of the coin data can be substantiated with other evidence.

2.4.5: The metalwork

The large-scale excavations that took place in Lincoln in the 1970s and 1980s produced extensive evidence for metalwork production and consumption in the form of crucible sherds (for an analysis of the residues, see Bayley 2008b; for a discussion of the fabrics, see Young and Vince 2005), scrap-metal (for a discussion of the scrap metal from Flaxengate, see White 1982), and some part-finished and finished objects. The metalwork from Lincoln is listed in appendix 11. In recent years, there has also been a sharp rise in the number of decorative metal objects from the rest of Lindsey as a result of the establishment of the *PAS* (see above, 2.4.4). The metal artefacts from the rest of Lindsey are listed in appendix 12.

The metalwork from Lincoln was supposed to be published by Bayley, White and Foley as part of *The Archaeology of Lincoln* series (the bibliography in Bayley 1992 lists the volume as forthcoming), and some of the finds had already been drawn for publication. However, before the publication was finished, *The Archaeology of Lincoln* series was replaced with the *Lincoln Archaeological Studies* series (the first volume in this series being Vince 1993c), which placed the emphasis on site stratigraphy rather than artefactual evidence, and consequently only those artefacts that were significant for the establishment of the correct chronology have since appeared in the published record (Mann *pers. comm.*). Appendix 11 specifies which objects have previously been published and provides references to the relevant sources.

This thesis presents the first near-comprehensive catalogue of the middle and late Anglo-Saxon metalwork from Lincoln. The finds, in as far as they have not been published in the various volumes of the *Lincoln Archaeological Studies* and

The Archaeology of Lincoln series, were collated from the database of The Collection, with additional information obtained, with the help of Jenny Mann, formerly of the CLAU, during a visit to the stores of The Collection. The present author photographed any finds that had not already been drawn for publication. Where the finds were absent, the finds cards from the CLAU were studied, which in all cases included a description and sketch of the objects. Some copper-alloy artefacts were never cleaned, and for these objects the x-rays were studied. In most cases a second opinion was sought from Leahy, Finds Advisor to the PAS, and Thomas, of the University of Reading.

A limited number of artefacts were on display in The Collection. No arrangements were made to remove the artefacts from their cases for further study, as this was deemed unnecessary in the context of the current study. Finally, the scrap-metal from Flaxengate was taken from White (1982); the scrap-metal from other sites has not been included in any detail, but a table indicating which sites yielded evidence for ninth- to eleventh-century metalworking has been included, based on White (1992) and Bayley (2008b). As many of the finds were from residual contexts, their dating rests in most cases exclusively on art-historical grounds. For this reason, all non-ferrous material of possible ninth- to eleventh-century date was included in the current thesis, as well as all definite pre-Conquest ferrous material. Dimensions are recorded, where the information is available, to one decimal place.

The rural data was compiled from the PAS database in 2009, including the modern counties of Lincolnshire, North Lincolnshire, and Northeast Lincolnshire. Additional data was retrieved from individual published and unpublished reports, including Brown (2006) (for Torksey); Evans and Loveluck (eds) (2009) (for Flixborough); Didsbury (2000) (for Barton-upon-Humber); and White and Everson (1983) (for Horncastle). Unless mentioned otherwise, the identification and dating of the finds is based on the records of the PAS and the other published and unpublished sources. The PAS website occasionally provided some problems, as many of the finds were still awaiting verification, and the available records varied in quality depending on the Finds Liaison Officer responsible for the data entry. In some cases, where the PAS entry was deemed incorrect, the dating or identification of the objects was altered accordingly.

Unstratified metalwork nevertheless remains difficult to date with precision. For that reason, all finds with a date range between the eighth and eleventh centuries were included (including those from Kesteven and Holland, to provide a comparison). Finds whose date range included the sixth or seventh to eighth century were excluded. Finds with an uncertain date range (usually very broad) were individually assessed, and only included when the author considered them relevant. In particular, tools (axes, hammers, etc.) and spindle whorls (which were

only included if made from metal) could often not be dated with any precision, and the small sample of such tools that does appear in appendix 12 should therefore not be regarded as representative. Objects with uncertain provenance (*i.e.* 'Lincolnshire') were excluded. Following the minimum density of geographical information included in the records of the *PAS*, the data was organised per (modern) parish.

The accumulation of 'rural' data from a variety of sources was occasionally problematic, especially where data from the *PAS* database was compared to Leahy's (2007) published account. For example, the *PAS* listed c. 14 ansate brooches for Lindsey when it was searched in March 2009. Leahy (2007: 155), on the other hand, stated that Lindsey has produced some 27 ansate brooches. The most likely explanation for the discrepancy is that Leahy, who was a key figure for the increased cooperation between metal detectorists and archaeologists, has access to data that has not been included on the *PAS* website. A similar discrepancy occurred when the data from the *PAS* website was compared to that from Torksey in Brown 2006. Here, the suggestion was raised that the *PAS* database has a backlog of several years, or that a significant chunk of material was never reported. Although the dataset is incomplete, this is not considered to be problematic. As metal-detecting activities continue (and will continue) to take place, established interpretations will have to be revised. For this reason the material is mostly analysed from a qualitative perspective, although the distribution plans for the artefacts are also studied to identify any significant spatial patterning.

More important methodological issues need to be considered when comparing the assemblage from Lincoln to that from the rest of Lindsey. The same problems apply as to the coin evidence (see above: 2.4.4). As many metal dress accessories and related objects, like coins, represent casual losses, and the retrieval of casually lost artefacts is generally speaking more successful over a large geographical area (as opposed to in a small urban excavation trench), one would expect to find more strap-ends, horse harness-fittings and other metal artefacts outside Lincoln than in Lincoln itself. This is, generally speaking, true (see appendices 11 and 12) unless one of the developer-funded urban sites includes a metalwork production site, as was the case at Flaxengate, which led to an enormous increase in the number of (unfinished) hooked tags from the Lower City (appendix 11.2.14). In other instances, the discrepancy is potentially more meaningful, as was the case with the tenth-century hexagonal 'Norse' bells, which occurred in disproportionately large numbers in Lincoln as compared to elsewhere (chapter 5).

A final consideration that needs to be borne in mind is that the unstratified nature of metal-detected finds renders their dating on stratigraphic grounds impossible. Although coins (see section 2.4.4) and artefacts can be dated on stylistic grounds, late Anglo-Saxon scrap-metal and metalworking debris, which

cannot be dated on stylistic grounds alone, is almost impossible to identify in a 'rural' context. Consequently, the assumption that metalworking increasingly occurred in an 'urban' context should be treated with caution, especially because some evidence for tenth- to eleventh-century non-ferrous metalworking has also been identified at Donington on Bain (Wragg 2001) (appendix 2.14.1) and Flixborough (Wastling *et al.* 2009) (appendix 2.2.15). The possibility exists that there are more sites outside Lincoln where metalwork production took place during the late Anglo-Saxon period, which may only be recognised if excavations reveal stratified metalworking debris. This issue will be revisited in chapter 5.

2.4.6: The pottery

The analysis of the pottery demands a different approach from both the funerary deposits and the coinage and metalwork. Although pottery is portable in nature, and thus differs from monumental and structural deposits such as funerary archaeology, there are a number of significant differences with the other two types of portable material culture discussed in this thesis, the coinage and metalwork. The first of these is the fact that, although pottery could be (and often was) transported, it was also highly breakable. As a result, transportation of ceramic material may have been mostly limited to those situations whereby the pottery (or its contents) was moved from the place of production to the place of consumption or use. This is confirmed by Symonds's (1999; 2003a; 2003b) analysis of pottery distribution patterns in tenth-century Lincolnshire, which concluded that the majority of vessels were found in production centres and along the main roads and rivers leading out of these centres. In terms of the artefact biography of individual vessels, this would result in a very different 'life story' than, for example, that of a copper-alloy brooch, which would have moved around with the person who wore it, or that of a coin that circulated in the context of a monetary system (for a discussion of the theoretical concept of artefact biographies, see Gosden and Marshall 1999; Kopytoff 1986). Such differences in the movement patterns of different types of artefacts will be reflected in their eventual distribution patterns.

Another difference between metal artefacts and ceramic artefacts is the nature of the material itself. Whereas metal is not only unbreakable but also recyclable, pottery is both breakable and, once broken, cannot be melted down to create a new vessel. Although pottery can be reused in its broken form, for example as material to create level building surfaces (as occurred at Flaxengate (Perring 1982)), or lining of hearths or kilns (as was the case with wasters of fabric LSH, found as part of the kiln fabric at the Sessions House site in Lincoln (appendix 17.1.2.1.3)), the majority of broken pottery will be discarded as waste (Robinson and Aston 2003). In this respect it differs from metalwork finds, which are either casual losses (in the case of single finds) or deliberate deposits (in the case of

hoards). Again, this difference between metalwork and pottery is reflected in the spatial distribution of the two types of artefact, with metalwork usually occurring as individual finds (leading to their classification, in post-excavation analysis, as 'small finds'), but finds of pottery usually occurring in large numbers (leading to their classification, in post-excavation analysis, as 'bulk finds' (Bell 1994; *Small Find*).

There are also differences in the artefact biography of different types of ceramics. Pottery can have a variety of functions. They can be containers for other materials (examples may include the large Ipswich ware (IPS) storage vessel from West Halton (Perry 2009)), a commodity in their own right (definite examples are the Stamford ware crucibles (STCRUC) (Bayley 2008b; Young and Vince 2005: 97)) (for an overview of pottery codes used in this thesis, see appendix 18), or the personal property of a traveller or tradesman (possible examples are the limited number of ninth-century foreign imports from Lincoln (Young and Vince 2005: 74-75)). Kilmurry (1980) has drawn attention to differences in the nature between early and developed Stamford wares (EST/ST) that were traded, and early and developed Stamford wares (EST/ST) that were locally used. She (1980: 166) concluded that tablewares – in particularly pitchers and jugs – and smaller cooking vessels as well as crucibles tended to be traded, whilst large cooking pots were mostly used locally (Kilmurry 1980: 166-68; also see Young and Vince 2005: 97).

Before pottery distribution plans can be analysed, a number of issues need pointing out that are related to the different methods that can be employed for the recording of pottery. Simply put, there are two different ways of distinguishing between different pottery types. One of these methods distinguishes between different types of pottery based on a visual assessment of the fabrics, which is the method that was employed in the Fenland Survey (see Lane 1993; Healey 1993) and most early work (e.g. Dunning 1959; Haslam 1978; Hurst 1976). The other is more precise, and uses microscopic neutron-based and thin-section analysis to distinguish between different types of pottery based on their attribution to a particular kiln, which was the method employed in the above-mentioned *EMASPP*, which aimed to update existing pottery typologies in the modern counties of Lincolnshire, South Humberside, Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Leicestershire, based on new scientific developments (Vince and Young 1991a: 38).

The *EMASPP* (Vince and Young 1991a) involved a comprehensive re-examination of all recorded material from known Anglo-Saxon sites in Lincolnshire, as well as all pottery from Lincolnshire mentioned in the work by Myres (1969; 1977) that could be located (Young *pers. comm.*). An additional line of investigation involved the re-examination of every box that was accessioned into the Lincoln museum store until the mid-1990s (Symonds 2003a: 69; Young *pers. comm.*). The *EMASPP* has ensured that most recent work on the Lincolnshire pottery distinguishes between different pottery types based on their attribution to specific

kilns. A comprehensive pottery typology for Lincoln itself was published in 2005 (Young and Vince 2005), whilst a PhD thesis carried out at the University of York (Symonds 1999; later published as Symonds 2003a) utilised the data from the *EMASPP* in an analysis of tenth-century pottery distribution patterns across Lincolnshire, and incorporated that with separate research carried out on the Stamford (Kilmurry 1980) and Torksey (Barley 1964; 1982) industries. However, the pottery from Stamford was analysed prior to the start of the *EMASPP*, and because the archaeology unit in Stamford closed down not long afterwards, the material was not available for re-examination (Symonds 2003a: 120). As a result, Symonds's (1999; 2003a) analysis of tenth-century pottery distribution patterns within Lincolnshire uses vessel counts for the majority of the county, but sherd counts for the data from Stamford.

Unfortunately the *EMASPP* ran out of money, and data collection ceased in 1992, after only the county of Lincolnshire (excluding South Humberside) had been surveyed (Vince *pers. comm.*). Although known sites in North and Northeast Lincolnshire were included, including Flixborough, no attempt was made to go through the museum stores in the North Lincolnshire Museum (Young *pers. comm.*). In addition, the Fenlands surrounding the Witham fens were not included either (Symonds 2003a: 118-120).

One downside of the *EMASPP* is that it is impossible to reconcile its results with that of earlier pottery classification systems, based on a visual assessment of the sherds, apart from on the most general level (Symonds 2003a: 70). For example, Adams Gilmour (1988: 77-83), looking at the pottery from Flaxengate, distinguishes between the partially coil-built and hand-made 'Lincoln early shelly ware' (LES), of which some 793 vessels were found in the earliest layers at Flaxengate, and the wheel-thrown 'Lincoln Kiln-type shelly ware' or LKT, which she ascribes to the kiln at Silver Street. In contrast, recent work by Young and Vince (2005; summarised in appendix 17) no longer recognises the fabric type LES, and instead acknowledges the presence of MAX or Maxey-type ware in Lincoln. However, it is uncertain whether *all* vessels previously identified as LES are, indeed, MAX. What is more, whereas the earlier work (Adams 1977; Adams Gilmour 1988; Miles *et al.* 1989) treated the pottery *per site*, Young and Vince (2005), on the other hand, treat the pottery from Lincoln as a whole, only noting the most obvious differences between the various parts of Lincoln.

Another problem is caused by the fact that the *EMASPP* excludes more recent work (*i.e.* carried out after 1992, when data collection ceased). One recent comprehensive attempt to study the Lincolnshire pottery was a project known as the *NLPTS*, carried out in 2005 (Boyle *et al.* 2008). For this project, Young was commissioned to set up a pottery type series at the North Lincolnshire Museum (Young *pers. comm.*). Young treated this as an opportunity to carry out an

extensive survey, and went through each box stored in the North Lincolnshire Museum (Young *pers. comm.*). In addition to excavated assemblages, finds from watching briefs and from field walking exercises were also included, although unfortunately the types of event that produced the pottery were not systematically included (Hemblade *pers. comm.*).⁴³ However, although it contributed significantly to the data known collected in the context of the *EMASPP*, the fact that the *NLPTS* includes only a selection of sites, mostly from North Lincolnshire, renders the integration of the two datasets problematic on a county-wide level.

A different methodological issue that stands central to the study of pottery assemblages is that of dating. The production sites for a growing number of major pottery types from Lincolnshire have now been identified and excavated, including the Silver Street kilns in Lincoln (Miles *et al.* 1989), where LKT was produced, and the kilns at the Sessions House site, where Lincoln Saxo-Norman sandy ware (SNLS) and possibly Lincoln fine-shelled ware (LFS) were produced (*The Sessions House*; Donel 1996; Jarvis 1997; Young and Vince 2005) (appendix 17). However, when the pottery kilns where a particular type of pottery was produced have *not* been identified, as is for example the case for MAX (although wasters of a different variety of MAX, which occur only in York and on a number of sites in north Lincolnshire, including Belton, Bottesford, Flixborough and West Halton, have been found at Bottesford (Taylor-Wilson and Telford 2002: 29; Young 2002a)) and LSLOC or 'late Anglo-Saxon local fabrics', the exact production dates of that particular pottery type can only be established approximately. In these cases the dating of the wares is dependent on analysis and dating of the excavated assemblages in which they occur.

Young and Vince (2005: 11) have stated that the dating of ceramic periods for Lincoln is based on "the ability to recognise and date phases of activity on a regular basis in Lincoln".⁴⁴ Initially the pottery was viewed stratigraphically, assigning earliest and latest dates for the pottery groups assigned to each context. However, as this led to constant revision, dating 'horizons' were devised to overcome these problems (Young and Vince 2005: 5).⁴⁵ Excavated contexts were grouped into context groups. Subsequently, these context groups were grouped into Land Use Blocks (LUBs) (see section 2.4.2), which were then related to broad

⁴³ Hemblade works at the North Lincolnshire SMR and was kind enough to provide the present author with detailed information about the *NLPTS*.

⁴⁴ Young and Vince's (2005) analysis of the Lincoln sequence focused mainly on sherd count, not vessel count, and concentrated on recording attributes that could primarily be used in site interpretation (such as the usage, dating, and status of a site) (Young and Vince 2005: 5). All major wares were thin-sectioned, generally showing little internal variation. In addition, for the ninth- to eleventh-century wares, Neutron Activation analysis was undertaken (Young and Vince 2005: 7).

⁴⁵ Appendix 4 in Young and Vince (2005: 279) gives a list of assemblages that have been deposited over a brief period of time (1 ceramic horizon), but only the Upper City and Wigford could be included, as analysis of the data from the Lower City was still under way. This will be published in the forthcoming Lower City volume (Steane *et al.* forthcoming).

time periods (Young and Vince 2005: 9).

The use of LUBs allowed for a better understanding of which stratigraphic sequences actually denoted continuous activity. It became clear that previously, based on the incorrect assumption that all sequences were continuous, some wares had been misdated by up to two centuries (Young and Vince 2005: 10). To avoid any further problems with dating, Young and Vince (2005: 10) therefore decided to establish pottery 'horizons', which were based on the identification of patterns within the pottery assemblages that repeated themselves over and over again within a broad date range. In this thesis, only Anglo-Saxon Horizon 6 (ASH6) (the mid to late ninth centuries), ASH7 (the mid/late to late ninth centuries), ASH8 (the late ninth to early tenth centuries), ASH9 (the early/mid to mid tenth century), ASH10 (the mid to late tenth century) and ASH11 (the late tenth century) will be included.

Despite the extensive dating exercise carried out by Young and Vince (2005), the high levels of residuality that occur in Lincoln remain a problem. Young and Vince (2005: 10) have proposed that the groups with little or no residual items are generally speaking the smaller ones, overall amounting to less than 50 sherds. In the earlier post-Roman groups, the detection of the residual element was relatively easy, as they consisted of Roman wares. Nevertheless, problems could arise, as a number of Roman vessel sherds were found at Flaxengate in the Lower City, deposited on the dividing line between the Roman and late Anglo-Saxon stratigraphy, which were used as parting vessels. Although they are now assumed to indicate late Roman metalworking activities (Bayley 2008b), for a time it was thought that they possibly indicated late Anglo-Saxon metalworking activities that made use of residual Roman ceramics (Mann *pers. comm.*). From ASH8 (the late ninth to early tenth centuries) onwards, the residual wares also included late Anglo-Saxon types (Young and Vince 2005: 10-11). By the end of ASH 11 (c. 1000 AD), the establishment of a residual factor had become very difficult indeed, not in the least because LKT had been used for more than a century at this stage (Young and Vince 2005: 11).

In contrast to the density of urban deposits, rural sites are often characterised by a lack of substantial pottery assemblages (Symonds 1999), exceptions being provided by Flixborough (Young and Vince 2009) and West Halton (Hadley and Willmott forthcoming; Perry 2009). As a result, the dating of rural assemblages is typically achieved by reference to the urban sequence. This methodology glosses over potential differences between 'town' and 'country', including the possibility that more archaic pottery forms may have continued in use longer in 'rural' contexts than they did in 'urban' contexts. This can cause problems, especially in cases where the 'urban' settlements, whose ceramic sequence is used to date rural deposits, also became production centres for 'new' pottery types, as was the case

in Lincoln (chapter 6). It is nevertheless generally assumed that the start of the production of LKT in c. 870 caused the end of the production of MAX. However, recent work by Young (2002c: 24) has led to the acknowledgement that other types of middle Anglo-Saxon handmade pottery, such as ELFS, continued to be used and produced until the tenth century, and overlapped with the first phase of the wheel-thrown industries (appendix 18). These issues will be revisited in more detail in chapter 6.

2.4.7: The datasets: conclusions

The previous discussion has summarised the problems associated with the study of five disparate datasets, retrieved under a variety of different circumstances. Although the methodological issues are substantial, and each dataset is per definition incomplete (the only possible exception being represented by the sculpture, which is arguably relatively complete (see above: 2.4.3)), these problems are not insurmountable. Through an explicit awareness of the circumstances of retrieval and the shortcomings of each dataset, the material can be used to its full advantage.

2.5: Conclusion

To return to the aim of this thesis, the following chapters will reconstruct the changing significance of Lincoln within the context of Lindsey in the late ninth and tenth centuries. Acknowledging the fact that human interaction with the material world is complex, and is never dominated entirely by one single type of material culture, it will bring together the results of a wide variety of archaeological investigations that have been carried out by a number of different individuals over a number of decades. The descriptive summaries of these investigations are summarised in the various appendices. The following chapters each focus on one or two of the types of material culture that stand central to this thesis, starting with monumental and structural deposits (chapter 3), before moving to portable materials (chapters 4-6).

Nevertheless, certain categories of material culture have been excluded from this thesis. Most importantly, the faunal data has been excluded, despite its potential for studying town-country relationships. However, a study addressing this issue in the Lincoln context has already been published (Dobney *et al.* 1996); what is more, another PhD thesis that is currently in preparation at the University of Nottingham (Poole in prep.) addresses town-country relationships through an analysis of faunal remains in a number of ninth- to eleventh-century 'towns' across the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England, an abstract of which will be published in Hadley and Ten Harkel (forthcoming) (Poole forthcoming). Domestic architecture was also largely excluded from the discussion, largely because a study

of domestic space in urban and rural sites in the Viking Age in western Britain and Ireland is currently in preparation by Rebecca Boyd at UCD (Boyd in prep.; forthcoming). As mentioned previously, objects of bone, antler and jet from Flaxengate have been published (Mann 1982), and a selection of more recent discoveries from Lincoln will be included in Ashby (forthcoming). Other materials that have been excluded include glass, textiles and buildings, whilst ferrous metals were only included in some instances. These decisions were made for practical reasons: although glass beads have been found at Flaxengate, there is not enough glass from rural sites to allow for a comparison, whilst textiles are practically absent everywhere (an exception being a silk head dress from Saltergate (appendix 1.2.1.18)).

CHAPTER 3: FUNERARY DEPOSITS

3.1: Introduction

This chapter discusses the late ninth- and tenth-century funerary archaeology from Lincoln and Lindsey. It incorporates the evidence for funerary deposits below ground (the graves themselves) (Buckberry 2004) as well as above ground (the funerary sculpture) (Everson and Stocker 1999). Material from the neighbouring regions of Kesteven and Holland (Everson and Stocker 1999) and other parts of the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England (Lang 1991; 2001) will be included for comparison. The sculpture data from Lincolnshire (including Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland) is summarised in appendices 3 and 4, and the burial data in appendices 5 and 6.

Both burials and funerary sculpture (classed together as *funerary deposits*) differ from the other types of material culture discussed in this thesis in that they are monumental rather than portable. They structured the landscape in the same way as, for example, nucleated settlements. As such, they form a logical starting point for this thesis. The burials are typically still in their primary context (chapter 2). In contrast, the majority of stone sculpture fragments are no longer found in the location where they were originally erected, but are most often found incorporated into the fabric of later stone churches. It is commonly assumed that prior to their secondary use as building or foundation stones, they marked a grave in that same churchyard (chapter 2.4.3) (a possible exception being a Lindsey cover from Coates in Nottinghamshire: appendix 4.4.2).

Although funerary sculpture and burials were originally part of the same deposits, they are not often studied together (an exception is Hadley 2004b; 2006, chapter 6; 2008a; 2008b). As different concerns have characterised the study of these two categories of material culture, discussion of previous work on the two subjects will be split across the next two sections (3.2 and 3.3). One aspect of the different emphases of the two sub-disciplines is particularly relevant in the current context. The relationship between late Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and settlements in Lincolnshire has not often been explored, with the exception of the Sheffield-based *Cemeteries and Settlements* project (Hadley 2007).⁴⁶ The relationship between funerary sculpture and settlement development, on the other hand, has formed the basis for much recent work carried out on the Lincolnshire sculpture (Everson and Stocker 1999; Stocker 2000; Stocker and Everson 2001). A discussion of existing research on the sculpture will therefore form the starting point for this thesis.

Sections 3.4 and 3.5 will analyse the spatial distribution of the sculpture and

⁴⁶ The relationship between cemeteries and settlements during the middle Anglo-Saxon period has enjoyed more attention, not in the least because it formed the basis for one of the components of the now largely rejected so-called 'final phase' model, advocated by Leeds (1936: 102; also see Buckberry 2004: 9-11; Craig 2009) (see below).

the burials in the context of settlement development, with special attention for the development of Lincoln. Their respective distribution patterns will be interpreted in the context of the formation of communal and regional identities, and the manipulation of space within the broader landscape as a means to exercise control over the 'rural' population. This will be followed by a discussion of the use of funerary deposits for social and political display (section 3.6). A consideration of the dynamics of sculpture production in the context of changing power relations, followed by a brief conclusion, will close this chapter (section 3.7; 3.8).

3.2: The sculpture: existing research

Sculpture production in Lincolnshire did not really begin until the second half of the tenth century, although occasional earlier pieces do occur. The majority of tenth-century material from Lindsey consists of grave covers and grave markers intended to mark individual graves, although architectural fragments have also been recognised. In addition, three relatively large crosses have also been recognised, at Crowle (*Crowle 1*) (appendix 4.1.11), Brattleby (*Brattleby 1*) (appendix 4.1.5) and Bardney (*Bardney 1*) (appendix 4.1.2), which are believed to have been graveyard markers, although the possibility exists that they doubled in function as individual grave markers as well (Everson and Stocker 1999: 114). However, to the author's knowledge no excavations have taken place at Brattleby, where the only *in situ* example has been found, to investigate this. This chapter will focus on the funerary sculpture, although other types of sculptural carvings will be mentioned where relevant.

The only sculpture fragments from Lindsey that definitely pre-date the period of Scandinavian settlement are an *in situ* architectural panel from Caistor (*Caistor 1*) (appendix 4.1.7), which Blair (2005: 150) has identified as a middle Anglo-Saxon minster-site, and an eighth- to ninth-century fragment from Redbourne (*Redbourne 1*) (appendix 4.1.26) (fig. 6). The fragment from Redbourne was made of local Lincolnshire limestone (Everson and Stocker 1999: 240).⁴⁷ The above-mentioned *Bardney 1* could belong anywhere between the ninth and eleventh centuries, whilst *Lincoln St Paul-in-the-Bail 3* (figs 7 a; 8) is either of middle Anglo-Saxon or eleventh-century date (appendix 3.1.1).

Middle Anglo-Saxon sculpture fragments from Kesteven are equally rare (fig. 9). Some architectural fragments, dated to the middle of the ninth century, have been identified at South Kyme (*South Kyme 1*), possibly the site of another early ecclesiastical foundation (Everson and Stocker 1999: 251; Stocker 1993: 112-13) (appendix 4.2.34) and Edenham (*Edenham 2*), whilst a standing cross of possible mid ninth-century date, made of Ancaster freestone, has been recognised at

⁴⁷ The stone type of *Caistor 1* was not identified due to its inaccessibility (Everson and Stocker 1999: 123).

Edenham (*Edenham 1*) (appendix 4.2.13). Finally, a quoin stone from Ropsley (*Ropsley 2*) may be a re-used fragment of an earlier standing cross (appendix 4.2.28). In as far as the stone types could be identified, they were all made of Lincolnshire limestone from the southern Ancaster quarries. No fragments of comparatively early date have been recognised in Holland.

The character of the middle Anglo-Saxon sculpture assemblage from Lincolnshire differs from that from Yorkshire. In addition to early architectural remains, which were predominantly found at ecclesiastical centres in the east of the county, Yorkshire has produced a sizeable assemblage of funerary sculpture that pre-dated the period of Scandinavian settlement, in particular from York Minster and the early ecclesiastical centre of Lastingham, as well as Kirkdale and Hackness (Lang 1991: 18-21). To the south of Lincolnshire, in East Anglia and Nottinghamshire, the earliest sculptural products date to the tenth and eleventh centuries, and are made of stone from the Lincolnshire quarries (Everson and Stocker *pers. comm.*). This suggests that the practice of erecting stone sculpture in Lincolnshire took its inspiration from Yorkshire before spreading south. This suggestion is confirmed by the earliest late Anglo-Saxon monuments from Lindsey, the majority of which occur along the Humber estuary. They have been identified as products of the York-workshops on the basis of their decoration and stone-type – reddened Millstone Grit – that was widely used as a building stone in Roman York, and was subsequently re-used for the York-based sculpture production in the ninth and tenth centuries (fig. 10). These comprise the above-mentioned *Crowle 1* (appendix 4.1.11; fig. 7 b), decorated in *Jellinge*-style; the early tenth-century grave cover from Holton le Clay, identified as a product of the so-called ‘York Metropolitan School’ (appendix 4.1.16; fig. 7 c); and a heavily weathered fragment of an unidentified monument from Thornton Curtis (appendix 4.1.33), all dated to the early tenth century.

No York products have been recognised in Lincoln itself. Instead, some limited evidence for an early tenth-century production centre at or near Lincoln has been recognised in the form of two near-identical grave covers, made of Lincolnshire Limestone from the vicinity of Lincoln (Everson and Stocker 1999: 197-98). One of these, *Lincoln City Broadgate 1* (appendix 3.2.2; fig. 8), was found along Broadgate between the Lower City and Butwerk, whilst the other was found to the north of Lincoln, at Hackthorn (appendix 4.1.15; fig. 6; 7 d). Both displayed *Borre*-style decoration, and, together with *Crowle 1*, they represent the only sculpture from Lindsey with clear ‘Scandinavian’ stylistic influences. No sculpture with either *Borre*- or *Jellinge*-style decoration has been recognised further south in Lincolnshire.

From the middle of the tenth century onwards, sculpture production in Lindsey increased significantly. Two types of monuments have been identified that were produced from Lincolnshire Limestone from the Lincoln vicinity, the so-called

Lindsey-type markers, and the Lindsey-type covers. Lindsey-type markers are typically thick rectangular tablets of stone, ranging in size from about 60-90 cm in height, 40-60 cm in width, and 10-30 cm in thickness. Their upper parts are all framed with a cable-moulding, and they are usually decorated on both sides with identical crosses that consist of two incised lines within each other (Everson and Stocker 1999: 60). They are commonly dated to the later tenth or early eleventh centuries (Everson and Stocker 1999: 60). A typical example is *Lincoln St Mark 16* (fig. 11 a). A total of nine examples of Lindsey-type grave markers were known in 1999, when the Lincolnshire volume of the *CASSS* was published. Their distribution was at that time entirely limited to Lincoln and Lindsey (Everson and Stocker 1999: 196) (fig. 6). Since then, however, one additional example has been recognised in Norwich, which has been interpreted as a grave marker for the grave of a well-off merchant who had been heavily involved in trade between Norwich and Lincoln (Everson and Stocker in prep.) (appendix 4.4.1).

Some 21 grave covers of Lindsey-type are known. These are all characterised by the same flat, rectangular or slightly tapering form, decorated with repetitive strands of interlace inside a cable border (Everson and Stocker 1999: 51, 54). A typical example is *Miningsby 1* (fig. 11 b). In 1999, at the time of the publication of the Lincolnshire *Corpus*, all known fragments came from Lindsey. Since then, however, an additional example has been recognised in Coates (Notts.), in a farmyard just on the other side of the Trent (Everson and Stocker in prep.). As there is no church nearby, nor a recognised cemetery, Everson and Stocker (*pers. comm.*) argue that this was not found in its original location, but that it had arrived here as rubble (appendix 4.4.2).

It has been suggested that the Lindsey-type covers and markers were intended to form composite monuments (Everson and Stocker 1999). The use of composite monuments has also been recorded for York minster, where markers made of re-used Roman masonry were used in combination with grave covers during the middle Anglo-Saxon period (see Lang 1991). The distribution patterns of both the Lindsey-type covers and markers are (largely) restricted to Lincoln and Lindsey, and they have been found together on a number of sites, including St Mark's Church in Wigford (see for example *Lincoln St Mark 7* and *17*) and Stow (Everson and Stocker 1999: 58, 60, 196). What is more, in as far as they were examined petrologically, both monument types were made of the same stone type, which was quarried near Lincoln (Everson and Stocker 1999: 60). However, there are far more surviving Lindsey-type grave covers than markers. If, as Stocker (2000: 183) has argued, the number of surviving fragments is an accurate reflection of the number of monuments that were erected in the tenth and eleventh centuries (chapter 2.4.3), this may imply that the combined use of a Lindsey-type cover with a marker only occurred in the context of burials of the highest status,

higher even than those marked with a single monument.

Other production centres have been identified in Kesteven, at Ancaster and Barnack (fig. 9). The Ancaster quarries were the most prolific in the tenth century, and produced cross-shafts as well as grave covers (Everson and Stocker 1999). The Ancaster cross-shafts were produced from the first half of the tenth century onwards, contemporary with the early York imports into the north of Lindsey. They revealed significant variation in terms of their size and decoration, even if the latter usually involve panels filled with interlace (Everson and Stocker 1999: 33-35). Three examples have been found in Lindsey to date. These included the above-mentioned large shafts from Brattleby (appendix 4.1.4; fig. 11 c), which stood to at least 1.5 m tall, and Bardney (appendix 4.1.2), of which only the base survives. The third example from Lindsey, *Lincoln St Mark 1* (appendix 3.3.3), was smaller, although how much is uncertain due to the limited size of the surviving fragment (Everson and Stocker 1999). The remaining examples have all been found in Kesteven and Holland (Everson and Stocker 1999: 33).

The so-called mid-Kesteven grave cover group, also produced at Ancaster from the first half of the tenth century onwards, is more uniform in terms of decoration and size. They have been interpreted as derivatives of the Trent Valley hogbacks, an offshoot of the general hogback tradition (Everson and Stocker 1999: 86; for a discussion of the Trent Valley hogbacks, see Everson and Stocker 1999: 35-36). Their size suggests that they were intended to mark individual graves (Everson and Stocker 1999: 44). Their decoration is typically defined by plain or double cable moulded borders (possibly providing the inspiration for the cable mouldings on the later Lindsey products), dividing the surface into a central panel with two traverse panels at either end. The central panel is typically filled with a large double-ended cross surrounded by interlace, whilst the traverse panels are filled with a single unit of interlace (Everson and Stocker 1999: 36-42). A typical example is *Lincoln St Mary-le-Wigford 2* (fig. 11 e). The northernmost example of these covers has been recognised at Humberston in Lindsey (appendix 4.1.17; fig. 9) (Everson and Stocker 1999: 36, 85-86).

The ends of the mid-Kesteven grave covers are usually undecorated, suggesting that they were intended to be used in conjunction with standing grave markers at either end. As their interlace decoration was not dissimilar to that of the Ancaster cross-shafts, it has been suggested that the smaller examples of these cross-shafts were intended to be used in conjunction with the Ancaster covers (Everson and Stocker 1999: 33). This may have been the case at Cranwell and Burton Pedwardine (Everson and Stocker 1999: 44) (appendix 4.2.9; 4.2.6). However, as was also the case for the Lindsey-type covers and markers, there are significantly more mid-Kesteven covers than Ancaster cross-shafts (Everson and Stocker 1999: 35). Again, this may suggest that the majority of covers was used in

isolation, and only burials of the highest status were given a composite monument.

In the course of the early eleventh century, the mid-Kesteven grave covers were replaced by the so-called Fenland grave covers from the Barnack quarries, which were broad tapering slabs decorated with a simple cross on the flat surface, the panels between the arms infilled with strands of interlace, and enclosed within a simple border of rectangular section (Everson and Stocker 1999: 47). Their distribution, which included Lindsey (including Lincoln), Kesteven, Holland, the *soke* of Peterborough, Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, Bedfordshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex and London (Everson and Stocker 1999: 46-47). The Fenland group falls outside the date range included in this thesis; however, a limited number of tenth-century monuments have been identified as potential precursors to the eleventh-century Fenland group. One of these is the tenth- or eleventh-century stone from Broughton (*Broughton 2*; appendix 4.1.6; fig. 7 e), which was made of Lincolnshire Limestone of the Lincoln vicinity (Everson and Stocker 1999: 49). Everson and Stocker (1999: 117-18) have commented on similarities between *Broughton 2* and the earliest products of the Lincoln-based workshops, the above-mentioned *City Broadgate 1* and *Hackthorn 1* with their *Borre*-style decoration, as well as *Lincoln St Mark 6* (appendix 3.3.3), with derived *Borre*-style decoration (fig. 7 d). Finally, the grave cover from Ewerby (appendix 4.2.14) represents a transitional phase between the mid-Kesteven covers and the Fenland group (Everson and Stocker 1999: 49). The high variety of different regional stylistic influences on the eleventh-century Fenland group, as well as the wide distribution of the Fenland covers, can be seen as an indication that earlier, regional identities were beginning to disappear, presumably as a result of the West Saxon expansion of the tenth century.

Other tenth- to eleventh-century products from the Barnack-quarries are the so-called South Kesteven cross-shafts, which were related – in terms of their shape and decoration – to the Ancaster-type cross-shafts (Everson and Stocker 1999: 32). They are typically twice as broad as they are thick, and are not very tapered (Everson and Stocker 1999: 29). Their decoration is standardised, consisting of simple interlace patterns confined within plain borders of rectangular section (Everson and Stocker 1999: 31). A typical example is *Toft next Newton 1* (fig. 11 d). Their distribution was largely restricted to the southern parts of Kesteven and Holland, and outside Lincolnshire, further to the southwest and southeast (Everson and Stocker 1999: 29).

The South Kesteven cross-shafts varied in size and were used for a number of purposes. The smaller ones were typically markers for individual graves, as was probably the case for the only definite example that has been found in Lindsey, at

Toft next Newton (Everson and Stocker 1999: 31) (appendix 4.1.34).⁴⁸ It is likely that this specimen was transported via the coast and the Humber estuary and then inland again via the Ancholme (Everson and Stocker 1999: 33). The larger ones may have been markers for graveyards (but see above: this does not exclude a double function as individual grave markers), or, in the case of the Elloe stone in Holland, possibly as a marker for the meeting place of the *wapentake* (Everson and Stocker 1999: 31, 162) (appendix 4.3.2).⁴⁹

From the late tenth century onwards, other smaller monument groups developed, usually with a very wide distribution, and little evidence for region-specific attributes, again suggesting that regional boundaries were becoming less important (see above). One of these groups consists of grave covers decorated by a simple cross with splayed arms. This type of decoration is near-impossible to date on art-historical grounds. The only two examples from Lincoln, *Lincoln St Mark 9* and *10* (fig. 7 g), were both found as part of the eleventh-century church fabric, and therefore dated stratigraphically to the period from the middle of the tenth to the eleventh centuries (Everson and Stocker 1999: 57-58) (appendix 3.3.3). As the majority of the others have been found in eleventh- or twelfth-century contexts, Everson and Stocker (1999: 58) suggest that the two monuments from St Mark's are early examples within this group, implying that this new type of monument first developed in Lincoln before it was exported to other parts of the county.

Finally, from the late tenth century onwards, a group of so-called 'gridded markers' were produced at Barnack and Ancaster, broad rectangular tablets decorated with geometric patterns based on cross-forms, whose distribution stretched across Kesteven, Leicestershire, and the Peterborough area. It is suggested that these were loosely based on the more elaborate Lincoln markers (Everson and Stocker 1999: 61). Possible early examples from Kesteven include *Ancaster 1* (appendix 4.2.1) and *Swarby 1* (appendix 4.2.35), as well as *Wilsford 2* (appendix 4.2.40), which possibly displayed similarities to *Lincoln St Mark 7* and *Lincoln St Mark 17*. Early examples from Holland include *Bicker 4* (appendix 4.3.1; fig. 11 g) and *Gosberton 1* (appendix 4.3.3).

All surviving funerary monuments from Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland fall

⁴⁸ Another possible eleventh-century example has been found at Thornton le Moor, but has been excluded here on the basis of its uncertain identification and supposed later date (Everson and Stocker 1999: 266).

⁴⁹ This suggestion is based on the accounts of the eighteenth-century antiquarians William Stukely and Maurice Johnson of Spalding, who in turn based their conclusions on a combination of oral and written sources (including a late fifteenth-century lawcode of Henry VII; recorded in Everson and Stocker 1999: 162). In addition to accounts concerning an annual council at the site of the Elloe stone, Stukely and Williams (quoted in Stocker and Everson 1999: 162) furthermore claim that the stone lent its name to the wapentake of Elloe, and its original location marked the boundary between the two parishes of Moulton and Whaplode (Everson and Stocker 1999: 162). Two alternative suggestions, offered by Everson and Stocker (1999: 164), are that the stone was originally a grave marker, which was re-used later (perhaps not until the medieval period) as a meeting place stone, or that the location of the wapentake meeting place coincided with that of a pre-Conquest cemetery.

into one of the above-mentioned categories. Stocker and Everson (2001: 226) have drawn attention to the fact that not all the funerary sculpture comes from known minster churches or other attested (or suspected) middle Anglo-Saxon church foundations. This suggests that the monopoly on burial rights that the minsters had probably once enjoyed (Blair 2005) had been undermined significantly by the second half of the tenth century. This situation is not restricted to Lincolnshire alone, but can also be discerned in the Scandinavian-controlled regions of East Anglia and the East Midlands (Blair 2005: 467-69). Elsewhere in the country, however, minsters retained the exclusive right to receive the dead for much longer (Blair 2005: 467-69).

The distribution of the tenth-century Lincolnshire sculpture is in many cases limited to one piece of sculpture per parish (or one composite monument, as may have been the case at Hackthorn). Everson and Stocker (1999: 77-79; also see Stocker 2000; Stocker 2007: 284; Stocker and Everson 2001: 227) have argued that a relationship existed between parish formation and the erection of funerary monuments. The tenth century witnessed the formation of many smaller parishes in the areas of Scandinavian settlement (Everson and Stocker 1999: 76-79; Stocker 2000; Stocker and Everson 2001: 224-29). Traditionally, this was regarded as a process of fragmentation of the parishes associated with the seventh- and eighth-century minster churches; however, this pattern was later criticised on the basis of evidence that some of the alleged 'mother' parishes were no older than the tenth century themselves (Blair 2005: 153). It is held nowadays that the tenth century witnessed a process of significant restructuring of the landscape, although the process of parish formation that took place did, to an extent, "make use of earlier quasi-parochial structures of some kind" (Blair 2005: 153; also see section 3.3).⁵⁰ In this context, Everson and Stocker (1999: 12) view the sculptures as representing the graves of the 'founders' of these newly established tenth-century parishes, a suggestion that is strengthened by a couple of *in situ* stone grave monuments that were erected over high-status burials at Raunds Furnells (Northants.) (Stocker 2000: 182).

At this point a brief consideration of the difference between minster churches and parish churches may be in place. Blair (2005: 3) has drawn attention to the

⁵⁰ Blair (1988) has argued that in the seventh and eighth centuries, minster churches were founded by royal decree. In the course of the tenth century, a large amount of parish churches were established, creating a more elaborate pattern of mother-and-daughter churches. According to Blair (1988), most of the mother churches corresponded to the earlier minster churches, but this idea was criticised by Cambridge and Rollason (1995), who believed that the tenth-century parish system had nothing to do with the earlier minster system, but were the result of a large-scale reorganisation inspired by the Carolingian reforms. As Buckberry (2004: 118) has suggested, it is possible that Blair's (1988) hypothesis is still valid for the areas that were not affected by Scandinavian settlement, whereas church organisation in the Scandinavian-controlled regions of Britain underwent more significant reorganisation.

broad usage of the Old English word *mynster* ('minster') as denoting "any kind of religious establishment with a church" and has proposed the following definition:

[An Anglo-Saxon minster is] a complex ecclesiastical settlement which is headed by an abbot, abbot, or man in priest's orders; which contains nuns, monks, priests, or laity in a variety of possible combinations, and is united to a greater or lesser extent by their liturgy and devotions; which may perform or supervise pastoral care onto the laity, perhaps receiving dues and exerting parochial authority; and which may sometimes act as a bishop's seat, while not depending for its existence or importance on that function.

Blair (2005: 1) has furthermore drawn attention to the fact that the distinction between these 'minsters' and later 'towns' is often unclear, and that many 'minsters' grew out to become 'towns'. Blair (2005: 6) has emphasised the economic importance of these minsters, and characterised them as "initiators and leaders of new practice, rather than merely as beneficiaries of secular enterprise". In his (2005: 6) opinion,

Religious communities had ways of gathering, increasing, and using wealth which were new and very important, and which generated more complex, structured, and permanent sorts of place than the English could have created if they had not been exposed to this external cultural stimulus.

An important aspect of the early minsters was that they were *static*, in which respect they differed from the various royal elites, which were itinerant (Blair 2005: 252-53). The first evidence for the direct exploitation of peasants who were bound to the land (as opposed to the payment of tribute by followers who were bound to the king in person) has been recognised in the context of the estates of middle Anglo-Saxon minsters. This has led Blair (2005: 252-53) to suggest that the transition to a land-based economy first found its origins in the context of these 'monastic' estates (the term 'monastic' is used in this context, following Blair (2005: 3), as 'pertaining to a minster'), although he acknowledges that secular aristocratic estates probably also contributed to this development. The relationship between the 'monastic' and secular elites underwent some significant changes during the middle Anglo-Saxon period. From about 700 onwards, there was a marked increase in the foundation of minster churches by nobles on land granted to them for that purpose by their king, a process which greatly troubled Bede, who saw these developments as a decline in moral standards (summarised in Blair 2005: 100-02). In 747, the so-called *Clofesho* canons were produced, which were aimed at instigating certain reforms to counteract the concerns that had arisen from this process of 'secularisation' (Blair 2005: 113), but the struggle between secular and ecclesiastical control over the minsters continued well into the ninth

century.⁵¹

When the viking raids of the ninth century took off, the Anglo-Saxon Church was already in transition, its position undermined by its rivalry with the secular elite. The events of the tenth century also involved a process of church foundation by secular landowners, but this time the process was aimed to consolidate power relations between the ecclesiastical and secular landholding elites, many of whom were now of Scandinavian descent (Blair 2005: 292-95; Hadley 2006: ch. 5). Everson and Stocker (1999: 12) have placed the start of the Lindsey-style sculpture production simultaneously with the first recorded mention of a bishop at Lincoln in 953, who they believed was (re)instated to counter-balance the power of the archbishop of York (also see Hadley 2006: 207; Whitelock 1959: 73-75).

It is unclear where the bishop's see had been located in the middle Anglo-Saxon period, as during this period the bishop was always referred to as the bishop of *Lindsey*, or, in one case, in a document dated to AD 803, the bishop "of the southern *civitas*" (*syddensis civitas*), a hitherto unidentified location (for a discussion of the various possibilities, see Stocker 1993).⁵² From the middle of the tenth century, however, the bishop was referred to as 'the bishop of Lincoln'. Everson and Stocker (1999: 77-79) argue that the bishop was an important driving force behind the process of parish foundation, as the subdivision of existing parishes into smaller units would help him to exercise better control over the region that fell under his jurisdiction, whilst the bishop's patronage could provide the secular landholders with the required legitimisation for their power over their (newly acquired) territories (Carver 2001: 17; Hadley 2006: ch. 5; Stocker 2000; 2007; Stocker and Everson 2001). For these reasons, the bishop would have stimulated the production of stone sculpture in the so-called Lindsey-style (see above), whose products would have been granted to any landholding family who supported the bishop's position. As a result, the distribution of the sculpture produced under his patronage coincided with the area over which he exercised control (*i.e.* the historic area of Lindsey), even if it did not exclude the occurrence of sculpture from different production sites in the same area (fig. 12).

Stocker (2000: 196) has suggested that the bishop's patronage of Lincoln's stone sculpture production was inspired by the actions of the archbishop of York.

⁵¹ An example is the battle over two Kentish minsters that occurred from 817 to 821 between the Mercian king Coenwulf (769-821) and the archbishop of Canterbury, Wulfred (805-32) (Blair 2005: 115, 123-24). Although the archbishop eventually won the case, in the 820s his successor Ceolnoth ceded control to the West Saxon rulers, who had supplanted the Mercian kings in Kent (Blair 2005: 124).

⁵² Stocker (1993: 188) has drawn attention to the fact that in Mercia and Northumbria the bishops were usually based in monastic centres, situated at some distance from the secular royal power centres. As Bede (*HE* II: 16) refers to Lincoln having a *praefectus* called Blæcca, who was the first to be converted during Paulinus' mission in the seventh century, Stocker (1993: 118) argues that Lincoln is the most important secular power centre within Lindsey, and therefore unlikely to have *also* housed the bishop.

The archbishop of York had full control over the ruined Roman buildings in York that provided the stone for the local York-based sculpture production, and encouraged the typical mixing of secular and ecclesiastical imagery that characterises so much of the figural sculpture produced at York to forge ties between the new secular elite and the Church (Stocker 2000: 196). Such imagery is almost entirely absent from Lindsey (with the exception of the above-mentioned early tenth-century cross from **Crowle** (*Crowle 1*), which was a York-product), but the organisation of the sculpture production may still have been similar.⁵³

Lincoln's bishopric was disbanded again and merged with those of Leicester and Dorchester as early as 971 (Everson and Stocker 1999: 12). Everson and Stocker (1999: 12) have interpreted this as a further attempt to draw Lindsey firmly into the southern provinces, a response to an ongoing dispute between the archbishops of Canterbury and York about who had authority over Lindsey. The Lindsey-type sculptures nevertheless continued to be produced into the eleventh century. Everson and Stocker (1999) do not provide any suggestions how their production was organised *after* 971. It is possible that the bishops of Lincoln, Dorchester and Leicester continued to control the Lincoln quarries; alternatively, production may have continued without centralised control.

Blair (2005: 407) has commented on the relationship between parish-formation and developing settlement identities in an 'urban' context (also see Stocker forthcoming). The formation of new 'urban' parish churches in Lincoln and York occurred from the tenth century onwards, but there were no obvious differences between these 'urban' churches and their 'rural' counterparts, neither architecturally nor in terms of their various functions or topographical locations (Blair 2005: 407; Stocker forthcoming). Instead, individual parishes were founded for a number of different reasons, not merely by local lords, but sometimes also by local communities (Stocker forthcoming; Stocker and Everson 2006: 58-70). As Blair (2005: 407; also see Stocker forthcoming) has stated,

In trying to understand the spread of churches in towns we should lay the stress not on models of urban distinctiveness projected back from later periods, but on individualistic parochial mentalities, bred by high population levels and fragmented land-tenure, which may have been as evident in the most developed rural areas as in towns, and shared by lords, peasants and tradesmen.

Just as there is no single blanket explanation for the process of parish formation, not all the sculpture from Lincolnshire can be explained by reference to

⁵³ Unfortunately it is unclear to what extent the Lindsey-type covers and markers were made of freshly quarried stone or re-used Roman masonry (there is some limited evidence for re-used masonry, as at *Lincoln Cathedral 2* (appendix 3.1.2) and *Lincoln City Broadgate 1* (appendix 3.2.2), but Stocker (2007: 285) believes that new quarries were also opened), but even if the majority of sculpture was made from newly quarried stone, the most likely location for the quarry was in the immediate vicinity of Lincoln itself (fig. 6).

the process of parish formation. There are a number of parishes throughout Lincolnshire with multiple monuments of possible tenth-century date that could *not* have formed part of the same, composite monument. These include Aisthorpe, Blyborough, Broughton, Marton, Stow and the churches of St Mark and St Mary-le-Wigford (both in Lincoln) in Lindsey;⁵⁴ Bassingham, Burton Pedwardine, Syston and Sleaford in Kesteven; and Bicker in Holland (appendix 4). The most significant numbers of sculpture have been recognised at St Mark's Church in Wigford, which produced some seventeen individual monuments of possible tenth-century date (appendix 3.3.3), and St Mary-le-Wigford (appendix 3.3.2), which produced six possible tenth-century fragments. In Kesteven, the most important exception is the parish of St Peter's Church in Creeton, which produced five cross-shafts and four covers (appendix 4.2.10). Finally, the pattern of one stone per parish is also less clear in Yorkshire.⁵⁵

It is possible that these cemeteries with multiple sculpture fragments served more than one parish (Blair 2005: 398). Alternatively, Stocker (2000: 186-87) has suggested that, in some cases, relatively high numbers of sculpture may indicate the presence of a high-status (minster) church, as may have been the case at Stow and possibly at Creeton, as well as York Minster, which produced more than 25 fragments in total (Lang 1991; Stocker 2000).⁵⁶ However, not every high-status church has produced large numbers of sculpture. Stocker (2000: 187-91) has drawn attention to the fact that the presumably high-status foundation at St Paul-in-the-Bail, which was fully excavated in the 1970s (chapter 2.2.2), produced a much smaller number of sculptural fragments than the tenth-century churches of St Mark and St Mary-le-Wigford. According to Stocker (2000: 187-89), the explanation for this discrepancy can be found in the demographic of the population that was buried in the cemeteries of St Mark and St Mary-le-Wigford. He (2000: 189) has suggested that these were the graveyards of the upcoming mercantile elite who had settled in Wigford (chapter 2.2.4). Stocker (2000: 203-05) has explained the high number of sculpture fragments from the church of St Mary Bishophill Senior in York, amounting to fifteen pieces in total, in the same way, and

⁵⁴ Stocker (2000: 183) quotes six monuments for the church of St Margaret in Marton; however, one of these (*Marton 6*) is an eleventh-century architectural fragment (Everson and Stocker 1999: 230-32), whilst two of the funerary monuments are eleventh- or twelfth-century (*Marton 4* and *5*), and thus fall outside the date range of this thesis (Everson and Stocker 1999: 229-30). Finally, *Marton 1-3* could arguably all belong to the same composite monument (appendix 4.1.22). Five funerary monuments (four covers, one of which (*Stow 4*) was of eleventh-century date, and one marker) have been recorded for Stow, but the existence of two of these is only attested from documentary sources (appendix 4.1.30).

⁵⁵ In the East Riding of Yorkshire, to the north of the Humber estuary, the pattern of one piece of sculpture per parish is fairly constant; however, the number of monuments per site increases further north, and in Ryedale and York itself the majority of parishes with sculpture have produced multiple monuments of roughly contemporary date (Lang 1991).

⁵⁶ The unusual high number of monuments from Creeton is more difficult to explain, but it has been suggested that there was a connection between the church at Creeton and the nearby minster site at Castle Bytham to the west (Stocker 2000: 187 n. 3).

has postulated the nearby presence of a 'strand' along the River Ouse. Finally, Stocker (2000: 189-90) has also applied this argument to the relatively high number of tenth- and eleventh-century sculptural fragments from Marton, and suggested that this was the graveyard for the inhabitants of Torksey, which itself has not produced any tenth-century sculpture. However, Torksey itself also had a cemetery (Barley 1964; Palmer-Brown 1995) (appendix 6.1.24), and excavations in the 1990s revealed that its origins went back to at least the late ninth century (Palmer-Brown 1995: 22). An alternative explanation for the nature of the sculpture assemblage from Marton will be provided below (section 3.4).

3.3: The burials: existing research

The following section provides a summary of existing research into middle and late Anglo-Saxon burial practices. It is based to a large extent on previous work by Buckberry (2004), whose analysis of middle and late Anglo-Saxon burials focused entirely on Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, and Hadley (2004b; 2006: 237-71; 2008a; 2008b; 2009), whose work on ninth- and tenth-century burial practices covers all areas of Scandinavian settlement, albeit with a slight bias towards Yorkshire and Lincolnshire. For the location of the burials and cemeteries discussed in this chapter, see figs 13 and 14.

The sub-discipline of Anglo-Saxon burial archaeology is well established. Although no longer accepted in its entirety by most Anglo-Saxon burial archaeologists, a pioneering work that focused on middle Anglo-Saxon burial practices was Leeds (1936), who took the first step in developing the concept of 'final phase' burials. According to Leeds (1936), the earliest middle Anglo-Saxon burial grounds, which were generally speaking more regular in layout and situated closer to settlements than preceding early Anglo-Saxon burials, but still contained grave goods (many of which had crucifix designs), represented the 'final phase' of 'pagan' burial in England (the term 'final phase' initially being coined only to refer to seventh-century art styles (Craig 2009)). These 'final phase' cemeteries supposedly came to an end in the course of the eighth century, when, under the direct influence of the Church, they were replaced with churchyards associated with minster churches, whilst burial rites became increasingly egalitarian at this time (Faull 1976: 232; Hyslop 1963; Meaney and Hawkes 1970: 53; for a summary of the model, see Buckberry 2004: 9).

In more recent years, the 'final phase' model has been criticised for a number of reasons, which are excellently discussed by Boddington (1990) and Craig (2009: ch. 4). Directly relevant in the current context is the fact that it was increasingly realised that grave goods, in particular dress accessories, may indicate status or gender, and that burial rites therefore also reflect changes in economic pressure, hereditary law, or 'fashion' (*i.e.* the types of clothes people wore in life *and* death),

rather than exclusively the (pagan) religion of the deceased (Boddington 1990: 197; Buckberry 2004: 9-11; Craig 2009: ch. 4; Hadley 2009). What is more, the notion that burial practice became more egalitarian from the eighth century onwards, which was based largely on the evidence from excavated cemeteries from the southern Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, can no longer be maintained in the context of Buckberry's (2004; 2007) work on the eighth- to tenth-century burial evidence from Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, which noted significant variation in burial practices in late Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire and Yorkshire.

The current consensus is that burial practice was far from homogenous during the centuries following the conversion (Buckberry 2004: 85-86, 303-04; 2007; Craig 2009; Hadley 2000a: 199, 209; 2009). Although most burials were supine and extended, and were buried on a west-east alignment, in orderly rows in the vicinity of a known church or other settlement activity, and grave goods became increasingly rare (Buckberry 2004: 85-86), other aspects of burial rites were still used to signal social identity. Variation in burial practice could find expression in the location of the grave (in particular the distance to the church and to other graves); the use of grave markers above ground (such as the stone covers and markers discussed in section 3.2); and grave furniture below ground (including coffins, which occurred from the seventh century onwards, chests, cists and pillow stones) (Buckberry 2007: 118). Other deposits that contributed to the variation in burial practice included sticks or wands made from branches of a willow tree, as were found at Barton-upon-Humber (appendix 6.1.2); white quartz stones thrown into the grave fill, as was found at Kellington in Yorkshire (Buckberry 2007: 118); stones placed over the eyes and mouth of the deceased, as occurred in one case at Fillingham (appendix 6.1.9) (Buckberry 2007: 118); and charcoal deposits, as occurred at St Mark's Church in Wigford (appendix 5.3.3) (Buckberry 2004: 159). Variation also occurred in the positioning of the hands (Buckberry 2004: 22).

The significance of these various rites has been the topic of some debate (Buckberry 2004: 85-86, 159, 191, 299-300, 304; 2007; Thompson 2004). Charcoal burials, which occurred from the ninth to twelfth centuries, are believed to be a high-status ritual, and seem to have occurred slightly more frequently in 'urban' contexts than elsewhere (Buckberry 2004: 85-86, 304; also see Buckberry 2007: 125). They have been recorded throughout the country in a number of places, in particular in high-status cemeteries such as at Castle Green Hereford, Exeter Cathedral, Winchester Old and New Minsters, Staple Gardens Winchester, and St Oswald's Church in Gloucester. They are often also coffined burials, and generally speaking there is a slight tendency towards adult males (Buckberry 2004: 299-300). They are often found in clusters, usually situated close to the church, as at St Mark's Church in Wigford (Buckberry 2004: 191). Their symbolic significance is unclear. The charcoal may be included to soak up decomposition fluids, or it may

be a sign of penitence and humility, similar to the ash cross that Christians traditionally receive on their foreheads on Ash Wednesday (Buckberry 2004: 191; Thompson 2004).

Another common feature of ninth- to twelfth-century grave furniture consists of various stones deposited around the head, sometimes referred to as 'pillow stones' (Thompson 2004). These are often found in plain earthen graves, in coffins, in cists, or in charcoal graves. Again, they occur slightly more often in 'urban' than in 'rural' contexts (Buckberry 2007: 85-86; Thompson 2004). They occur in three main locations: under the head (sometimes exclusively referred to as 'pillow stones'), on either side of the head (also referred to as ear-muff stones) and around the head ('head cists') (Buckberry 2004: 296; Thompson 2004). Again, their significance is uncertain, although in one instance from Fishergate in York the reasons may have been practical. This particular individual had been decapitated, and the stones may have been put in place to stop the head from rolling over (Buckberry 2004: 189-90). In other cases it may have been done to secure the position of the head, forcing it to look to the east or towards heaven. Alternatively their uncomfortable hardness may have been a sign of penitence or humility (Buckberry 2004: 189; Geake 1997: 168).

Different burial rites could be combined in any possible way, although usually they occurred in isolation (Buckberry 2004: 194-95). Exceptions include six graves from Barton-upon-Humber, one of which combined a charcoal layer with pillow stones, whilst the other five combined the use of pillow stones with the above-mentioned willow 'wands' (possibly symbolising pilgrims' staffs (Buckberry 2004: 192-93)), whilst similar combinations also occurred at St Mark's Church in Wigford (Buckberry 2004: 194). Buckberry (2004: 196) has suggested that the relative complexity of the various burial rites reflected the status of the buried individual, and has noted that elaborate graves were increasingly restricted to adult males. Gender specific assemblages had been decreasing since the seventh century, possibly as a result of increased social stratification and a growing link between masculinity and power (Buckberry 2004: 158; Hadley 2004b; 2008).

In addition to the variety of burial practices discussed above, a limited number of ninth- and tenth-century burials from England have traditionally been identified as the graves of the Scandinavian settlers. One 'typical' Scandinavian rite was supposedly the use of cremation instead of inhumation, as occurred at Heath Wood, Ingleby (Derbs.) (Richards 2004b: 146-49; 2004a). The continued deposition of grave goods, usually in the form of dress accessories that signal a 'Scandinavian' identity, such as the non-matching oval brooches found in a female burial at Adwick-le-Street (Yorks.) or the ringed pin found in a (possibly double) male grave at Sonning (Berks.) (Hadley 2006: 237, 241-44; Richards 2004b: 142), has also been interpreted as 'Scandinavian'. However, Halsall (2000) has

questioned the equation of grave goods with Scandinavian descent, and has suggested that the inclusion of 'typical' Scandinavian artefacts may be a further variation on the already wide variety of different burial rites, intended to signal status, or allegiance to the new settlers (also see Hadley 2006: 237).

The furnished inhumations that are traditionally interpreted as the graves of Scandinavian settlers also include a small number of graves with explicitly 'male' assemblages of grave goods (also known as 'weapons graves') that were entirely restricted to adult males (Halsall 2000; Hadley 2006: 241; 2008; Richards 2002). Some of these occur in isolation, and are often marked by barrows, such as the grave from Camphill near Bedale in Yorkshire; another grave at Beacon Hill, Aspatria (Cumb.); and the above-mentioned grave at Eaglesfield (Cumb.) (Hadley 2006: 241; Richards 2002). Others, however, are located in prime locations in churchyards, as at Kildale (Yorks.) and Wensley (Yorks.) (Hadley 2006: 242; Richards 2002). In addition, for a short period around c. 900 AD, a form of accompanied burial occurred in the north and east of England that is often interpreted as 'Scandinavian' as well (Hadley 2008b). These were frequently located in churchyards, although some occurred in isolated locations. Many of these accompanied burials contained weaponry and, again, the majority belonged to adult males, such as the double grave from the churchyard at Repton (Derbs.), which also contained a Thor's hammer, or the cist with two adult males and a female buried underneath a mound at Cambois, Bedlington (Northumb.) (Biddle and Kjølbye-Biddle 1992; 2001; Hadley 2006: 241-43; Hadley 2008b). These 'weapon graves' have been interpreted as expressions of masculinity in the face of the social unrest caused by the Scandinavian settlement (Hadley 2006: 241-43; 2008b).

No more than some 30 sites have been recognised in all of England that are traditionally interpreted as 'Scandinavian' (Hadley 2006: 237-45). None of these are from Lincolnshire (Hadley 2006: 238, fig. 35, 250). Hadley (2006: 250-52) has suggested that the lack of 'typical' Scandinavian burial in Lincolnshire was caused, somewhat paradoxically, by the relatively dense nature of the Scandinavian settlement, indicated by placename evidence and Scandinavian stylistic influences on locally produced metalwork (chapter 5):

Indeed, a paradox often found in the early medieval archaeological record is that small groups of newcomers, in a precarious position, attempting to assert their presence and status, may be more inclined to make dramatic statements than in contexts where the newcomers are much more numerous.

In other words, the majority of the Scandinavian settlers in Lincolnshire – and, indeed, elsewhere – were buried in ways that rendered them indistinguishable from their Anglo-Saxon contemporaries (Hadley 2006: 250-52, 254). For example, radiometric oxygen isotope analysis of the skeletal material from a number of west-

east aligned graves that betray no sign of 'Scandinavian' rites from St Peter's Church in Barton-upon-Humber have revealed that some of the people buried here had grown up in the west of the British Isles (Budd *et al.* 2004; MacPherson 2006), leading Hadley (2008a: 176) to suggest that "they were second-generation 'Scandinavians' born in Ireland who subsequently settled in England".

This is not to say that a process of ethnic identification with the native Anglo-Saxon population was taking place (chapter 1.5). Anglo-Saxon burial practices were subject to continuous change, and burial practices in ninth- and tenth-century Scandinavia were not egalitarian or uniform either (Hadley 2006: 253-55). Besides, many aspects of Scandinavian burial were similar to the variety of practices that occurred in contemporary England. For example, grave goods occurred in no more than a quarter of inhumations and cremations from southern Sweden, and were often restricted to a single knife or some beads, in many ways similar to the majority of ninth- and tenth-century graves with grave goods from England (Hadley 2006: 253; Svanberg 2003). Chest burials, which have been found on a number of sites in Lincolnshire, also occurred at Fyrkat, Forlev and Lejre on Sjælland in Denmark (Brønsted 1936; Hadley 2006: 253). Coffin burial was also common throughout Jutland (Denmark) and at Birka (Sweden) (Hadley 2006: 253; Gräslund 1980). Finally, the practice of lining the inside of graves also occurred throughout Jutland in Denmark and at Birka in Sweden (Hadley 2006: 253; Gräslund 1980), although here the material used was timber rather than stone.

Hand in hand with the growing realisation that funerary practice was subject to constant change and negotiation, burial interpretation has moved on from a static appraisal of funerary deposits, to the acknowledgement that funerary deposits may have been the outcome of elaborate funerary rites of which only the *material* remains (and not the words that may have been spoken, or the feasting that may have taken place) can be recognised archaeologically, and whose meaning may be multi-layered, or change over time (Buckberry 2004: 106-08; Price forthcoming).⁵⁷ Seen from this perspective, the lack of typical 'Scandinavian' burials in Lincolnshire is an expression of the processes of cultural assimilation and negotiation between the Anglo-Saxons and the Scandinavian settlers. As Hadley (2006: 254) has stated, burial practice was not the result of "cultural conservatism", but:

⁵⁷ The notion that funerary deposits were the outcome of elaborate rites has been proven archaeologically during the excavation of the Oseberg ship. It turned out that the mound over the Oseberg ship was erected in two stages, with a significant time lapse between the two. As Price (forthcoming) argues, the half mound with the open grave chamber in the middle may have function as a stage for elaborate rites not dissimilar to the account of Ibn Fadlan with respect to the burial of a Rus chieftain (see Frye 2005). Although the scale of the rites in tenth-century England was probably more modest, resulting in simpler grave deposits, it is nevertheless important to realise that the *process* of burial had great potential for social display (Craig 2009).

Even where burial rituals are similar to those found in the Scandinavian homelands, it is likely that this was because the ritual served a contemporary purpose in the context of settlement in a new region.

Just as burial rites underwent continuous change, the relationship between burials and settlements was not straightforward either, despite previous suggestions made in the context of the above-mentioned final phase model (Faull 1976; Hyslop 1963; Leeds 1936; Meaney and Hawkes 1970). In particular, the supposed decrease in spatial distance between cemeteries and settlements has been questioned (Blair 2005: 59; Buckberry 2004; Craig 2009: ch. 4; Hadley 2007; Reynolds 2002). It is now apparent that neither settlements nor cemeteries were stable features in the late Anglo-Saxon landscape, but that both were frequently relocated, and that, in some cases, areas of settlements might move closer to cemeteries rather than *vice versa*, as was the case for Lincoln's Lower City, where the earliest late Anglo-Saxon settlement core grew up next to a possible middle Anglo-Saxon burial ground (appendix 5.2.2; chapter 2.2.3). In other cases, cemeteries were abandoned in favour of settlement expansion, or founded in locations that had previously been used for domestic settlement, as happened at Fillingham (appendix 2.7.12) and Whitton (appendix 2.2.1) (Blair 2005: 59; Buckberry 2004: 11; Hadley 2007: 194-95, 200-01; Reynolds 2002). Finally, Hadley (2007) has demonstrated that late Anglo-Saxon isolated burials were more common than has hitherto been assumed.

Even if the relationship between funerary and settlement activity was fluid, burial in consecrated ground was becoming increasingly important (Blair 2005: 228, 465; Hadley 2007). However, it would be incorrect to view the presence of a church – a communal place of worship – as the driving force behind this development. Not all middle to late Anglo-Saxon parish cemeteries were associated with churches, at least not initially (Buckberry 2004: 19-20; Hadley 2007). There are a number of cases in Lindsey where a cemetery was superimposed upon a pre-existing settlement *before* a church was built. For example, the site of St Peter's Church at Barton-upon-Humber in Lindsey (appendices 2.3.2 and 6.1.2) was originally a settlement site, possibly associated with the early Anglo-Saxon inhumation cemetery at Castledyke, c. 1 mile to the southwest. In the ninth century, a cemetery was established *on top* of this settlement site, whilst the earliest evidence for a church dates to the tenth century (appendix 2.3.2) (Hadley 2007: 194). Other sites in Lindsey where a middle to late Anglo-Saxon cemetery was superimposed on top of (part of) a pre-existing settlement *before* a church was built include Barrow (Boden and Whitwell 1979; Buckberry 2004: 343-444) (appendix 6.1.1); Cumberworth (Green 1997) (appendix 6.1.6); Fillingham (Hadley 2000b; 2007) (appendix 6.1.8); St Mark's Church in Lincoln (Gilmour and Stocker 1986) (appendix 5.3.3); and possibly Holton le Clay (Sills and Heath 1976)

(appendix 6.1.11). In the case of Lincoln, Stocker (forthcoming) draws attention to the fact that the location of many pre-Conquest urban cemeteries coincides with the known location of early medieval markets, suggesting that these cemeteries fulfilled several functions, not only as burial grounds but also as meeting places for the living.

3.4: Spatial distribution of the sculpture

3.4.1: Spatial distribution of the sculpture: introduction

The following section will discuss aspects of the spatial distribution of the sculpture from Lincoln and Lindsey that have not been analysed in any detail before. It will start with a discussion of the distribution of sculpture in the Upper City. This will be followed by a discussion of the sculpture fragments from the Lower City and Wigford. In the context of the Wigford-assemblage, comparison will be made to the *absence* of funerary sculpture from Barton-upon-Humber, which was arguably another 'proto-urban' settlement (chapter 2.3). The regional distribution patterns of the various products of the Lincoln, Ancaster and Barnack quarries will also be discussed, and placed in the context of various political tensions that were played out through the erection of these different types of funerary monuments.

3.4.2: Spatial distribution of the sculpture: The Upper City

The settlement history of the Upper City prior to the tenth century was similar to that of York. York had originally also been a Roman fortress with an associated *colonia* (Carver *et al.* 1978; Hall 1997; Ottaway 1996). The former fortress remained a political and ecclesiastical focus throughout the Anglo-Saxon period, although, as at Lincoln, no evidence for middle Anglo-Saxon settlement activity has been recognised in the walled area of the former fortress (Tweddle *et al.* 1999). The only archaeological evidence from inside the former fortress was represented by a number of burials, as well as some 20 *in situ* middle Anglo-Saxon grave stones from the minster site, which was built in the same location as the preceding Roman *forum* (Lang 1991: 5). In the late ninth and tenth centuries, contemporary with the Scandinavian settlement, both sides of the River Ouse were occupied, in particular the areas around Coppergate and Bishophill (Hall 1984; 2004; Moulden and Tweddle 1986; Wenham *et al.* 1987).

There is no evidence to suggest that the Church suffered overly much during this period, and the erection of funerary monuments at York Minster continued without any visible interruption into the late ninth and tenth centuries (Lang 1991: 3-8). Excavations at York Minster in the 1960s and 1970s revealed an additional 26 ninth- to tenth-century *in situ* gravestones (Lang 1991: 3, 5). Throughout this period links with Dublin were strong, and much of the sculpture displayed Irish influences, in particular the ring-headed shape of many cross-heads (Lang 1991:

8). The quality of the decoration on the sculpture from York Minster was high (Lang 1991: 26), suggesting that the individuals buried there were of relatively high status. This suggests that York Minster retained its prominence throughout the ninth and tenth centuries, a fact that is confirmed by the construction of the Norman Cathedral in the same location.

Although the stratigraphic sequence at St Paul-in-the-Bail, which is discussed in detail in chapter 2.2.2 (also see appendix 1.1.1.4), has remained problematic (Gilmour 2007), this site provides a parallel for the minster-site in York in terms of topography and early development. Like York Minster situated within the former Roman *forum*, the site remained in use as a cemetery throughout the early and middle Anglo-Saxon periods. The skeletal evidence has produced a more-or-less continuous series of radiocarbon dates spanning the early to late Anglo-Saxon periods (summarised in Gilmour 2007: 247-48). The cist grave mentioned in chapter 2.2.2, which contained a damaged seventh-century hanging-bowl in its packing, was originally thought to represent the oldest burial on the site, although more recently Gilmour (2007: 249) has suggested that the cist burial reoccupied an earlier focal point for the cemetery.

The possibility that the cist burial reoccupied an earlier focal point deserves further attention. The only dating evidence for this grave is the seventh-century hanging bowl, whose deposition, as has been discussed in chapter 2.2.2, cannot be determined with more precision than *after* the middle of the seventh century. The only other possible evidence for middle Anglo-Saxon activity at St Paul-in-the-Bail consists of a small fragment of stone sculpture. *St Paul-in-the-Bail 3* (fig. 7 a) was probably made of Ancaster freestone, and was decorated with a well-executed geometric pattern. On the basis of its possibly middle Anglo-Saxon date, this piece has been proposed as further evidence that a high-status ecclesiastical foundation existed in the Upper City during the middle Anglo-Saxon period (Jones *et al.* 2003: 151). However, the dating of this sculpture fragment is highly uncertain (Everson and Stocker 1999: 220). Decorative similarities to an eleventh-century grave-cover from Whaplode in Holland (*Whaplode 2*: Everson and Stocker 1999: 271-72) suggest that *St Paul-in-the-Bail 3* belongs to the period between the later tenth and twelfth centuries instead (Everson and Stocker 1999: 220). This would make it roughly contemporary to *Lincoln St Paul-in-the-Bail 1*, a late tenth- to twelfth-century grave stone decorated with a simple ring-headed cross, which is suggestive of contacts with Dublin and York (Everson and Stocker 1999: 217-18) (appendix 3.1.1; fig. 7 h). In the light of the extremely limited evidence for a middle Anglo-Saxon sculpture tradition in Lincolnshire (see above: section 3.2), the latter option is more plausible.

Everson and Stocker (1999: 220) have suggested that, *if* the later date for *St Paul-in-the-Bail 3* can be accepted, this sculpture fragment may be interpreted in

the context of the transformation of the site from a monastic cell into a parish church, which supposedly occurred at some point in the tenth or eleventh century. Given the prominent position of the church of St Paul-in-the-Bail within Lincoln, the particularly high quality of the decoration on *St Paul-in-the-Bail 3* seems fitting in this context. What is more, as properly high-status burials were often characterised by elaborate funerary deposits *below* ground as well as above ground (section 3.3), it may even be possible to suggest that *St Paul-in-the-Bail 3* (or, indeed, *St Paul-in-the-Bail 1*) marked the burial in the cist, which, in that case, would have to be assigned a late date as well. In that case, the cist grave may have belonged to the 'founder' of the parish, who may also have been responsible for the construction of the later tenth-century single-celled structure with stone footings, identified as a church or chapel (see above; appendix 1.1.1.4). The reoccupation of an earlier focal point, and the deposition of a seventh-century hanging bowl, both of which may be seen as attempts to create a link with the past, would fit well with the possibility that these developments occurred as part of the process of reconciliation between the Church and the new landholding elite, as discussed in section 3.2.

In the late Anglo-Saxon period, the church at St Paul-in-the-Bail lost its prominence. Although its cemetery continued to include a significant number of 'high-status' burials (Buckberry 2004: 188), Jones *et al.* (2003: 196) suggest, on the basis of the absence of a chancel, that in the late tenth and eleventh centuries, the church of St Paul-in-the-Bail was a mere chapel. In this respect the history of the church at St Paul-in-the-Bail differs from that of York Minster, whose continued status eventually found expression in the construction of the Norman cathedral in the same location. However, in Lincoln, the Norman cathedral – the only other site in the Upper City that has produced pre-Conquest sculpture – was built on the postulated site of the preceding church of St Mary, which yielded a single high-quality Lindsey-type grave marker (*Lincoln Cathedral 2*; appendix 3.1.2), made from a piece of re-used Roman masonry (chapter 2.2.2) (Jones *et al.* 2003: 198-99; Stocker and Vince 1997). If production of the Lindsey-type grave covers and markers was indeed instigated under the patronage of the bishop of Lincoln in the middle of the tenth century (section 3.2), this marker indicates the location of the bishop's church, especially as other sculpture fragments in this style are entirely absent from the Upper City. The sculpture from St Paul-in-the-Bail belonged to a different tradition, or rather, two different traditions. *St Paul-in-the-Bail 3* was probably made of Ancaster freestone, and its decoration possibly betrayed similarities to southern monuments. The other piece, *St Paul-in-the-Bail 1*, was made of local stone, but expressed a clear affinity with the York-based sculpture production.

Can these different monument types be interpreted as expressions of political affiliation, tools in the ongoing struggle for control over the bishopric of Lindsey? If,

as Stocker and Vince (1997) have suggested, the church of St Mary was another church foundation of considerable antiquity, it is possible that a degree of rivalry existed between this foundation and that at St Paul-in-the-Bail. Although St Paul-in-the-Bail was located in the centre of the Upper City, in the same location as the Roman *forum*, the church of St Mary was situated within the same walled enclosure, but slightly further to the east, closer to Jerusalem, and therefore arguably in a spatially more important location. If the bishop of Lincoln was re-established to counteract the power of the archbishop of York, the ring-headed cross on *St Paul-in-the-Bail 1* may be seen as a blatant expression of allegiance to the archbishop of York.

Both parties were not without their supporters, but the supporters of the new bishop were more numerous, which may have led to the demise of the establishment at St Paul-in-the-Bail. The high-status religious establishment at Stow produced at least two, and possibly four, tenth- to eleventh-century funerary monuments decorated in the Lindsey-style (appendix 4.1.30). In addition, there are a significant number of parishes throughout Lindsey that yielded a single piece of Lindsey-type sculpture, spread fairly evenly across the landscape (fig. 6). By contrast, in addition to the York-products discussed above (section 3.2; fig. 10), only three other sites are known from Lindsey with sculpture made of local stone but displaying stylistic influences from York, either in terms of their figural carvings or the ring-headed shape of the cross. One of these came from Conisholme near the mouth of the Humber estuary, and the other, *Marton 1*, from Marton along the Trent (appendices 4.1.9 and 4.1.22; fig. 10 i; fig. 7). The eleventh-century *Lincoln St Mark 8* (Everson and Stocker 1999: 203-04) also displays a ring-headed cross.

The sculpture from Marton deserves further comment. As mentioned above (section 3.2), it has been suggested that amongst the people buried at Marton were the first members of the mercantile population of Torksey (Stocker 2000); however, the fact that Torksey itself also had a cemetery that probably dated back to the ninth century (Barley 1964; Palmer-Brown 1995: 22) renders this suggestion unlikely. A closer analysis of the sculpture from Marton can provide an alternative explanation, and one that could provide further support for the arguments related to the sculpture from St Paul-in-the-Bail. *Marton 1* falls either into the category of large wheel-headed crosses of the type found in Cumbria, Lancashire and Cheshire, which were first brought over the Pennines by the Scandinavian settlers from Ireland in the first half of the tenth century, or the smaller type that gained a limited distribution in East Yorkshire in the second quarter of the tenth century (Everson and Stocker 1999: 81). In either case, *Marton 2* was probably its base (appendix 4.1.22). The only other sculpture fragment with a date range that includes the tenth century is *Marton 3*, a grave cover made of stone from the Lincoln vicinity, with interlace decoration that is reminiscent of the Lindsey-type

covers, but displaying influences from the Trent Valley hogbacks in terms of its chest-like shape (appendix 4.1.22) (Everson and Stocker 1999: 226-29).

Everson and Stocker (1999: 81) have suggested that the mix of influences visible in the sculpture from Marton may serve to prove its importance as a port in this period. However, they (1999: 228-29) have also suggested that *Marton 1-3* may have formed a composite monument, and this contradicts the notion that the cemetery at Marton was comparable to the mercantile cemeteries of St Mark's Church and the church of St Mary-le-Wigford in Lincoln because, in that case, the cemetery at Marton contained only a single tenth-century monument.⁵⁸ Instead, it seems more plausible that the unusual style of the sculpture should be interpreted in a similar light as the material from St Paul-in-the-Bail and Conisholme, as an expression of allegiance to the archbishop of York in the face of recent attempts to curtail his power. In the case of Marton, however, situated on an important communication route between York and Lincoln, the message was subtler, as the interlace patterns on the grave cover also duly acknowledged the Lindsey-type sculpture that was produced under the patronage of the bishop of Lincoln.

3.4.3: Spatial distribution of the sculpture: The Lower City and Butwerk

The sculpture from the Lower City adds further detail to the arguments proposed above. Like the Upper City, the Lower City is characterised by a relative absence of sculptural fragments. Here, the total number amounts to two, including a tenth- or eleventh-century piece from Flaxengate (appendix 3.2.1), and the above-mentioned early tenth-century piece in *Borre* style from Broadgate (appendix 3.2.2). Neither belong to the Lindsey-type of funerary monuments. The piece from Flaxengate has not yet been studied in much detail (appendix 3.2.1), but preliminary analysis (Everson and Stocker *pers. comm.*) has suggested that it was of late tenth- to eleventh-century date, with possible decorative parallels in the south of Kesteven and *St Paul-in-the-Bail 3*.

As argued above in the context of the sculpture from St Paul-in-the-Bail, the absence of sculpture in the Lindsey style could represent a statement of opposition to the arrival of the new bishop in Lincoln. Although any such conclusions with regards to the Flaxengate piece must await further study (Everson and Stocker in prep.), the similarities between these fragments and *St Paul-in-the-Bail 3* may suggest that they were both commissioned around the same time, and would have expressed a similar message. *If* both pieces were of late Anglo-Saxon date, the possibility should be kept in mind that both expressed a degree of resistance against the West Saxon expansion.

⁵⁸ The presence of the later, eleventh- to twelfth-century sculpture fragments *Marton 4* and *Marton 5* does not contradict this, and their presence may be explained by reference to the social aspirations of the later inhabitants of Marton, mercantile or not.

The second piece of sculpture from the Lower City, *Lincoln City Broadgate 1*, was of early tenth-century date, and can therefore not be interpreted in the context of the politics surrounding the establishment of the bishop in the middle of the tenth century. Analysis of its decoration within the context of possible parallels from the rest of the county can nevertheless shed further light on the relationship between Lincoln and York prior to the mid-tenth century. The cover from Broadgate was near-identical to an example from Hackthorn (fig. 7 d; appendix 4.1.15), whilst a third possible parallel is a tenth-century grave-cover from St Mark's in Wigford (*Lincoln St Mark 6*) (Everson and Stocker 1999: 51, 197-98, 202-03) (appendix 3.3.3; fig. 7 f). The near-identical decoration of the two stones from Broadgate and Hackthorn has led Everson and Stocker (1999: 51) to comment that the early sculpture production at Lincoln was organised to fairly high standards. However, as only two examples have been identified, and they have argued elsewhere that the survival rates of the sculpture are fairly representative of the sculpture that was actually produced in the tenth and eleventh centuries (chapter 2), this assessment might be somewhat optimistic. Instead of representing two (or three) isolated examples of an originally much more significant typological group, it is more likely that these covers were the products of a single sculptor who tried to set up a production workshop in Lincoln. The relatively low number of surviving pieces may be an indication that his attempt failed as a result of a lack of existing demand, a situation that remained unchanged until the re-establishment of the bishop in the mid-tenth century provided the necessary stimulus for the start of a more widespread tradition of funerary sculpture.

The *Borre*-style decoration on the Broadgate and Hackthorn monuments is sometimes taken as evidence that there were contacts between Lincoln's elite and the inhabitants of York before AD 953, as *Borre*-style elements on sculpture occurred in some isolated instances in York (Everson and Stocker 1999: 51, 174; Stocker and Everson 2001: 232) and Ryedale (in particular *Levisham 3*; Lang 1991: 176-77).⁵⁹ However, the *Borre* style was extremely rare throughout England, and Stocker and Everson (2001: 232) have suggested as well that "the *Borre*-style is ... a largely Scandinavian phenomenon". It is therefore also possible that the occurrence of this style in both Lincolnshire and Yorkshire merely suggests that both regions had been subject to Scandinavian settlement.

Comparison to the above-mentioned contemporary monuments from Crowle, Holton le Clay and Thornton Curtis (fig. 10), all decorated in *Jellinge* style, and produced at York, may shed further light on the significance of the *Borre*-style covers. These three pieces clearly indicate early tenth-century contacts between

⁵⁹ The use of the triquetra is also found on Yorkshire and Cumberland hogback tombstones, and on Yorkshire cross-shafts, whilst similar motifs recur on tenth-century coins (Everson and Stocker 1999: 20) (also see chapter 4).

the coastal zone of the Humber estuary and York (Everson and Stocker 1999: 81). This is not surprising; the Humber was an important transport route towards York, and one would expect to find stylistic influences from York on both banks. However, the fact that the inhabitants of the south bank of the Humber had appropriated an identity that associated them with York does not necessarily mean that the inhabitants of Lincoln had done the same. If that had been the case, one would expect to find actual York products at Lincoln, made from the 'right' type of stone, the reddish Yorkshire Millstone Grit instead of the greyish Lincolnshire Limestone, and decorated in *Jellinge*, rather than *Borre* style. The geographical distance between York and Lincoln should not have caused any issues in this respect. Even if Lincoln was not yet connected to the Trent via the Fossdyke at this point (chapter 2.2.4), it could also be reached via the tidal Witham and the coastal waters that connected it to the Humber estuary. Although such a journey was significantly more dangerous than the inland waterways, the fact that such relatively long-distance transportation of stone sculpture via the coastal waters did occur in the tenth century is confirmed by the occurrence of the Lindsey-type marker in Norwich and the mid-Kesteven grave cover at Humberston, both discussed previously (section 3.2; fig. 12). Seen from this perspective, it becomes possible to suggest that, although the products of both the Lincoln and the York workshops expressed a 'Scandinavian' identity, this identity varied in its nuances depending on the location of the production centres where these monuments were produced. These ideas will be explored in more detail in chapter 5.

This only leaves the question why there were not more sculpture fragments from the Lower City, or, indeed, the Upper City. Many factors would have contributed to the decision to erect funerary sculpture or not. The context and timing of parish foundation was merely one of them. Other factors may include the relative wealth of the founders, and their level of engagement with existing political tensions. Another factor may be the amount of parishes that may have been in their possession, a factor that was of particular importance in the case of the Lincoln elite, many of whom held estates in Lincoln itself as well as elsewhere. For example, the *DB* entry for Lincoln records the fact that a certain Kolsveinn owned land both within and just outside the *civitas* (*LDB* 336 v), whilst his other landholdings and dues (including 1 carucate of land and several ploughs at Brattleby, Riseholme, Faldingworth and Scothern) are listed separately in *LDB* (chapter XXXVI). Landowners with multiple estates, like Kolsveinn, may have founded more than one church or chapel, in which case they (or their surviving relatives) could choose where they were buried. As will be argued below, in the course of the middle and late Anglo-Saxon periods, landed wealth was steadily becoming more important than portable wealth, and it is possible if not likely that the majority of landowners would prefer to be buried on their rural estates, and be

associated with the source of their wealth in death as well as in life.

3.4.4: Spatial distribution of the sculpture: Wigford

As mentioned above, the only two parishes in Wigford that yielded any definite late Anglo-Saxon sculpture fragments at all, the churches of St Mark (appendix 3.3.3) and St Mary-le-Wigford (appendix 3.3.2), produced multiple sculpture fragments each. As mentioned above (section 3.2), Stocker (2000: 203-05) has postulated that the populations buried in these cemeteries, like those from the cemetery of the church of St Mary Bishophill Senior in York, were mercantile, and that Wigford functioned as the 'strand' for Lincoln (also see Lang 1991: 26, 88-95). In these cases, the habit of erecting stone sculpture was an expression of the social aspirations of the emerging mercantile elite.

Other relatively large settlements in Lindsey with a possible mercantile population included Torksey (Stocker 2000: 189-90; appendix 2.20) and Barton-upon-Humber (chapter 2; appendix 2.3.2); however, neither produced any sculptural material. In the case of Barton-upon-Humber, the decision *not* to erect funerary sculpture seems to have been a conscious one. This is confirmed by the assemblage of tenth-century architectural stonework from the church of St Peter at Barton-upon-Humber, which include an *in situ* architectural panel, two *in situ* label stops, and five mid-wall shafts of baluster form, all made of Yorkshire Millstone Grit (appendix 4.1.3), suggesting that this church enjoyed a relatively high status (Everson and Stocker 1999: 101-04). What is more, as this stone type is not known as a building stone from the nearby Roman settlements at Winteringham and Brough, it is generally assumed that it was brought in from York (Everson and Stocker 1999: 81), suggesting that the person who commissioned the construction of the church possessed the wealth to import stone over a considerable distance.

An explanation for the lack of funerary sculpture from Barton-upon-Humber can be found in the topography of the settlement. As discussed in chapter 2.3, Barton was a polyfocal settlement that focused on an enclosed space that is commonly interpreted as a defended manorial site (Bradley 2000: 5; Gardner and Bunn 2006: 4; Rodwell 2007: 6). In this respect Barton differs from Lincoln, which does not have the same clear presence of a single aristocratic household imprinted upon its topography. The only visible authority in the settlement at Lincoln consists of a number of ecclesiastical institutions, some of which may have belonged to competing political alliances (see above). The mercantile settlement core in Lincoln would therefore have developed differently from that at Barton, whose (probably) exclusive focus on a single aristocratic household left no room for the same levels of competition and social aspiration that facilitated the erection of funerary monuments. Even the absence of a founder's monument can be explained in these terms, because the need to erect a monument in order to ascertain one's power

over a particular area as an individual (or individual family) does not exist if one's power is unchallenged.⁶⁰

Returning to Wigford, the assemblage from the church of St Mark also stands out for the high variation in monument types that occur within a single graveyard, including covers and markers of local manufacture as well as products from the Ancaster quarries (appendix 3.3.3). This may be the result of the spatial location of Wigford, which was technically speaking situated in Kesteven, but had close dealings with the walled Upper and Lower cities of Lincoln across the river (fig. 3). Alternatively, the varied nature of the sculpture may reflect the widespread contacts of the traders who inhabited the settlement (Stocker 2000: 191).

There is only one other parish in Lincolnshire with evidence for the occurrence of sculpture from different production centres within the same graveyard (fig. 12). This was Blyborough in Lindsey, which yielded at least one Lindsey-type cover, and one mid-Kesteven cover, both of mid-tenth to eleventh-century date (appendix 4.1.4). Unfortunately no excavations have been carried out in the area that could shed light on the nature of settlement during the late Anglo-Saxon period. However, it is located between the line of the Roman road from Lincoln towards the Humber estuary and the River Ancholme (which also flows towards the Humber estuary), and it is therefore not unlikely that Blyborough functioned as a trading post as well. The meaning of the placename possibly confirms this. The first element may be derived from Old English *bliðe* (the gentle, merry stream), whilst the second element means 'fortified place' (Cameron 2001: 134), suggesting that Blyborough was a fortified settlement along a riverine transport route. Alternatively, however, *Bliða* could be a personal name, in which case the placename means 'Bliða's fortified place' (Cameron 2001: 134).

There are also instances whereby monuments belonging to different sculpture traditions occur in neighbouring parishes. This does not occur in Kesteven or Holland, whose sculpture tradition is represented entirely by the Ancaster and Barnack quarries. As the quarries of Ancaster and Barnack were operational at a slightly different time, and their products revealed significant decorative similarities (see above: section 3.2), the distribution of their products probably merely reflects a chronological difference. However, the adjoining parishes of Humberston, Holton le Clay (fig. 7 c) and North Thoresby in Lindsey each produced a single monument from a different production centre. As they were single monuments, they can be interpreted in the context of parish foundation rather than mercantile activity (see above), and, as argued previously in the context of the sculpture from the Upper City (section 3.4.2), their different decorative styles may reflect different political affiliations.

⁶⁰ Unfortunately the topography of Torksey is not so well understood, but future investigations may shed more light on the situation here.

As mentioned previously, Holton le Clay produced an early tenth-century grave cover produced by the York 'Metropolitan' School (appendix 4.1.16; figs 7 c and 10). If the sculpture can indeed provide a date for parish formation, this parish therefore found its origins in the first half of the tenth century, before the establishment of the bishop of Lincoln in the middle of the tenth century. The parishes of Humberston to the north and North Thoresby to the south produced a single mid-Kesteven grave cover of later tenth- to eleventh-century date and a Lindsey-type grave cover of later tenth- to eleventh-century date respectively (appendices 4.1.17 and 4.1.24). Continuing the same line of argument that has been followed in previous sections, the Lindsey-type cover from North Thoresby would have expressed affiliation with the newly established bishop of Lincoln, and could thus be seen as a challenge to the pro-York sympathies of the landholder from Holton le Clay.

The tenth- or eleventh-century mid-Kesteven cover from Humberston represents the northernmost example of the Ancaster-products (fig. 12), and its transportation to Humberston, which probably took place via the rivers towards the Wash and from there out to sea (Everson and Stocker 1999: 190), was a considerable undertaking that must have required serious investment in terms of both time and cost. If the products of a given quarry signalled a degree of affiliation with the politics of the surrounding area, as was arguably the case in Lincoln, the possibility presents itself that the Kesteven products *also* expressed a specific political message. As *Humberston 1* was a product of the southern Ancaster quarries, which were situated much closer to both Stamford and Nottingham than to Lincoln itself, it is possible to suggest that the individual(s) responsible for the erection of this monument was/were in favour of Lindsey's incorporation into a united Anglo-Saxon England. Although this piece can be argued to belong anywhere in the tenth or even early eleventh centuries, this does not affect such an interpretation. It is possible that *Humberston 1* belongs to the period of West Saxon expansion during the earlier tenth century, but a later date is equally plausible. The political conquest of Lindsey had been achieved in the 950s, but not to everyone's satisfaction, as is made clear by the ASC (E: 1012; translation Swanton 2000; my emphasis) entry for AD 1013, which relates how

King Swein [Forkbeard] came with his fleet to Sandwich, and very quickly turned round East Anglia into the mouth of the Humber, and so upwards along the Trent until he came to Gainsborough. And then Earl Uhtred and all Northumbria immediately submitted to him, and *all the people in Lindsey*, and afterwards the people of the Five Boroughs...

In other words, despite some five decades of West Saxon rule, the loyalties of at least some of the inhabitants of Lindsey still lay elsewhere. What is more, as people "in a precarious position ... may be more inclined to make dramatic statements"

(Hadley 2006: 250-52) (see section 3.3), the isolated nature of the Kesteven-product so far north (fig. 12) suggests that support for the West Saxon rulers was, indeed, limited in this region.

Similar political rivalries may have been played out between a number of other parishes to the north of Lincoln, but no such situations occurred in Kesteven or Holland, which is evident from the lack of sculpture that was *not* produced at one of the Kesteven-quarries (fig. 12). The suggestion is raised that tensions resulting from the expansionist aspirations of the kings of Wessex were felt more clearly in Lindsey than further south. As Lindsey was situated much closer to York, this may have been a direct result of the ongoing struggle for power and independence between Wessex and Northumbria. But certain differences can also be discerned within Lindsey itself. The sculpture that occurs in Lincoln itself and to the north of the settlement, especially along Ermine Street and the Lincoln Edge, displays much more typological variation than the sculpture further to the east (fig. 12). This suggests that Lincoln was, to an extent, a focal point for the political arguments that were being played out between north and south. In this respect, Lincoln differed greatly from Stamford, which is characterised by a complete absence of pre-Conquest funerary sculpture (Everson and Stocker 1999), despite being situated within spitting distance from the Barnack quarries. The explanation may lie in Stamford's southern location: situated well inside the region that was firmly in southern hands before the sculpture tradition in Lincolnshire really took off, there was no need for such explicit display of political affiliations.

3.4.5: Spatial distribution of the sculpture: conclusions

The preceding discussion has emphasised the high levels of variability in the distribution and nature of stone sculpture in Lindsey. It is clear that funerary monuments may signal status, political or ecclesiastical affiliations, or social aspirations, none of which were necessarily mutually exclusive. It is also clear that although a case can be made that a significant number of monuments were associated with parish foundation, the process of parish foundation itself did not always involve the erection of funerary sculpture, and, whilst mercantile communities can sometimes be recognised through the occurrence of multiple sculpture fragments, some cemeteries associated with trading settlements produced no sculpture at all.

Previous work on the sculpture has tended to disregard sites that did *not* yield any sculptural material. However, when the sculpture is treated in its settlement and landscape context, it becomes clear that the choice to erect funerary sculpture itself may also shed light on the socio-political aspects of developing settlement hierarchies. It may be possible to suggest that the landowners who erected stone sculpture were less secure in their position than landowners who did not, and thus

possibly belonged to the 'new' landholding elite who had profited from the social disruption caused by the viking incursions.

Further insights into the process of settlement differentiation may be gleaned from the actual decoration on the sculpture itself. The standardised decoration of the various monument groups suggests that the choice to erect a monument of a particular type signalled allegiance to the elite(s) under whose patronage that type of sculpture was produced, and that the socio-political relationships between individual estates and settlements were subject to an ongoing process of negotiation. This process of constant negotiation was most clearly visible in and near Lincoln itself, from where, it has been argued, the transformation of the rural Lincolnshire landscape from a minster-based organisation to a secular parish-based organisation was orchestrated by the newly (re-)established bishop. Although the sculpture from Wigford is typically interpreted as evidence for the rise of a mercantile elite, the diversity of decorative styles bears witness to the fact that this upcoming social group was involved in the ongoing socio-political debates between north and south as well. The next section will now turn to the spatial distribution of excavated burials in Lincoln and Lindsey in order to add further detail to the arguments presented above, and shed light on the demographic of the various populations that were involved in these events.

3.5: Burials and settlements

3.5.1: Burials and settlements: introduction

This section will analyse the relationship between cemetery and settlement development. Despite the fact that certain high-status burial rites occurred more frequently in 'urban' contexts (section 3.3), Buckberry (2004; 2007) has argued that there was no qualitative distinction between the burial practices that occurred in 'urban' and 'rural' cemeteries, but, for a time when the distinction between 'urban' and 'rural' itself was still in its embryonic stage, this should not come as a surprise. Following Blair's (2005: 407; see above) approach towards parish churches from this period, the following sections will therefore treat the evidence on a parish-based level. For Lincoln (fig. 13), the evidence has entirely been retrieved in the context of developer-funded and rescue excavations. For Lindsey (fig. 14), the work carried out by the University of Sheffield in the context of the *Cemeteries and Settlements* project (also see Hadley 2007) will stand central to the following discussion. As no comparable investigations have taken place to date that focused on the late Anglo-Saxon burial data from Kesteven or Holland, nor on the relationship between cemeteries and settlements in this period, these regions will be excluded from this section.

As discussed in section 3.3, the relationship between cemetery and settlement development was not straightforward (Hadley 2007). Nucleated

settlements may have grown up around graveyards associated with parish churches or minsters, as seems to have been the case in Lincoln (appendix 5) and Whitton (Hadley 2007) (appendix 6.1.26). In other cases, cemeteries may have been superimposed upon pre-existing settlements, as happened at Fillingham (Hadley 2007) (appendix 6.1.9) and Holton le Clay (appendix 6.1.12). In some cases, the village cemetery predated the village church itself, as was the case at, again, Fillingham and possibly at Holton le Clay (appendix 2.4.16) and Whitton (Hadley and Davies 2001: 16).

Regardless of the relative chronology of these cemeteries and their associated settlements, it is clear that funerary activity was intrinsically related to the process of settlement nucleation (Hadley 2007). Having said that, there is a growing body of evidence that suggests that isolated cemeteries, which were *not* associated with churches, and were located at some distance from known settlement sites, also existed during the late Anglo-Saxon period (Buckberry 2007: 117; Hadley 2007). Although the exact reasons for the existence of such cemeteries are open to debate, Hadley (2007: 199) has suggested that the individuals buried in isolated locations were excluded from burial in consecrated ground. They will be discussed in more detail in section 3.5.3.

Despite the evidence for isolated burials, by the later tenth and eleventh centuries churchyard burial was the norm (Hadley 2007: 199). The realisation that the distance between the living and the dead was on the whole relatively small in late Anglo-Saxon England is not a new one. As Thompson (2004: 1) states, “[late Anglo-Saxon] living experience was shaped by encounters with death, funerals, corpses, monuments, relics and intercessory prayer”. The location of a cemetery within a settlement reflects the relative importance of burial activity within a given society:

When the cemetery was to be found in the center of the village, that is to say, in and around the church, death and its rituals were to be found at the center of life. The expulsion of the dead beyond the boundary of the village preceded in fact the expulsion of the dead from our everyday life (Ragon 1983: 39).

Lincoln itself, with its multiple cemeteries – that may have functioned as market places as well – inside a relatively densely occupied settlement, is the most striking example of the close relationship between the living and the dead. A discussion of the relationship between settlement and burial in the Upper and Lower Cities and Wigford will therefore form the starting point for this section.

3.5.2: Burials and settlements: Lincoln

As discussed in chapter 2, the earliest post-Roman structural evidence in Lincoln was found in the Upper City, at St Paul-in-the-Bail, and the Lower City, along Silver

Street. In both cases, the evidence consisted of a number of burials that may have been associated with two separate religious foundations, one associated with the church of St Paul-in-the-Bail, and the other with the possible double foundation of St Peter-at-Pleas and St Peter-at-Arches (fig. 13) (Jones *et al.* 2003: 144-45). In the course of the ninth century, settlement and craft-making activities began to occur in the Lower City, in the immediate vicinity of the Silver Street burials. In the Upper City, this did not happen until the later tenth century, but when it did, metalworking was again amongst the earliest activities that took place. Here, it occurred literally *on top* of the cemetery of St Paul-in-the-Bail, as the sunken-featured building associated with the metalworking evidence was found overlying earlier burials (Gilmour 2007; Steane *et al.* 2006: 154, 162-63, 170-71).

The importance of the Church for the economic development of Lincoln is paramount. Already in the 1980s, Ragon (1983: 137) regarded cemeteries and their associated churches as public space, and suggested that they played an important commercial role in late Anglo-Saxon settlements, which would have lacked any other significant public space that lent itself well to such activity, the streets generally speaking being relatively narrow, and individual houses typically being too small. What is more, Sawyer (1986) has argued that coins found in churchyards indicate trade, a suggestion that may explain the presence of a handful of ninth-century West Saxon *Lunette* coins found at St Paul-in-the-Bail (appendix 1.1.1.4; chapter 4), and is confirmed by Stocker's (forthcoming) study of the topographical aspects of cemeteries in Lincoln (section 3.3). Finally, the alternative name for the church of St Peter-at-Arches – St Peter-at-Mootstone (section 2.2.3) – also indicates that this was the location of an assembly place.

As referred to in section 3.2, Blair (2005: 246-90) has discussed the significance of middle Anglo-Saxon minster sites for the development of 'towns'. He (2005: 247) has argued that the concept of the 'city' was heavily influenced by "a range of overlapping senses formed by their [*i.e.* the Anglo-Saxons'] immediate environments, by their perceptions of contemporary Christendom, and by their liturgical observances and reading". This approach sheds a very different light on the process of urbanisation than the interpretation of more 'traditional' urban archaeologists and historians, whose emphasis usually rests on the economic dimensions of town development (see chapter 1). Thus Blair (2005: 248) states:

Trade, industry, or specialized occupations were not essential to their [*i.e.* the Anglo-Saxons'] conceptions of the *civitas*: it was not because it had a market-place, or housed a concentration of people living by non-agrarian means, that the heavenly Jerusalem was a city. The values evoked by such images were those of cultural and moral 'civilization' – in its literal sense – informed by both the biblical and the Roman worlds: the city should be stately, commodious, and populous, protected by physical boundaries and legal privileges, a place of righteousness and refuge, above all holy. No kind of settlement that was practicable in

seventh- and eighth-century England could meet these requirements so well as the monastic settlement.

The acknowledgement that Christian ideology and doctrine had a profound effect on the late Anglo-Saxon urbanisation process sheds an interesting light on the early development of Lincoln, in particular in the context of the limited amount of written references to the settlement. In this context, it is worth drawing attention to another argument proposed by Blair (2005: 249) that focuses on the use of the words *civitas* and *urbs* during the middle Anglo-Saxon period:

It was within the stone walls of Romano-British ruins, so enthusiastically adopted by monastic founders, that lay perceptions of special places in the landscape coalesced with literary ones of the heavenly and earthly Jerusalems. Bede could use *civitas* in the strictly physical sense of an archaeological monument, and the distinction in Anglo-Latin between sites with visible Roman walls and sites with earthen fortifications mirrors an equivalent distinction, known from placenames, in pre-Christian English: *civitas* or *ceaster* as against *urbs* or *burh*. But on a more conceptual level, the ecclesiastical adoption of such places conferred 'cityness'. Roman towns re-born as bishoprics or minsters embodied a transfer of meanings from old (abandoned) cities to new (revitalized and holy) ones.⁶¹

Thus when Bede (*HE* II: 16) referred to the stone church that Paulinus built in the *civitas* of Lincoln after his conversion of Blæcca, Lincoln's reeve (chapter 2.2.2; section 3.2), he may have referred to an archaeological monument (a ruined Roman *colonia*) that was being transferred into a minster or similar ecclesiastical establishment, rather than to a 'town' in the modern sense of the word. As discussed in chapter 2, the absence of archaeological evidence for domestic activity at Lincoln during the early and middle Anglo-Saxon periods confirms this suggestion. The choice to build a church in this deserted location would then perhaps not be an indication that Lincoln still fulfilled certain administrative, social, political or religious functions at the time of Paulinus's arrival (Jones *et al.* 2003: 141-45), but that it fulfilled a symbolic role as a visible and ancient location within the landscape that could be revitalised as a holy 'city' under the positive influence of Christianity.

After the conversion of the seventh century, Lincoln, or at least one or possibly two religious establishments in Lincoln, was of relatively high status. Although the excavations at St Paul-in-the-Bail or elsewhere did not yield evidence for international trade in luxury items and zoned industrial activity comparable to, for example, the site at Flixborough (Blair 2005: 258-59; Evans and Loveluck 2009; Loveluck 2007), Lincoln was the location for the consecration of the archbishop of Canterbury within years of Blæcca's conversion (Bede *HE* II: 18). Its

⁶¹ However, Sawyer (1998: 79) has commented on the fact that throughout his work Bede seems to use the term *urbs* for certain Roman cities of particular importance, but also for places that were fortified, but not by the Romans.

location inside an old Roman town would have conveyed status to the settlement in the eyes of those who embraced the Christian concept of *civitas*, whilst the fact that burial activity took place within Lincoln's walls would have added status as well.

The importance that is sometimes attached to evidence for international trade in luxury items as an indication of the relative importance of a settlement is again a symptom of more 'traditional' economic approaches to settlement development. Although evidence for international trade, where it occurs, is certainly an indication that a particular settlement was important, conversely, its absence does not necessarily imply that a settlement was *unimportant*, but merely that it fulfilled a different function, or set of functions. The assemblage from Flixborough may be exceptional even for minster sites, as West Halton, which has also been suggested as a middle Anglo-Saxon minster site, did not produce a similar assemblage either (Hadley *pers. comm.*).⁶² It must be added, however, that the excavations at West Halton did not chance upon any significant midden deposits, as did the excavations at Flixborough (Hadley *pers. comm.*; Loveluck and Atkinson 2007)

Returning to the subject of this chapter, the significance of burial activity for the development of Lincoln deserves further comment, and in this context it is worth referring briefly to two Old English poems. The first of these is the fragmentary poem *The Ruin*, written down in the tenth-century *Exeter Book*, which laments the decline of a Roman city, and the second is the early twelfth-century poem *Durham*. *The Ruin* probably describes the ruined Roman settlement at Bath, although the sentiments conveyed can be transferred onto other abandoned Roman towns as well. It depicts an unnamed ruin as a place filled with the memories of the dead from a long-gone heroic past. The surviving fragment alternates between graphic descriptions of the broken physical remains of the settlement, and elegiac depictions of its imagined past inhabitants. It is often interpreted in the longstanding tradition of the *encomium urbis*, or praise poetry focusing on cities, a sub-genre of which contrasts the past glory of cities with their present decline (Hamer 1970: 31). By contrast, *Durham*, which sings the praises of the early twelfth-century settlement at, indeed, Durham, belongs to the main tradition of the *encomium urbis* genre. Here, the settlement is described in positive terms, as a wondrous place, with a minster church filled with saintly relics, protected from the wilderness in the surrounding valleys by natural boundaries. *Durham* survives in its complete form, and it is interesting to note that more than half of the poem is dedicated to a description of the various saintly dead that were buried inside the settlement, including St Cuthbert, King Oswald (or rather, his head), and Bede.

Each poem gives a very different impression of a 'town'. This ought not to be surprising given the fact that each was entrusted to parchment at opposite ends of

⁶² Caistor, another suspected minster site from Lindsey, has unfortunately not been excavated on a significant enough scale to provide a useful comparison.

the period of 'urban' development. Whilst *The Ruin* describes the kind of archaeological monument that Blair (2005: 249; see above) believes would have been considered a *civitas*, *Durham* describes a very different kind of *civitas*, a place that Blair (2005: 248; see above) might describe as "stately, commodious, and populous, protected by physical boundaries and legal privileges, a place of righteousness and refuge, above all holy". One shared characteristic of the description of both 'towns', however, is that they convey a sense of antiquity that is related to the presence of the ancestors.

Admittedly, the poems themselves never use the word *civitas*, but this should not be surprising given the fact that *civitas* is a Latin word, and the poems were both written in the vernacular. They do not employ the word *ceaster* either, despite the Roman origin of the settlement described in *The Ruin* (compare Blair 2005: 249; see above). In *The Ruin*, the settlement is described as a *burgsted*. Likewise, *Durham* is described as a *burch* (both transcriptions from Hamer 1970). This use of terminology sheds an interesting light on the perceived military function of settlements that incorporate a derivation of *-burh* in their placenames. However, Old English verse is alliterative, and therefore the terminology used was often highly formulaic. What is more, according to Yorke (forthcoming), different terms could be used for the same settlement, depending on the aspect of that particular settlement that needed to be emphasised, or the message that one wanted to get across (also see Reynolds 1987: 299-300). Especially in the context of *The Ruin*, with its overtones of a Germanic heroic past, it is possible that the word *burgsted* was chosen on purpose, to create a metaphorical link between the tangible remains of a past that built cities out of stone, and a remembered past that centred around the timber halls and homesteads of mythical heroes like Beowulf. The fact that *The Ruin* was written down in the tenth century, following the Scandinavian settlement, may explain why such a metaphor might be employed, as it would have 'translated' the unfamiliarity of the stone ruins of their adopted Roman ancestors into a more familiar image of the past. The choice of the word *burch* to describe *Durham* may seem less logical, but, keeping Yorke's (forthcoming) argument in mind, it is possible that the poet deliberately chose this word to emphasise a sense of safety, as he depicted the wonders of *Durham* as a civilised haven that provided protection from the wilderness outside.

The perceived importance of the ancestors is equally transparent from other historical sources, such as the *Anglo-Saxon Genealogies* (Yorke 1990) and the *ASC*, which in some versions (including the earliest version, the so-called *Winchester*-manuscript or version A) includes a genealogy of the West Saxon King Alfred as a preface to the main chronicle-entries. The practice of erecting funerary sculpture itself was, of course, also more than merely a means to express a claim to land or a political affiliation, and would have served to honour the ancestors as well, and,

especially over time, the antiquity of such a monument may add significant status to the descendants of the buried individual. And if a longer ancestry added extra status, it seems plausible that a cemetery that had been in use over a longer period of time would also have been considered to be of higher status than a newly established cemetery.⁶³

Wickholm (2008: 1) has argued how the repetition of burial custom helps to build collective memory, and thus create collective identity. She (2008: 92) identifies two different types of reuse: genealogical reuse (which is associated with the continuous use of certain customs over a long period of time), and mythological reuse (which is *not* possible to associate with a people's direct past, but represents a process of repossession of certain myths and stories associated with a people's past). The burial evidence from St Paul-in-the-Bail has yielded the only (relatively) convincing evidence for continuous (if possibly intermittent) use from the post-Roman into the medieval periods, with evidence for the use of chests, coffins and stone-lined graves in the late Anglo-Saxon phase (appendix 5.1.1), suggesting it was of relatively high status. A possible parallel in this respect is the minster cemetery from York, which was also in use over a prolonged period of time, and which produced evidence for the re-use of Roman gravestones during the Anglo-Saxon period (although the latter could also be seen as mythological reuse). It is possible, therefore, that the status of settlements like Lincoln and York, and their subsequent development as the political, economic and social focal points of their surrounding regions, was heavily influenced by the long history of their respective burial grounds, which in each case were situated in a prominent location within the settlement.

In the case of Lincoln, the processes of cemetery foundation and settlement development had a mutually stimulating effect. In addition to the cemeteries at St Paul-in-the-Bail and Saltergate, a number of new graveyards were established in Lincoln from the tenth century onwards, each serving its own parish, and each associated with its own parish church (figs 3 and 13) (Jones *et al.* 2003).⁶⁴ These included the churches of St Mark, St Mary-le-Wigford and possibly St Botolph in Wigford, but also the churches of St Lawrence, St Swithin, St Edmund, the Holy Trinity and possibly St Martin in the Lower City, and the churches of St Clement-in-the-Bail and All-Saints-in-the-Bail in the Upper City (appendix 1). The establishment of new parishes was an expression of the consolidation of existing power relations between the various members of the elite who held properties

⁶³ This argument does not apply to the status of 'pagan' cemeteries, such as, for example, the Castledyke cemetery in Barton-upon-Humber, which went out of use in the middle Anglo-Saxon period, as these represent a very different set of ideas.

⁶⁴ In many cases the evidence for tenth-century cemetery foundation in Lincoln is circumstantial. See appendix 1 for a discussion of the various church sites and the evidence for their early dates.

within Lincoln. The ensuing increase in the number of parishes with burial rights would have added to the status of the settlement as a whole, and this, in turn, would have had a stimulating effect on the growth of the settlement, as it became increasingly attractive to be associated with it.

In short, the settlement at Lincoln was increasingly characterised by the presence of a number of different cemeteries, all of varying status. In this respect the settlement differed from the surrounding 'rural' areas, where each settlement was associated with a single (parish) cemetery at most.⁶⁵ The distance between individual cemeteries was typically much larger in 'rural' areas as well, even if the spatial relationship between settlements and cemeteries was on the whole equally small. To an extent, the central location of cemeteries within settlements, both urban and rural, may be explained by reference to changing perceptions of death that developed as a result of the spread of Christianity, which regarded the soul as immortal, and death as a gateway to a different (and hopefully better) existence.⁶⁶ But death also had social implications. As Fahlander and Oestigaard (2008: 1) have pointed out, death creates social movement as it opens up positions. During a period characterised by numerous shifts in the established power balances, death would have occupied a central part in people's lives. It created a context for the expression of social aspirations, as it offered an opportunity for the family members of the deceased to invest in burial rites in order to increase the status of their entire family (Hadley 2004b; 2008; 2009). Although it is debatable to what extent people may have been able to choose in which cemetery they buried their deceased family members, the presence of a number of cemeteries within a single settlement, each with their own character in terms of status and demographic, was a visible and tangible expression of the social stratification and complexity that existed within that settlement.

3.5.3: Burials and settlements: Lindsey

As mentioned above, the relationship between late Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and 'rural' settlements remains under-explored. The only exception in this respect is North Lincolnshire, where the University of Sheffield has carried out a number of research investigations, including those at Fillingham and Whitton (Hadley 2007) that addressed the issue (sections 3.3 and 3.5.1). In addition, a number of developer-funded and rescue excavations in Lindsey have chanced upon evidence for the relationship between settlements and cemeteries, as happened at Barton-upon-Humber (appendix 6.1.2) (fig. 14). For that reason, the following discussion necessarily focuses on Lindsey. The remainder of this section will provide an

⁶⁵ As suggested in section 3.2, some cemeteries may have served more than one parish.

⁶⁶ Indeed, what little is known about the Germanic religion from Bede, the Icelandic sagas and other Christian sources, a recurring theme is the belief that eventually the whole world would come to an end, a more pessimistic view than that proposed by Christianity.

overview of the archaeological evidence, and place these case studies in the context of theories about the relationship between settlement formation and burial activity.

Hadley (2007) has argued that space within continuously occupied settlements was frequently reallocated for a different purpose during the middle to late Anglo-Saxon periods. Ground that was used for domestic settlement may be given over to funerary activity, and *vice versa*. On the whole, there seem to be two 'models' for the relationship between burial activity and rural settlement in Lincoln and Lindsey. The first model, which is similar to the *early* development of Lincoln (section 3.5.2), involves a pre-existing burial ground associated with a religious foundation, around which a polyfocal settlement developed in the course of the ninth or tenth centuries, even if the character of the site may have changed in the process. The second model has more in common with the *later*, tenth- to eleventh-century development of Lincoln, whereby formalised cemeteries and/or parish churches were superimposed onto pre-existing settlements. This can be seen as an act of appropriation, whereby the landscape became more fragmented as different communities were increasingly tied to smaller land units through their ancestors, often visibly expressed through the erection of a funerary monument or the construction of a (stone) church.

The development of the settlement at Whitton (appendix 6.1.26) in Lindsey shows most similarities to the early development of Lincoln. The excavated cemetery was in use over a prolonged period of time. A series of three radiocarbon dates gave date ranges of 560-780 AD, 620-780 AD and 680-960 AD at the 95% confidence level (Buckberry 2004: 411), and it was suggested that the cemetery was originally associated with a middle Anglo-Saxon religious foundation, which may have been founded by, again, Æthelthryth in the seventh century AD (appendix 2.2.1) (Hadley and Davies 2001: 17).⁶⁷ The later settlement at Whitton was polyfocal (Hadley 2002a: 45), and it seems plausible that the earlier ecclesiastical foundation was the main attraction for these various settlement cores, as was the case at Lincoln as well. The later phase of the cemetery was identified as a lay cemetery because it included both juveniles and adults (Hadley and Davies 2001: 18). The site of the cemetery was given over to domestic settlement sometime in the ninth century, possibly as the result of an increased need for space (Hadley 2002a: 45; 2007).

Elsewhere in Lindsey, at Barton-upon-Humber, Holton le Clay, Cumberworth and Fillingham, there is evidence that formal graveyards were superimposed upon pre-existing settlements. The late Anglo-Saxon settlement at Barton also had a

⁶⁷ Hadley (*pers. comm.*) prefers West Halton as Æthelthryth's main monastic foundation, but accepts that Whitton, situated at a crossing point over the Humber, may be an associated foundation, partially because it is of the same date, and partially because it is one of the few settlements in the vicinity that retained its Old English name, like West Halton itself.

polyfocal character, and may have developed around an eighth- to ninth-century manorial centre (Gardner and Bunn 2006: 4-5; Rodwell 2007: 5; Rodwell and Rodwell 1982). In the ninth century, a settlement shift occurred, and a cemetery was established in an area previously used for settlement (Tibbles and Steedman 1990: 3). When the existing church of St Peter was excavated in the 1980s, it became clear that the cemetery predated the earliest phase of the church (Rodwell and Rodwell 1982) (appendix 2.3.2).

At the church of St Peter in Holton le Clay, possible remnants of a middle Anglo-Saxon domestic settlement were found underneath a late Anglo-Saxon cemetery (appendices 2.4.16 and 6.1.12) (Sills and Heath 1976: 58). Again, the eleventh-century stone church of St Peter was stratigraphically later than the cemetery itself, and although the existence of a wooden precursor has been postulated (Sills and Heath 1976: 58), no archaeological evidence for its existence has been found. It is therefore equally possible that the early tenth-century grave cover *Holton le Clay 1*, with its *Jellinge*-style zoomorphic decoration, marked the founder's grave (and, by default, the cemetery itself) before the church was built in the eleventh century (see above: section 3.2). The presence of late Anglo-Saxon pottery, animal bone and shell from features excavated on a site adjacent to the church of St Peter (Albone 1999) suggests that domestic activity continued in the immediate vicinity of the cemetery throughout the late Anglo-Saxon period. This suggests that part of the middle Anglo-Saxon settlement may have been cleared for the construction of the cemetery in the wake of the Scandinavian settlement. As such, the developments can be seen as an attempt by the local (and, in the light of the overtly Scandinavian decoration of the funerary monument, probably newly established) landowner to increase his hold over his territory, which he invested with a sense of antiquity by establishing a cemetery at the centre of his peasants' village, and therefore at the centre of their everyday lives.

The development of Cumberworth (appendices 2.17.33 and 6.1.7) reveals strong similarities with the development of Holton le Clay. The medieval village church of St Helen was fully excavated in 1992 (Green 1997). The investigations revealed a stratigraphic sequence beginning with an eighth- or ninth-century sunken-featured building, probably related to a domestic settlement (Green 1997: 3-4). After the building went out of use, a layer of soil was allowed to build up, and the site was subsequently used as a graveyard (Green 1997: 4-5). The earliest burials predated the first (timber) phase of the church (Green 1997: 5). In the tenth- or eleventh-century, a stone church was built on the site (Green 1997: 5). A stone funerary monument, incorporated into the fabric of the medieval church, was also found, but it is unclear whether this was earlier or later than the first timber church (appendix 4.1.12) (Everson and Stocker 1999: 152-53).

Finally, the development of Fillingham (appendix 6.1.9) bears similarities to

that of Holton le Clay although, on the whole, events took place somewhat earlier (Hadley 2000b: 44-46; 2007; Jones 2000: 6). A combination of stratigraphic and ¹⁴C dating revealed that an area that had previously been occupied by domestic settlement was given over to funerary activity in the eighth century, although settlement activity continued in the immediate vicinity (Buckberry 2004: 188; Hadley 2000b: 44-46; 2007; Jones 2000: 6). The changes that occurred at Fillingham thus *predate* the period of Scandinavian settlement (also see Hadley 2000b: 45-46; 2007), suggesting that the developments of the late Anglo-Saxon period found their roots in the preceding middle Anglo-Saxon period (chapter 6).

Other examples from Lindsey where domestic settlement and burial activity occur in close vicinity prior to the late Anglo-Saxon period have been identified at Flixborough (Loveluck 2007; Loveluck and Atkinson 2007) and possibly at Barrow (Hadley 2007: 198). These types of sites, where domestic activity is found in close proximity to a communal cemetery, represent the majority of burial sites within Lindsey. However, there are a small number of instances where the dead were treated very differently indeed, and a closer look at these unusual cases – and their various interpretations – can provide further insight into the significance of the dead for the living.

Two examples of isolated middle Anglo-Saxon burials from Lindsey are the middle Anglo-Saxon so-called smith's grave at Tattershall Thorpe (Hinton 2000), and the seventh-century barrow burial from Caenby (Geake 1997: 167). The smith, whose identification rests on metalworking tools and a box containing pieces of scrap-metal that were found in his grave, was discovered during the excavation of a Neolithic settlement site, and constituted the only Anglo-Saxon feature on the site (Hinton 2000). He was buried in a liminal position, near the boundary between two *wapentakes* as well as the boundary between Lindsey and Kesteven, which has led to the suggestion that the smith was a travelling craftsman who died during a visit to a nearby estate (possibly the nearby settlement of *Coningsby*, or 'the king's settlement') (Hinton 2000). As an outsider, he could not be buried in the communal cemetery, but he was nevertheless buried with due respect (hence the grave goods) out of fear for the magical powers related to his craft (Hinton 2000; 2003). The isolated burial at Caenby, on the other hand, which was accompanied by a bronze buckle, a sword and a shield with silver mounts, as well as possible helmet fragments and some horse bones, is commonly interpreted as a burial of extremely high status, whose isolated yet visible location within the landscape was a statement of political control, an attempt to organise the landscape during the period of state formation and Christianisation (Reynolds 2009a: 207).

Late Anglo-Saxon examples of isolated burials are less common. Possible examples include a possible late Anglo-Saxon burial from Broughton, which was found associated with a tenth-century boundary ditch; however, the stratigraphic

relationship with the ditch could not be established, and this burial may also be of prehistoric date (Buckberry 2004: 351) (appendix 6.1.4). In Scotter, there were reportedly two different cemeteries, one near the village church (which was unfortunately destroyed without being recorded) and another one on the other side of the village green (Buckberry 2004: 392-93). The second cemetery was excavated in the nineteenth century, and according to antiquarian reports the skeletons were found in unusual positions (Buckberry 2004: 392-93). Although this cemetery is not mentioned in most discussions on late Anglo-Saxon execution cemeteries (such as Reynolds 2009a), the alleged unusual positions of the bodies may suggest that this was an execution cemetery (appendix 6.1.16). The exclusion of criminals from communal cemeteries is well attested in the late Anglo-Saxon period (Reynolds 2009a).

The only definite example of a late Anglo-Saxon isolated burial from Lindsey is a double burial of a female and adolescent at Swinhope, inserted into the northwestern terminal of a Neolithic longbarrow, and dated, using ^{14}C techniques, to 1090 +/- 70 BP (or the tenth or eleventh centuries) (Buckberry 2004: 402; Philips 1985: 72-73; 1989: 32-34, 169-71) (appendix 6.1.20). As the discovery was made in the context of a project that aimed to reconstruct prehistoric land-use patterns, and no cultural material was found associated with the burials, no interpretation was attempted beyond the assignment of a 'Viking Age' date (Philips 1989: 169-71). The adolescent was heavily disturbed, but both seemed to have been supine and extended. The woman's hands had possibly been folded in her lap (Philips 1989: 34: fig. 3.5). No clear grave-cut was discovered, and it was concluded that they must have been interred in a shallow grave in the slumped northwest corner of the mound (Philips 1989: 33). No note was made on their alignment. Analysis of the skeletal remains (Philips 1989: 149-60) revealed that the woman had been between 25 and 35 years old when she died, and had some pathological changes in the spine that were identified as osteophytes (Philips 1989: 153). The adolescent was between 12 and 15 years old when he or she died (Philips 1989: 156).

The circumstances of the burial – the location in a prehistoric mound, the shallow nature of the grave and the absence of grave goods – indicate that that the woman and adolescent were social outcasts, and that they were not buried with great care (see Reynolds 2009a: 209-18). It may be possible – providing the human remains are still in storage somewhere (again, no note was made regarding their final deposition) – that stable isotope analysis could reveal whether the individuals buried here were of Scandinavian descent; however, this method does not guarantee any answers, as the isotope signatures from different regions can be the same (Budd *et al.* 2004). Besides, although isolated burials under mounds are sometimes considered as 'Scandinavian' (section 3.3), the presence of an adolescent

is highly unusual in this context. The alternative possibility exists that the woman and the adolescent were execution victims; however, both women and adolescents are rare in execution cemeteries (Reynolds 2009a: 170). Their interpretation as social outcasts therefore seems most appropriate, although the reasons for their status must remain open to speculation.

If only social outcasts were buried in isolated locations, it was clearly important for the status of an individual and his or her family to be buried in a communal (consecrated) graveyard. The social importance of burial rites has also been highlighted in the context of the contemporary Frankish kingdoms. Paxton (1990: 168) has argued that, in the Frankish realm, death was seen as a moment for anointment, confession and reconciliation, and that in the course of the ninth century, the rituals surrounding the moment of death were becoming increasingly important. According to Paxton (1990: 207), this was directly related to the political uncertainty of the time, as "the later ninth century [was] a time of invasion, confusion, and breakdown on the political scene, [and] was [therefore also] a time of energetic creation and synthesis in ritual life". If this idea is transferred onto the late Anglo-Saxon situation, an argument can be made that here, too, the political instability caused by the ninth-century raids had a profound impact on the ritual life of the inhabitants, both 'native' and new, of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. If death was a moment for reconciliation, what better solution was there than to make no distinction between 'native' and 'viking', and to bury them all within the same cemeteries, with the exception of 'real' social outcasts, such as strangers and criminals?

3.5.4: Burials and settlements: conclusions

In sum, it seems that, in terms of the burial evidence, Lincoln differed from settlements in the surrounding region because it housed a number of different communities, each of which had their own cemetery. The pre-viking cemeteries at St Paul-in-the-Bail and Saltergate may both have been linked to separate middle Anglo-Saxon religious foundations, which were a focal point for other forms of economic, political, religious and social activities. As such, they attracted groups of tradesmen, craftsmen, and secular and ecclesiastical aristocrats, some of which established their own parishes with associated cemeteries, such as the excavated cemetery of St Mark in Wigford, or the postulated parishes and cemeteries in the Upper and Lower Cities. In all this, the relationship between burial activity and settlement activity was thoroughly dynamic, each providing the driving force for the development of the other. One thing is, however, obvious from the literary evidence: the presence of the dead added status to the dwelling places of the living.

In the 'rural' parts of Lindsey, settlement and funerary activity were also

inherently related, and not so very different from the situation in Lincoln. In some cases, as at Whitton, a rural settlement may have developed around a pre-existing religious foundation with associated cemetery, as was also the case at Lincoln. In other cases, as happened at Holton le Clay, Cumberworth and Fillingham, cemeteries may have been superimposed upon pre-existing settlements. This was presumably done to boost the status of the settlement, and to legitimise the power of the local landowner through his ancestors, who were now increasingly buried in the centre of rural settlements and at the centre of village life, their graves often made visible through the erection of funerary monuments. The example from Fillingham has demonstrated that such strategies pre-dated the period of Scandinavian settlement, even if the need for such explicit statements may have been felt more strongly during periods of social unrest.

3.6: Funerary deposits as a medium for social and political display

3.6.1: Funerary deposits as a medium for social and political display:

introduction

Closer analysis of the specific rituals that were performed during the burial of the deceased, of which funerary deposits are the outcome (Price forthcoming), can shed light on aspects of social and political display that are relevant to the research questions that stand central to this thesis. The aim of such rituals would have been multi-layered, as the message they conveyed expressed statements related to religion, age, gender, status and social aspiration, either of the deceased or of his or her surviving family members. The following section will only discuss those aspects of social and political display that shed light on the development of Lincoln in its regional context, and will not go into the full range of socio-political messages that can be expressed through funerary rites.

3.6.2: Funerary deposits below ground as a medium for social and political display

Although organic preservation in the excavated cemetery sites in Lincoln was on the whole not good (even in the relatively low-lying cemetery of St Mark's Church (appendix 5.3.3) in Wigford no wood survived), it seems that most burial rites, including coffined burials, chest burials, stone-lined graves and charcoal burials, occur both in Lincoln and elsewhere. Still, there is *one* type of burial rite that does not seem to have been recorded for Lincoln at all. This is the use of wood from boats, recognisable by the typical metal fittings that commonly occur in boat construction, as recognised at Barton-upon-Humber (Rodwell 2007; Waldron 2007) (appendix 6.1.2; section 3.2). This may be the result of the fact that a larger amount of wood from boats that had gone out of use was available at Barton than in Lincoln, but as both settlements were situated on waterways, and boat wood in

funerary context *did* occur at York Minster (Hadley *pers. comm.*; Phillips and Heywood 1995), it is also possible that the difference in the type of wood that was used was socially significant.

On one level, it can be argued that the occupants of Barton were more closely associated with York than with Lincoln, a suggestion that is strengthened by the Yorkshire Millstone Grit used for the tenth-century architectural carvings from the church of St Peter. However, it may be possible to suggest a different explanation as well. Boat burials are recorded for pre-Christian Scandinavia, but also for the pre-Christian Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, including, of course, the famous example from Sutton Hoo, excavated in the early twentieth century (Bill 1997; Carver 1992; 1998; Meulengracht Sørensen 1997; Sjøvold 1957). There is no evidence to suggest that the Church actively forbade boat burial – in fact, Staecker (2003) has argued that in Scandinavia, burial rites that involved boats or other modes of transport increased after the conversion – and although burials in complete boats are not recorded in a churchyard context in England (despite attempt to prove the contrary for the York Minster cemetery (see Phillips and Heywood 1995)), it is likely that the ritual expressed a message that was more complex than merely stating the religious beliefs of the deceased.

The use of boat timbers may indicate that the deceased had been part of a seafaring community. As maritime activity was to an important extent associated with 'viking' activity, it is possible that the use of boat timbers, which in a Lincolnshire context occurred exclusively at Barton, indicates that the community based at Barton-upon-Humber had a more clearly defined 'Scandinavian' or even 'viking' identity than the inhabitants of Lincoln itself. As discussed above (section 3.3), the evidence from stable isotope analysis from a number of burials at Barton indicated that some individuals buried here were born in the western parts of the British Isles, and may have been of Scandinavian descent (Budd *et al.* 2004; Hadley 2008a: 176; MacPherson 2006). No comparable analysis has been carried out on the skeletal material from Lincoln, and the possibility should therefore not be excluded that some of the individuals who lived and were buried there were Scandinavians as well. However, as differences in the use of burial rites are culturally rather than biologically determined, it may be possible to suggest that the inhabitants of Lincoln did not wish to portray themselves as 'Scandinavians' or 'vikings', whilst some of the inhabitants of Barton regarded their 'viking' background as part of their identities.

3.6.3: Funerary deposits above ground as a medium for social and political display

Whereas funerary deposits below ground would have only been visible before the grave was filled in, grave covers and markers, in particular those made of stone,

continued to express their message for much longer, and were therefore arguably more suitable for social and political display. Although there is evidence that wooden grave markers were used in Lincolnshire as well, for example at Holton le Clay (appendix 6.1.12), none of these have survived. The following section will therefore focus entirely on funerary sculpture. First, it will address aspects of the decoration on the grave markers that are usually not discussed, and second, it will analyse the implications of erecting stone memorials within the landscape in the context of settlement development. It will do so by applying the theoretical concept of materiality, or “[the] style of enquiry that engages with the unavoidable qualities of a material” (Taylor 2008: 297).

The sculptural material from Lincolnshire is not typically analysed from an art-historical perspective, although Everson and Stocker (1999) do provide a detailed description of the different decorative patterns on the various monument types. The reason for this lack of attention to the Lincolnshire sculpture amongst art-historians is undoubtedly their mass-produced and homogenous nature. Unlike the Yorkshire sculpture, figural carving on funerary monuments rarely occurs in Lincolnshire, except on the single example from Crowle (appendix 4.1.11) (Everson and Stocker 1999: 25; ill. 146, 148), and the two crucifixion scenes on the crosses from Conisholme (appendix 4.1.9) (Everson and Stocker 1999: 132-33) and Marton (appendix 4.1.22) (Everson and Stocker 1999: 227-28). In addition, some bird motifs occur on the sculpture fragments from Broadgate (appendix 3.2.2) (Everson and Stocker 1999: 197-98) and Holton le Clay (appendix 4.1.16) (Everson and Stocker 1999: 149-51). All other funerary sculpture fragments from Lincolnshire are decorated with different combinations of interlace strands, simple crosses, and moulded borders. In particular the Lindsey products and the mid-Kesteven grave-covers are remarkably homogenous in their decorative patterns. Although the Ancaster and Barnack products showed more variation, their decoration is still non-figural and relatively uniform compared to the Yorkshire sculpture (section 3.2).

In order to understand the near-absence of figural carvings, it is necessary first to consider the significance of figural carvings. Much of the ninth- and tenth-century figural sculpture from the kingdom of Northumbria combines elements that could be interpreted as having either Christian or Norse connotations, often involving warrior-on-horseback scenes. Bailey (1980: 101-75) and Lang (1976: 83-94) explain these sculptures as a conscious effort to create common ground for both Christians and pagans in an attempt to further the assimilation between ‘natives’ and ‘settlers’ (also see Hadley 2006: 9). Hadley (2008b: 283-84) has furthermore proposed that they were created for an aristocracy who were dealing with competing notions of acceptable masculine behaviour at a time of considerable social disruption. In this respect they were not very different from the tradition of furnished burial, in particular weapon burials (see above), leading Hadley (2006:

258-59; 2008) to suggest that this type of funerary sculpture took over from the tradition of weapon burials.

The absence of figural carvings of armed men in Lincolnshire deserves further comment. According to Hadley (2008b: 284), these monuments with warrior imagery were usually erected "at the periphery of royal authority". Although it can be argued that Lindsey was no less peripheral to the royal authority of the southern Anglo-Saxon realm than the Vale of York was, sculpture production in Lindsey did not take off until much later, at which point different concerns may have influenced the tradition, especially if the driving force behind their initial production was the bishop of Lincoln. These concerns were clearly no longer rooted in heroic values, nor were they concerned with creating a bridge between Nordic mythology and Christianity. The lack of concern for heroic values on the part of the Lindsey elite was already apparent some decades earlier, when an independent coinage was produced at Lincoln that was dedicated to St Martin, a convert saint who had become famous, amongst other things, for laying down his arms and refusing to fight after his conversion to Christianity (chapter 4).

If the decision to depict mythological or biblical scenes on funerary sculpture conveyed a message to its observers, so was the choice *not* to do anything of the sort. Valdez del Alamo and Pendergast (2000: 1) have drawn attention to the fact that funerary memorials "established a dialogue between the living and the dead and articulated mutual benefits for both parties" and that "memory was the guarantor of eternity for the deceased and for the community of believers. It was the bridge across the permeable membrane separating the living and the dead". In this context it does not matter whether such memorials were highly individualistic or mass-produced. Memory created through individualistic monuments would have placed greater emphasis on existing or constructed differences, whereas memory created through mass-produced monuments, on the other hand, would have emphasised a common past and a common ancestry. In other words, the erection of a piece of sculpture that was similar to an existing piece of sculpture would have indicated that the patron who commissioned the second piece wanted to be regarded as belonging to the same social group as the patron of the first.

If production of the Lindsey-type sculpture was indeed organised from Lincoln, possibly under the initial patronage of the bishop of Lincoln, the message that its products expressed had implications for the identity of Lincoln as well. If the message was one of social, political and religious unity, then Lincoln was the centre from which such unity emanated over the surrounding region. The envisaged effect would have been in line with the ideology of Alfred of Wessex (d. 899), whose visions of a united England had set the West Saxon expansion in motion less than a century earlier (Foot 1996; 1999; Nelson 1993), strengthening the suggestion that the sculpture tradition was instigated by the bishop, who himself

was established to counteract the power of York and facilitate the incorporation of Lindsey into a united Anglo-Saxon realm.

The lack of decorative variation on the Lindsey products is uncommon in the context of (near-) contemporary sculpture. In addition to the above-mentioned Yorkshire products, the contemporary Manx sculpture was also highly variable (Kermode 1892), as were the earlier Welsh grave stones (Longden 2003; Petts 2003), or the later Scandinavian rune-stones (Sawyer 2003). If charged with finding a sculpture assemblage that may have provided the inspiration for such homogeneity, a parallel may be the simple funerary sculpture with incised crosses from the middle Anglo-Saxon phase at the monastic foundation at Whitby (Lang 2001; http://www.dur.ac.uk/corpus/Whitby_Updates.htm), which, unlike the later, eleventh-century tradition of slabs with simple crosses (see above), was still clearly a local rather than a cross-regional style. In a Christian context, such simple and uniform decoration can be argued to reflect the idea that all men are equal, also expressed in the Biblical metaphor of 'sheep' or 'fish', two species that are not exactly known for their individuality, to denote Christians. It is possible that the low degree of decorative variation on the Lindsey-products should also be placed in this light.

In this context it may be worth briefly focusing on the iconography of the cross on the Lindsey-type markers. Everson and Stocker (1999: 203) regard only the markers with *three* crosses (a central one flanked by two smaller ones), like the examples from St Mark's (*St Mark 7 and 17* (appendix 3.3.3)) (Everson and Stocker 1999: 203, 209), which possibly formed a composite monument, as "unusually explicitly Christian among the later pre-Conquest sculpture in the county", because of their possible reference to the three crosses on Golgotha, and the redeeming power of the Crucifixion. However, the depiction of a single Christian cross on the Lindsey-markers, such as *Lincoln Cathedral 2* (appendix 3.1.2), is, in the opinion of the current author, no less 'explicitly' Christian.

The significance of the cross, or more precisely the significance of the process of erecting a cross in the landscape, may have carried complex messages to the Anglo-Saxon mind. In the *HE* (III: 2), Bede refers to a wooden cross that was erected by King Oswald of Bernicia (d. 642) as "the first sign of the Christian faith to be erected in Bernicia". Wood (2006: 3-5) regards this story as a 'Bedan' invention to draw a comparison between Oswald and Constantine the Great, whose mother Helena discovered the true Cross, but who also obtained an important military victory because of his veneration of a Christian cross. The story about Constantine and Helena was rendered into Old English by the poet Cynewulf, and survived in the tenth-century *Vercelli*-manuscript (Bradley 1982: 109), which suggests that these stories were familiar to a late Anglo-Saxon audience as well. It is possible, therefore, that the process of erecting a cross (or monumental depiction

of a cross) would have carried a significance *beyond* the purely religious, as it established a link with previous great Christian kings, including the Anglo-Saxon king Oswald, who granted the island of Lindisfarne to St Aidan to establish a monastery there (the same monastery that was attacked by a group of viking raiders in 793), and was so saintly that after his death his hands were kept at Bamburgh as relics, and apparently never decayed (ASC E: 27). Even though the crosses that were erected in the Lincolnshire landscape were inscribed in stone rather than constructed out of wood, like the true Cross (described in Cynewulf's *Elene* as 'the tree of glory' or 'the holy tree'; trans. Bradley 1982), it was the symbol that mattered in this respect, and its potential to associate the landholding elite, some of whom came from pagan backgrounds, with saintly kings like Constantine and Oswald, both of whom were important facilitators for the spread of Christianity across their respective realms.

Just as the choice to mass-produce sculpture is socially meaningful, so is the choice to produce it at all. The use of stone in a monumental sense was extremely limited in Lincolnshire prior to the tenth century. However, the later tenth century was characterised by a prolific sculpture tradition, whilst the eleventh century saw the construction of the first stone churches, followed, after the Norman Conquest, by secular buildings constructed from stone. What, then, inspired the tenth-century Lincolnshire secular elite, or the late ninth-century Yorkshire elite, to start imitating a practice – the use of stone for monumental purposes – that until then had mainly occurred in a 'monastic' context?

One of the undeniable qualities of stone is that it is a permanent and durable material. Seen from this context, it is possible to suggest that the increased use of stone for monumental purposes was symptomatic of a movement towards an increased permanence and control of the landscape. This process had been set in motion in the conversion period, when, under the influence of Christianity and the related process of state formation, land became increasingly commoditised as it gradually replaced portable wealth as the basis for wealth and power (Blair 2005: 8-9, 49-51; Campbell 1989; Ten Harkel forthcoming a; Wickham 2006). One way through which this process of increased landscape organisation found expression was in the seventh-century practice of barrow building, itself possibly a reaction *against* Christianity, but which nevertheless represented a process of restructuring of the landscape that was potentially even more permanent than the erection of stone sculpture (see Blair 2005: 8-9, 49-51). The main difference between barrow building and the erection of sculpture was the material itself. Whereas earthen barrows blended into the surrounding landscape, and can be seen as belonging to a culture whose existence was based upon a very close relationship with the natural landscape as a sacred and meaningful place in itself, sculpture was undeniably an artificial and man-made imposition upon the surrounding landscape, even if the

material from which it was made was, of course, natural. The significance lay in the cultural reference: in Anglo-Saxon England, up to that point, stone was the stuff that the ruined Roman *civitates* were made of, places which the Church had appropriated as their locations of choice, where 'civilisation' was kept protected from the natural wilderness (see *Durham* (section 3.5.2)). The use (and sometimes reuse) of stone *outside* the strictly 'urban' (in the widest sense of the word) and/or monastic context implied that civilisation was no longer restricted to 'urban' and 'monastic' locations, but was spreading as the ecclesiastical and secular elites from these 'urban' and 'monastic' settlements visibly took control over the wilderness outside.

The gradual commoditisation of the landscape under the influence of the conversion and the related process of state formation had far-reaching consequences for the archaeological remains that were created. Geake (1997) has drawn attention to the increased importance of burial location, with churchyard burial at the top of the scale, rather than lavish grave goods as a means to express status.⁶⁸ Symonds (2003a: 57) believes that these changes, which she views as the transformation of society into a land-based 'feudal' system, are expressed in the increased importance of the wool trade, which became a fixed element in the relationship between town and country, allowing for the surplus of both areas to be exchanged. The increased permanence of the landscape had a profound effect on settlement development as well. As Blair (2005: 194) has noted, "eighth-century rural settlements tended to be less structured and stable than high medieval ones, and dispersed settlement patterns were more general [in the eighth century] than they were to be (at any rate in lowland England) by the twelfth century". The development of boundary features in Anglo-Saxon settlements and cemeteries are another expression of the increased permanence and organisation of the landscape. These begin to appear in the later sixth century, contemporary with the conversion, but became increasingly common in the seventh and eighth centuries. Reynolds (2003: 98) interprets these changes in the light of "the growth and consolidation of the early English kingdoms whose increasing geographical extent, at the expense of each other, required new forms of social organisation".

Domestic architecture was also affected. Although older studies of rural settlement often highlighted the difficulty of assessing the lifespan of individual buildings (Everson 1993: 92-93), more recent research has highlighted attempts to increase the lifespan of timber buildings. This was done through the development of building types that did not involve vertical posts sunk into the ground to support the structures, as these posts were very prone to rotting away, but had stone

⁶⁸ It is interesting to note that the amount of dress accessories from later ninth- and tenth-century graves is extremely low compared to the sheer numbers of metal-detected finds that have been found in Lindsey (chapter 5), which suggests that there was clearly a different 'fashion' for the dead than for the living.

footings (Gardiner 2004: 345). Two main phases of this development have been identified. The first occurred from c. 800, when high-status dwellings were increasingly built on stone or gravel footings, such as building 1 at Flixborough, and the second occurred from the tenth century onwards, and has predominantly been recognised in 'urban' contexts, including structure 9 from Flaxengate (Gardiner 2004: 346, 350-54).⁶⁹

The two developments identified by Gardiner were inspired by very different incentives. Gardiner (2004: 357) has argued that the introduction of buildings with gravel and stone footings on ninth-century high-status sites was functionally specific, intended to create "an impression of longevity for social or spiritual purposes", and that "their methods of construction were not subsequently adopted on a wider range of sites, because there was not a wider perception in the ninth century of a need for enduring buildings". However, the tenth-century developments were related to an increased permanence of settlement patterns. To quote Gardiner (2004: 357-58) once more:

This [*i.e.* the functionally specific nature of the ninth-century architectural experiments] makes it all the more interesting that from the 10th century there was renewed interest in methods for constructing buildings with a greater life. The reasons for that need to be considered in the context of wider changes in society. From this time onwards villages became established on permanent sites, and there were more closely defined boundaries and rigid field systems. These changes mark a fundamental shift in the permanence of the landscape. Settlements were being established which were intended to last. The construction of buildings with greater longevity both reflected, and contributed to, the developing appreciation of an increasingly permanent and tightly structured environment.

The significant (re-) occupation of the former Roman towns, which had been fixed and visible locations within the landscape for many centuries, was also a symptom of this perception of increased permanence of the landscape. As argued previously (section 3.2), the initial re-occupation of these sites in the wake of the conversion was deeply meaningful from an ideological perspective, as it constituted the civilisation of the old 'pagan' order into a new Christian order (Blair 2005: 249). Yet the predominantly ecclesiastical character of these settlements throughout the middle Anglo-Saxon period reveals that for a time, the ideological aspects of their re-occupation were valued primarily by the ecclesiastical elites. The secular elites did not embrace the new worldview until later, when interpretations of the Scandinavian attacks as God's punishment, as advocated by contemporary writers such as Alcuin (d. 804) (Allott 1974; Whitelock 1979: 775-79 (nos 193 and 194)) and Alfred (d. 899) (*Prose Preface*) prompted them to reject their old ways in an

⁶⁹ However, the deeper stratification and usually more careful excavation on urban sites ensures a better survival rate, and one such self-supporting rural structure has been found in a twelfth-century rural context in Eynesbury (Cambs.) (Gardiner 2004: 354).

attempt to cure the problem.

A well-known source that conveys contemporary sentiments regarding the vikings is a letter written by the Northumbrian scholar Alcuin to the monks at Lindisfarne following the viking attack on the monastery in AD 793, which blamed the events on the Anglo-Saxons themselves: they had incurred God's wrath because they did not behave like good Christians (Allott 1974; Whitelock 1979: 775-79). Likewise, in his *Prose Preface* to his translation of Gregory's *Cura Pastoralis*, Alfred expresses a belief that the viking attacks were caused by a lack of (Christian) learning in his realm. The sentiments that these sources convey were built on an existing tradition that viewed destruction as a sign of divine displeasure, whose origins went back much further. An example that is directly relevant in the current context is the passage from Bede's *HE* (II: 16), written in the 730s, long before the vikings first appeared on the scene, in which he refers to the stone church built by Paulinus in the following terms (chapter 2.2.2):

In this city (*civitas*) he [Paulinus] built a stone church of remarkable workmanship; its roof has now fallen either through long neglect or by the hand of the enemy, but its walls are still standing and every year miracles of healing are performed in this place.

Bede was clearly displeased with the current state of affairs in Lincoln, as Paulinus' successors had not seen the process of its 'civilisation' through to the end, and even allowed it to be partially reversed as they let his stone church fall into disrepair. Like the elegiac poem *The Ruin*, its message may have been primarily didactic, based on "the idea that in the remains of 'extinct' civilisations, there are not only clues to the fate which will befall our society, but sources of ancient wisdom which, if interpreted correctly, may help us to avoid cataclysm" (Denning 1999: 90).⁷⁰

It is clear that the ideological significance of the late ninth-century re-occupation of Lincoln was far more complex than a revival of the Roman past, as Carver (1987) (chapter 1.3) has suggested. In this case, the ideology that contributed to Lincoln's development had been filtered through several centuries of Christian doctrine, belief and social organisation. Yet even within the context of Lincoln's 'revival', Christianity was not the only contributing ideology. After all, if the objective was to rebuild the *civitas* in the image of Rome or the heavenly Jerusalem, then the question arises why there is no archaeological evidence for the reconstruction of the old stone buildings, or the repair of the city walls, whilst there is more plentiful evidence for the deliberate robbing of Roman masonry structures, as was observed at The Collection (appendix 1.2.1.14), Flaxengate (appendix

⁷⁰ This latter statement was made in the context of contemporary popular archaeology books that focus on lost civilisations by authors such as Graham Hancock, but is therefore no less relevant in the current context.

1.2.1.15) and Park Street (appendix 1.2.1.4). What is more, although excavations at the Central Library (appendix 1.2.1.23) revealed that a number of dumps were deposited on top of the Roman rampart in the late Anglo-Saxon period, these probably represent rubbish disposal rather than intentional repairs, a suggestion that is strengthened by the fact that numerous cut features (possibly including rubbish pits) were also dug into the rampart (Jarvis 1996: 8). Finally, excavations at St Mark's Station (appendix 1.3.1.8) suggested that the surviving walls of half-collapsed Roman structures were incorporated into Anglo-Saxon timber buildings, but yielded no evidence for repair in stone (Trimble 1998: 72).

The only tentative evidence for repair of a Roman building comes from Flaxengate (appendix 1.2.1.15), but the evidence dates to the middle Anglo-Saxon period. Here, a third- to fourth-century Roman apsidal building remained in use, probably as a church, until the eighth or ninth century. In the ninth century, a dark brown loam was deposited over the site, but not inside the building, suggesting that the building still retained its roof (Lincoln HER 70360-MLI85944). From the tenth century onwards, the building stone was robbed, but the destruction layers of the building contained post-Roman finds, including seventh- to ninth-century vessel- and window-glass (Lincoln HER 70360-MLI85944; Perring 1981: 6).

Why did the inhabitants of Lincoln not try harder to rebuild their city in stone? The explanation can certainly *not* be found in a lack of technical ability for masonry construction on the part of the Anglo-Saxons, as the surviving tenth-century stone fabric of the church at Barton-upon-Humber clearly illustrates that the necessary expertise existed. Besides, the seventh-century window glass found at Flaxengate suggests that they were also capable of completing repairs. What is more, there is evidence that specialist moneyers and potters from the continent were employed in late ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln (chapters 4 and 6), and there is no reason why specialist masons could not have been employed as well. Can the initial 'restoration' of Lincoln, not in stone but from organic materials, then be seen as a compromise between the ecclesiastical elite, whose primary concern was with the 'civilisation' of Anglo-Saxon society, and the secular elite, who were accustomed to using organic building materials?

An argument that organic building materials also had ideological connotations that were also acceptable in the context of the Christian belief can be found in Alfred's *Preface to Augustine's Soliloquies*. This *Preface* employs the metaphor of building a house from timbers that were collected in the forest as a means to improve the state of learning and thereby the fortunes of the entire kingdom. Such a metaphor exists in opposition to the later medieval concept that there was a direct contrast between city and wilderness (or *cultus* and *incultus*) (Maxwell 2007: 128), which is already apparent in the twelfth-century poem *Durham*, which portrays the city as surrounded by steep slopes and rocks from the forests and

dales surrounding the city. In Alfred's *Preface*, however, and in Lincoln in reality, the organic materials from the wilderness outside were allowed to invade the ruins of the decaying stone city.

The rationale behind the choice to build in timber rather than stone may have been the fate that had befallen the old Roman town, which, given its present state, was clearly not good, and could be seen as an example of the fate that would ultimately befall the decadent City of Earth, as described by Augustine in his *De Civitate Dei*. In other words, rather than a *reconstruction* process, the 're-occupation' of Lincoln was a *destruction* and *construction* process, not in the sense as Maxwell (2007: 47) described for the later medieval period, between nature and 'civilisation', but between an old civilisation and a new civilisation. Seen from this perspective, the transformation of Roman masonry into funerary sculpture, as is attested for *Lincoln Cathedral 2* (appendix 3.1.2) and possibly *Lincoln City Broadgate 1* (appendix 3.2.2) and *Lincoln St Mark 16* (appendix 3.3.3), also gains a more complicated ideological significance. Rather than merely constituting an acknowledgement of the 'Roman' or 'Christian' associations of the material, or creating a tangible link with the ancestors, it also added a material dimension to the process of deconstruction (of something that had once firmly belonged to the living) and construction (into a monument that was erected to allow the living to remember the dead) (also see Stocker 2007).

3.6.4: Funerary deposits as a medium for social and political display: conclusions

The preceding discussion has highlighted those aspects of late ninth- and early tenth-century funerary deposits that shed light on the changing significance of Lincoln within its regional context. Although variations in burial rites below ground continued to exist, they were gradually becoming less important as a means for social display, as funerary sculpture increasingly took over this role. A combination of art-historical and materialistic approaches to the sculpture revealed that Lincoln could be seen as the centre from which the surrounding region was being civilised and unified. At the same time, the consolidation of existing power relations between the secular and ecclesiastical elites led to a complicated discussion about 'the city', which had as many roots in the Christian, classical tradition as in the pagan, Anglo-Saxon past.

3.7: Production and power: the rise of a new elite

Absent from this chapter so far is a consideration of the economic and socio-political dimensions of sculpture *production*, and a brief discussion of these aspects will therefore close this chapter. The issue who commissioned the individual monuments has not been addressed yet, nor have the social and economic

implications of the sudden and relatively significant demand for expensive, specialist products. Again, these questions will only be answered in as far as they are relevant for our understanding of the development of Lincoln.

As Gondek (2006: 107) has demonstrated, the process of ordering, making, transporting and erecting sculpture is a socially meaningful process:

It [*i.e.* sculpture] is a statement of power not only because of the immediate visual messages of the completed monument, but also because it represents the culmination of a series of socially loaded processes ... The goal of comparing and contrasting levels of investment is to reveal concentrations of power at particular sites and regional patterns of investment. Exploration of these patterns should then be able to inform political and ideological landscapes.

What is more, the process of commissioning, producing and erecting sculpture created social relationships similar to gift-exchange, as the 'gift' or the commission was given to someone who became indebted to the patron, whose prestige increased as his money diminished by paying for such affairs (Gondek 2006: 107). This resulted in a complex web of social relationships:

Through the creation of a carved monument, opportunities could arise for possible relationships between the commissioner(s) and the monastery or church that displays the monument, and those relationships that supplied labour, food, and services for the duration of the production period. Such relationships were literally set in stone, declared, and displayed when a monument was erected (Gondek 2006: 108).

How does this relate to the Lincolnshire sculpture? It is possible that the Lincoln-based sculpture production was instigated by the bishop of Lincoln, who granted individual pieces to his loyal supporters, possibly together with a charter transferring burial rights to their respective manors. However, Lincoln's bishopric was disbanded again and merged with those of Leicester and Dorchester as early as 971 (Everson and Stocker 1999: 12), whilst the production of sculpture continued. It is possible that subsequent bishops continued to patronise the production of sculpture, but this does not sit comfortably with the exclusive occurrence of the Lindsey-type products in Lindsey. Alternatively, the organisation of sculpture production changed.

Perhaps the most important social consequence of the funerary sculpture tradition was the fact that it created a new group of specialist craftsmen (the sculptors) whose knowledge and expertise became indispensable for the power games of the landholding elite, and whose social (and financial) status rapidly improved as a result. In this context, the sculpture from St Mark's in Wigford and St Mary Bishophill Senior in York, commonly interpreted as marking the graves of the aspiring merchant community, take on a new significance. As the landholding elite sought new ways to maintain the traditional power balances, they created a

new 'artisan' elite in the process who provided the means to do so. This artisan elite included metalworkers and moneyers as well, whose social status will be discussed in more detail in the following two chapters. Some of the people who commissioned funerary monuments may have been members of this artisan class themselves, who had benefited enough from the increased investment in expressions of lordly power to be able to afford such visual expressions of their own social aspirations, or they may have been members of the landholding elite who continued to express their allegiance to other landowners. In either case, it was in the interest of the masons to continue producing sculpture.

A final point of interest, however, is the fact that, whereas imagery related to the mythical smith Weland (and Sigurd, foster-son to a smith) is a recurring theme on funerary sculpture, most noticeably from Yorkshire (chapter 5), 'mason' imagery is absent. No references to 'mythical' masons survive in Old English or Old Norse literature either. This is not surprising, given the fact that the use of stone for monumental purposes was so recent that the trade would have been barely recognised as significant (the later importance of the medieval Freemasons' Guild demonstrates that this would eventually change drastically). This may in itself be enough to explain the absence of mason-related imagery on Anglo-Saxon stone sculpture, although perhaps a further explanation can be found in the fact that such self-referential homage would have been considered inappropriate in a Christian context.

3.8: Conclusions

Funerary deposits can provide important insights into the changing identity and role of late ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln. Constituting a type of monumental archaeology, they shape and structure the landscape. At the same time, funerary deposits express and create settlement identities. Analysis of the spatial distribution of funerary sculpture suggested that Lincoln was *not* a homogenous settlement in terms of its demographic composition, or its political affiliations. These political affiliations differed per parish, and each of these had its own allies in the surrounding region. Despite these differences, analysis of the decoration of the monuments suggests that those who commissioned them aimed to create a sense of internal cohesion and unity within Lindsey itself.

Like funerary markers, burial rites shed light on the demographic of a population as well. There were few significant differences in the funerary rites performed in Lincoln as compared to elsewhere in Lindsey, with the exception of the use of boat timbers observed at St Peter's Church in Barton-upon-Humber, which was paralleled at York Minster. Burial rights added status to a settlement, whilst the presence of the ancestors within a settlement provided a tangible relationship between the living and the dead. In the case of the landholding elite,

this legitimised their hold on their territory, which was strengthened through the erection of stone grave covers or markers, which placed a lasting claim on the region that fell under their rule. And if the presence of a cemetery added status to a settlement, Lincoln's status was higher than that of most other settlements, simply because it housed more cemeteries than any other settlement in Lindsey.

The erection of stone sculpture was not the only sign of the increased permanence of the landscape. It was argued that the driving force behind this gradual move towards a more static and commoditised landscape was the Church, which seems likely given the fact that prior to the Norman Conquest, stone was used exclusively for Christian grave monuments and ecclesiastical buildings, at least in a monumental sense. The secular elite, on the other hand, seems to have made a deliberate choice to use organic materials in their reconstruction of the *civitas* of Lincoln. The next chapter, which analyses the coinage, will address the identities of Lincoln's secular elite in more detail.

CHAPTER 4: COINAGE

4.1: Introduction

Many studies that utilise coin data to address the process of urbanisation in late Anglo-Saxon England focus on the economic dimensions of settlement development (see for example Vince 2006). However, as Williams (2007: 180) has pointed out, the study of coin production can also shed light on the political and ideological aspects of the urbanisation process, as coins were a particularly suitable medium for the expression of political and ideological messages. Van Wie (1999: v; also see Williams 2007: 180-81) has argued in the context of modern European coinage:

The act of creating coinage is manifestly political. It is also manifestly economic. And there are important, inescapable artistic and propagandistic overtones as well. For when a political entity creates coinage, it does not simply create blank discs. Coins generally carry a message: words and numerals, of course, but usually more than that. Political symbols, slogans, names, and language, all laden with ideology, bias, self-image, and national identity. ... It is a mirror of political reality; it is also a window into the aims and values of the regime which gave it life. Since coinage is a very public medium, passing from hand to hand, it may rightly be called a branch of the mass media: one, not incidentally, controlled by the governing elite. And like all the arts, coinage has a powerful ability to communicate ideas mere printed words cannot.

This chapter discusses the evidence for coin production and use in late ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln and Lindsey. There is no evidence for coin production in Lincoln prior to the last decades of the ninth century, and until the later tenth century, when the inclusion of mint names became standard practice, the majority of the evidence can only be attributed to Lincoln by inference. There is also some evidence for the existence of a number of so-called 'minor' mints in Lincolnshire around 1000 AD, at Caistor, Torksey (Dolley and Strudwick 1956), Louth, Horncastle and, further south, at Grantham. However, their output was extremely limited, and their lifespan was brief. The mints themselves as well as the designs of the coins will be analysed in the context of the formation and manipulation of political, communal, and 'urban' identities.

On a different level, the distribution patterns of the coins from Lincoln and Lindsey will be analysed (for a discussion of the main methodological concerns, see chapter 2.4.4). A distinction will be made between single finds, thought to represent casual coin loss, and coin hoards, which may be deposited for a number of reasons (chapter 2.4.4). The discussion relating to the coin distribution patterns will partially focus on the different level(s) of monetisation following the viking settlement. This discussion will be continued in chapter 5. In addition, this chapter will analyse the relationship between monetisation and settlement formation, and the formation of 'urban' and mercantile identities.

4.2: The coinage: existing research

In a recent article summarising the current state of research on the coinage of Anglo-Saxon England, Metcalf (2007: 1) made a distinction between the study of *numismatics*, or the detailed study of the coins themselves, on the one hand, and that of *monetary history*, or the study of the production and use of coins in their wider historical context, on the other. The field of numismatics, which focuses on issues such as the identification of die-links, the silver content and weight of the various coinages, and the establishment of an exact chronology and correct attribution to the different mints, has long existed in isolation from other disciplines. Consequently, archaeologists and historians tended to treat coins primarily as dating evidence (see for example Perring 1981), whilst numismatists tried to fit in with established historical frameworks, rather than assess, by reference to the coin data, whether these frameworks were, indeed, correct (Williams forthcoming; in prep.). In more recent years, however, this has changed, primarily due to the efforts of Blackburn (2002; 2004; 2005; 2006; 2007) (a numismatist by training) and Williams (2000-02; 2007; forthcoming; in prep.) (a historian by training), whose work has been invaluable for the integration of coin data into studies of a more historical and archaeological nature. This section will outline the most important recent trends in the study of late Anglo-Saxon coinage in as far as they are relevant in the current context.

Although the Lincoln coinage has not been studied to the same extent as, for example, the York coinage, a number of important publications have nevertheless emerged over the years. One of the earliest studies of the coinage produced at Lincoln was Stewart's (1967) article on the early tenth-century St Martin's coinage. It provides an excellent discussion of the numismatic aspects of this coinage, highlighting, in particular, the similarities with the near-contemporary Sword St Peter coins, minted at York, and the regal coinage of Sihtric Caech, king of York (d. 927), and argues that these similarities imply that Lincoln fell under the direct jurisdiction of the York rulers. Some fifteen years later, Stewart (1983: 114) expanded on this argument, and suggested that the St Martin's coins were struck at Lincoln prior to 926, but went out of use when Sihtric Caech was baptised and married one of Athelstan's sisters. Stewart places Sihtric's regal coinage in the immediate aftermath of his baptism in 926, and suggests that it should be interpreted as a Lincoln-based replacement for the St Martin's. However, the relative chronology of the St Martin's and Sihtric's regal coinage is unclear on numismatic grounds, and Stewart fails to explain why Sihtric would have produced an overtly Christian coinage *before* his baptism as well (the St Martin's coinage). Not many new St Martin's coins have been discovered since the publication of Stewart's (1967) article, and consequently the discussion has not been revisited in

any detail since. However, the recent discovery of a hoard in Yorkshire, which contained one previously unknown St Martin's coin, may revive the interest in this rare issue (Williams in prep.; Williams and Ager 2010).

Another important numismatic study that focuses on Lincoln's coin production is Mossop's (1970) catalogue of the coins produced at Lincoln between c. 890 and 1279 AD. Providing a detailed overview of the various Lincoln coinages, including the identification of moneyers, die-links and weights, this is an invaluable and comprehensive piece of work, as it establishes a basic chronology and typology of the earliest coinages struck at Lincoln. Other studies have since added to our understanding of coin production at Lincoln in the later ninth and tenth centuries, even if none of these look at Lincoln alone. These studies included a detailed numismatic discussion of the coinage of tenth-century England, published by Blunt *et al.* (1989). This study revealed that in the middle decades of the tenth century, following Athelstan's conquest of the north in the late 920s, a coin series was produced at a number of mints in the East Midlands, including at Lincoln, which were not mint-signed. The lack of a mint signature was the reason that Mossop (1970) had not identified these coins, known as the North Eastern series (NE), as potential Lincoln-issues, but analysis of their find spots by Blunt *et al.* (1989) clearly indicated that all the sub-types of the series were struck at various mints in the so-called territory of the Five Boroughs.

The NE series sheds important new light on the political situation in tenth-century England. Following the success of his conquests, King Athelstan instigated a coin reform, which involved the introduction of two new coin types in addition to the two main existing types – the Horizontal- (or Two Line-) (fig. 15 a) and Portrait-type (fig. 15 a) coins – that King Alfred of Wessex (871-99) had introduced in the late ninth century, and had remained in use throughout Edward's (899-924) reign (fig. 15 c). These coins typically do not include a mint-signature, but they do include the moneyer's name. The portrait on the Portrait-type was modelled on the diademed portraits of the later Roman coinages (fig. 15 a) (see for example Reece and James 1986: 35; Sutherland 1974: 280, fig. 568), and the king was usually referred to as REX ('king') (for Athelstan's earlier coinages, see fig. 15 d-f).

The two new coin types that Athelstan introduced after c. 927 are known as the Circumscription Cross type (fig. 15 g) and the Bust Crowned type (fig. 15 f). Both designs allowed more room for text, which meant that the king's title was now expanded from REX ('king') into REX TOT BRIT (*rex totius brittaniae*, 'king of all Britain') or REX SAXORUM ('king of the Saxons'). In addition, a mint signature was now usually included, which created an explicit link between the ruler in whose name the coinage was issued, and the location where it was struck. Finally, the addition of a crown to the king's portrait, which occurred for the first time in Anglo-Saxon numismatic history on Athelstan's Bust Crowned type, can also be read as an

explicit statement of his royal status.

The Circumscription Cross type type became firmly established both in the south and at York. The Bust Crowned type was largely restricted to the south and East Anglia, as indicated by the Norwich mint signature on some of these coins, although it was minted at York towards the end of Athelstan's reign too. However, they are not known from any of the mints in the East Midlands, and it was not until Blunt *et al.* carried out their (1989) study of the tenth-century coinages that it became apparent that these mints continued to produce the traditional Horizontal-type coins, now known as the NE series, which had none of these attributes. This suggests that there was a certain degree of resistance to the blatant royal propaganda of these coins, a suggestion that will be revisited below (section 4.4.4).

A number of studies that focus exclusively on the West Saxon and Mercian coinages also deserve mentioning, as without these, it would not be possible to place the northern coinages in their numismatic context. The standard numismatic overview of early English coinage is still North 1980, which provides a detailed description of coin types from c. 600 to 1272 AD (also see Blackburn 1986a; Blackburn and Grierson 1986). More directly relevant in the current context, however, is Blackburn's (1998) discussion of Alfred's London Monogram coinage, which was copied in Lincoln in the 880s, resulting in a coinage known as the Lincoln Monogram coinage, constituting the earliest mint-signed coinage from Lincoln (section 4.4.2). In addition, a recent series of articles by Blackburn (2001b; 2004; 2005; 2006) provides detailed discussion of all the independent 'Scandinavian' coinages of Anglo-Saxon England. Although none of these studies focuses exclusively on Lincoln, each addresses a different geographical region, including York (Blackburn 2004), East Anglia (Blackburn 2005) and the Midlands (Blackburn 2001b; 2006). Through a comparative study of the various coin designs, die-links, moneyer's names and the distribution of the coins, Blackburn (2001b; 2004; 2005; 2006) sheds light on the early political histories of the various Scandinavian-controlled regions of Anglo-Saxon England. On one level, Blackburn (2004; 2006) has revisited Stewart's (1967) argument that important political links existed between York and Lincoln (Blackburn 2004: 335; 2006: 209; Stewart 1967: 51; 1983: 111). On another level, Blackburn has made a stronger argument for the likely attribution of previously unprovenanced imitative viking coinages, which were amongst the earliest coinages that were produced in the areas that fell under Scandinavian rule in the later ninth century. A summary of the main chronological developments in terms of coin production in Lincoln is summarised in appendix 7.

Imitative issues can be hard to attribute to a specific mint, because they often render the mint signature of the original coins unchanged (if, indeed, a mint signature was even included on the originals). Amongst the earliest imitative coins struck in the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England are two imitative issues

that were struck in the 890s, and were mostly found in the Cuerdale (Yorks.) hoard. The originals are known as the so-called Oxford (Orsnaforda) and Canterbury (Doro) types (Blackburn 2001b: 131), as they included a mint signature, which was still unusual at this time.

Imitations of the Oxford (Orsnaforda) (rendering the mint signature with an 'r' instead of a 'h', and therefore commonly referred to as the 'Orsnaforda'-type), and Canterbury (Doro) types have been attributed to a mint or mints in the so-called territory of the Five Boroughs, mainly because York and East Anglia were producing their own 'Scandinavian' coinages in the 890s (Blackburn 2001b: 131-32). At York, the Scandinavian king Sigeferth (895-900) was producing a regal coinage in large numbers (appendix 7) (Blackburn 2001b: 131),⁷¹ whilst the East Anglian mints produced the so-called St Edmund's coinage in the 890s (appendix 7), which commemorated the East Anglian king Edmund, who had been murdered by viking raiders in AD 869 (section 4.4.3) (Blackburn 2001b: 131). Consequently, Blackburn (2001b) prefers a different mint for the Oxford (Orsnaforda) and Canterbury (Doro) coins, and has argued in favour of their attribution to either Lincoln or Leicester on a number of grounds. First, these are the only two mints in the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England that produced mint-signed coinages that belong to the periods *before* and *after* the 890s, but not *to* the 890s (Blackburn 2001b: 130). In other words, both mints have a gap in their production sequence that the Orsnaforda and Canterbury (Doro) imitations could fill. However, this argument rests entirely on the assumption that minting occurred continuously throughout the early decades of the Scandinavian settlement, whilst it fails to explain why a mint would produce a coinage with an 'incorrect' mint signature *after* it had already produced a mint-signed coinage with the 'correct' mint name.

Blackburn (2001b) provides numismatic arguments for the attribution of the Orsnaforda and Canterbury (Doro) imitations to the region south of the Humber as well. The Orsnaforda coins include two different types. The first type has a reverse that is relatively close to the original Two Line design (fig. 15 m; compare to fig. 15 b). The second type incorporates on its reverse one of more than forty different cross-designs from Sigeferth of York's (895-900) coinage (fig. 15 n; compare to fig. 15 o). This combination of decorative influences from both Wessex and York suggests that the Orsnaforda coins were produced in the Midlands, where both coin types would have been available as a result of political and economic contacts with both regions. The occurrence of Yorkshire sculpture in northern Lincolnshire (chapter 3), and the widespread occurrence of both Northumbrian stycas and southern pennies in Lincolnshire during the ninth century (section 4.3.2), implies

⁷¹ Sigeferth has been identified as the Sigeferth, who, according to the late tenth-century *Chronicle of Æthelweard*, was active in Northumbria in the 890s, and possibly succeeded Guthfrith at York in 895 (Blackburn 2004: 329-31).

that Lincoln is a plausible candidate for the production of these Orsnaforda coins.

The Canterbury (Doro) imitations (fig. 15 q) display a far greater level of variation in terms of the prototypes that were used, which probably indicates that the original Canterbury (Doro) coins circulated in the region where they were copied. No coin finds of the original Alfredian Canterbury (Doro) type have been recognised in Lincolnshire to date, which suggests that these imitations were minted further south. However, the original coins did occur in the Cuerdale (Lancs.) hoard, whilst the *EMC* does not list even one single coin find of this type from all of Lancashire, and it is possible therefore that the discovery of a single hoard in Lincolnshire may yet alter the picture. Lincoln is certainly a plausible candidate in terms of its geographical location, as the North Sea provided a communication route with the more southern regions of Anglo-Saxon England. What is more, analysis by the current author of the mint-signed West Saxon coins that were struck in the 870s has indicated that Canterbury's influence certainly stretched as far north as Lindsey. Of the fourteen coin finds of Alfred's Lunette type of the early 870s, which were found in Lincoln (appendix 8.1.2), Riby (appendix 9.1.29), Torksey (appendix 9.1.41), Louth (appendix 9.1.23), Caistor (appendix 9.1.9), Flixborough (appendix 9.1.13), Barton-upon-Humber (appendix 9.1.5) and Barrow (appendix 9.1.4), only the coin from Barrow was *not* minted at Canterbury.

Taking a more historical approach, a collection of papers that also deserves mentioning in this context is that edited by Graham-Campbell and Williams (2007), which investigates the use of silver in the Viking Age from a historical and archaeological perspective. In particular the article written by Williams (2007) himself is relevant in the current context. This focuses on the ideological and political aspects of late ninth- to eleventh-century coin production in England and Scandinavia, taking an important step towards the integration of current numismatic and historical/archaeological debates. Williams (2007: 183-84) draws attention to three different levels on which coins can be used to recreate past identities (also see Blackburn 2004; 2005; 2006). First, the decision whether to strike coins or not can be a statement of identity in its own right. As summarised in appendix 7, the new elites of the viking-controlled regions of England began striking coinage almost as soon as they had settled, which suggests that they decided to appropriate an identity that involved issuing coins, presumably to integrate more fully into Anglo-Saxon society. Second, the coin legends and iconography can provide insights into the political, regional and sometimes ethnic identities of those who *issued* the coinage. This last aspect has received particular attention in Blackburn's most recent work (2001b; 2004; 2005; 2006).

The third method to use coins to reconstruct identities, according to Williams (2007), is analysis of their distribution patterns, which reveal aspects of the identities of those who *used* the coinage. Williams has not been the first to

acknowledge this; in fact, much previous work has focused on coin use in the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England. A much-debated topic in this context is the supposed level of monetisation of these regions, which can be assessed through analysis of the quantity of single coin finds, and the composition of hoards. Roughly speaking, there are two main types of hoard that occur in England that are relevant in the current context.⁷² The first type can be described as 'mixed' hoards, which contain a mixture of hack-metal (cut pieces of objects, usually made of precious metals, which were intended to be used for payments) and coins (both local and 'foreign' issues). Examples include the Cuerdale (Lancs.) hoard (Graham-Campbell 1992; forthcoming; Williams and Webster 2009) and the recent Vale of York hoard (Williams in prep.; Williams and Ager 2010). The second type are 'coin' hoards, which contain only recent and current issues of coins from the same kingdom or state, all of which may have been legal tender at the time the hoard was buried. Examples from England probably include the Tetney (Lincs.) hoard (appendix 9.1.39) (Gunstone 1981; Walker 1945) and the dispersed Welbourn (Lincs.) hoard (appendix 9.2.11) (Blackburn 1986b). Mixed hoards are believed to be indicative of a so-called bullion economy, whereby transactions were not conducted with coin but with precious metal by weight, and coin hoards are believed to be indicative of a monetary economy (Brooks and Graham-Campbell 1986; Graham-Campbell 2001a; for a Scottish comparison, see Graham-Campbell 1993; for an Irish perspective, see Sheehan 2004; for a Dutch perspective, see Besteman 2004).

As there are a significant number of mixed hoards from Anglo-Saxon England that date to the ninth century, it has been argued that the Scandinavian settlers, who came from a non-monetised society, had brought their bullion economy with them, which initially created a 'dual' economy (Blackburn 2001b; 2002; Graham-Campbell 2001a; Williams 2007: 196-97). Analysis of the finds from Flixborough has recently confirmed this idea, as lead weights and a silver ingot were found in the late Anglo-Saxon levels (Rogers 2009d; Wastling 2009), whilst single coin finds decreased drastically in the ninth century (Archibald 2009). In the later ninth and tenth centuries, as the Scandinavian settlers began to issue their own coinages, this 'dual' economy was gradually replaced again by a monetary economy. The *Checklist of Coin Hoards* reveals a gradual decrease in mixed hoards, and a gradual increase of coin hoards, in the course of the later ninth and tenth centuries. The latest mixed hoard that has been found, which was the hoard from Bossal/Flaxton north of the Humber, dates to c. 927. This suggests that in Northumbria, this 'dual' economy continued into the tenth century (Williams 2007: 197). The mixed hoards from the Scandinavian-controlled areas south of the Humber are all ninth-century

⁷² Excluded from this discussion are metalworking and tool hoards, such as the Flixborough tool hoard (Ottaway 2009c) and the tool and metalworking scrap hoard that was buried in the smith's grave in Tattershall Thorpe (appendix 2.15.22) (Hinton 2000).

in date, which might suggest that here, the reversal back to a monetary economy took place earlier. However, test marks on the coins and the presence of foreign coins in some of the hoards that have been found south of the Humber suggest that coins were still valued primarily for their weight in metal, at least until the first quarter of the tenth century (Williams 2007: 197).

Although the analysis of hoards does shed some light on the levels of monetisation in Anglo-Saxon England, care must be taken not to oversimplify matters. As Metcalf (2007: 1-2) has pointed out, the degree of monetisation in England prior to the Scandinavian settlement varied regionally. The use of coin for monetary purposes was much more widespread in the south and east than elsewhere, which, to Metcalf (2007: 1-2), suggests that it was intrinsically linked to long-distance and inter-regional trade. Other variables must be kept in mind too. As Williams (2007: 179-80) has pointed out, economic exchange was only one of the uses to which coinage could be put (also see Astill in press). Other functions may include the storage of wealth as an indicator of social status (Williams 2007: 179-80). In this context, Williams (2007: 181) has distinguished between three types of economy, which were *not* mutually exclusive, and which included, in addition to a coin-based and a bullion-based economy, also a status-based economy, whereby the *possession* of coins or precious metals, rather than their circulation, established a social structure.

The remainder of this chapter will be structured around the three levels for coin analysis that Williams has proposed (see above). It will start with a discussion of coin *use* through an analysis of their distribution patterns, and move on to a discussion of coin *production*, giving due attention to the rapid adoption of coinage by the new elites as well as to the designs of the coins themselves. All coin finds from Lincoln are given in appendix 8, whilst all coin finds from the rest of Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland are listed in appendix 9. The main production phases of the Lincoln mint are summarised in appendix 7, and the find spots of coins minted at Lincoln are listed in appendix 10. A discussion of the use of money in Anglo-Saxon society will close this chapter.

4.3: The coinage from a spatial perspective

4.3.1: The coinage from a spatial perspective: introduction

The following discussion of the distribution of coin finds from Lincoln and Lindsey is organised chronologically, dividing the coins in separate groups based on their rough production dates. Although this chapter acknowledges the problems discussed in chapter 2.4.4 with regards to the 'six-year cycle', it will nevertheless assume that the majority of coins were lost or deposited within the same broad time span as other coins that were produced at or near the same time. It must be emphasised that these chronological divisions are artificial, and that it is impossible

to establish a definite *terminus ante quem* for the primary deposition or loss of any unstratified finds. However, it is assumed that a coin produced in Lincoln in, for example, 880 AD is more likely to have been either lost or deposited, and thus taken out of circulation, prior to the 920s, when the next coin type was minted at Lincoln as a response to the changing political situation (see Astill in press).

This section will focus on single coin finds, which represent casual losses. The vast majority of single coin finds from the 'rural' parts of Lindsey came from unstratified contexts, whilst the majority of 'urban' finds came from contexts with high levels of residuality. Several general regional trends can still be determined, and these will be highlighted below. It is clear that in Lincoln, as in other 'urban' settings, the highest density of coin losses is from sites that also show evidence for manufacturing activity (Blackburn 1989b: 18). In Lincoln, the two sites that have yielded most coin finds are Flaxengate in the Lower City, and St Paul-in-the-Bail in the Upper City. Both sites have yielded evidence for manufacturing activity, but at the site at St Paul-in-the-Bail this did not occur until the tenth century (appendix 1.1.1.4), whilst the earliest coins are ninth-century in date (section 4.3.2).

A consideration of the varying levels of monetisation that existed in Lincoln and Lindsey over time will stand central to the following discussion. Much of this will be based around Metcalf's (2007: 3) argument that, if single coin losses were both widespread and from a high number of different mints, this indicates a relatively high level of monetisation. In this context, Metcalf (2007: 3) has drawn attention to the vast number of middle Anglo-Saxon stycas, sceattas and thrymsas that have been found in 'rural' contexts, as opposed to the lower number of eleventh-century coins that have been found in comparable contexts. This suggests that eleventh-century rural England was less monetised than seventh-century rural England, and that the socio-economic role of coinage within society had changed over time. These notions will be explored in more detail below.

4.3.2: Coin-finds from Lincoln and Lindsey: before c. 880

Despite the absence of evidence for coin production in Lindsey prior to the 880s, the pattern of single coin finds from the area suggests that a monetary system was in place from the eighth century (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 6; Vince 2006: 527). The presence of single coin finds of a number of different nominations that were minted roughly contemporaneously suggests that this was not a closed monetary system. The coins consist mostly of Northumbrian copper-alloy stycas and Mercian and West Saxon silver pennies (fig. 16).

Ninth-century Northumbrian stycas are difficult to date with any precision. They are a very debased coinage, and often carry blundered legends. Their production ceased at some point before the 860s. The reasons for the demise of minting in Northumbria are still debated, but can be found either in the context of

the Scandinavian conquest of York in the 860s, or of some unexplained crisis that may have taken place earlier (Blackburn 2004: 325). In Lincolnshire, finds of stycas are concentrated in Lindsey, in particular along the Rivers Trent and Witham, and in the northeastern part of Lindsey, in the coastal zone near the Humber estuary (fig. 16) (Blackburn 1993: 83; Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 6-7, 11).

The occurrence of stycas as single finds indicates that a (partially) monetised system was in place, as the relatively low value of the base metal of which they were made rendered them suitable for everyday transactions on a relatively significant scale. It also suggests that the transactions made with these stycas occurred in the context of transactions with Northumbria, where they were minted. Their concentration in the north of Lindsey is therefore not surprising, and is reflected in the exclusive occurrence of Yorkshire sculpture in this area (chapter 3). Lincolnshire is the southernmost county in England where they occur, in significant numbers, together with the southern silver coinages (Williams *pers. comm.*).

No stycas have been found in Lincoln itself, leading Blackburn (1993: 83) to suggest that no significant economic activity was taking place in Lincoln at this time. This suggestion is supported by the distribution pattern of imported Ipswich ware. Whilst this type of pottery is found in relative quantities at a number of sites in Lindsey, including in large quantities at Flixborough (Young and Vince 2009), only a single sherd has so far been retrieved from the city itself (Young and Vince 2005: 34) (chapter 6). At the same time it must be kept in mind, however, that “we cannot by studying coin finds, detect the transactions, unilateral or otherwise, that coins were *not* used for” (Metcalfe 2007: 7). In other words, the absence of styca finds from Lincoln does not shed any light on the potential quantity of non-monetary transactions that were carried out.

Anglo-Saxon silver coins found in Lincolnshire that date to the period between c. 805 and 880 AD consist almost entirely of coins of the West Saxon and Mercian kingdoms (fig. 16), who at that point both produced very similar coins that could probably be used interchangeably, a situation sometimes characterised as a monetary alliance (Blackburn 2001a; 2001c). The only coin that is not minted in Wessex or Mercia is EMC 2001.0695, an East Anglian coin minted in the name of King Edmund (855-69), found at Torksey (appendix 9.1.41). Amongst the West Saxon and Mercian coins are the first specimens that were actually found *within* Lincoln, all of which were struck in the 860s and 870s (Vince 2006: 529) (chapter 3.5.2). They were all found during excavations at St Paul-in-the-Bail (sp72) in the Upper City (appendix 8.1.2) (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 10; Steane *et al.* 2006: 153). All four came from later, disturbed, or undated contexts, and as their issue was roughly contemporary with the viking incursions into northern and eastern England, it has been suggested that they formed part of a disturbed viking hoard (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 10-11; 1993: 81-82; Vince 2006: 529). The fragmentation of three of

the four finds (fig. 15 i-l) may furthermore suggest that these coins had been used in a weight economy, which, as the Scandinavian settlers largely came from a non-monetised society, would also point to a possible 'viking' connection. Vince (2006: 529) associates the coins with a silver Carolingian belt buckle, and a *Trewhiddle*-style buckle with associated strap-ends that have also been found at St Paul-in-the-Bail (see chapter 5), and suggests that they all belonged to the same mixed hoard.

Blackburn *et al.* (1983: 11) mention the fact that the Lunette coins were all found on different sides of the Anglo-Saxon church as a potential counter-argument against their interpretation as a scattered hoard. Possible alternative explanations for their deposition include the suggestion that they were scattered grave goods (the presence of coins in late Anglo-Saxon graves is unusual, but not unheard of (for a list of examples, see Hadley 2009: 478-79)), or be indicative of a limited amount of economic activity that took place within the walls of the Upper City (for the use of cemeteries as markets, see Stocker forthcoming and chapter 3 (this thesis)). However, although the first evidence of economic activity in the Lower City dates to this period, the earliest Anglo-Saxon layers at St Paul-in-the-Bail revealed no evidence of manufacturing, industrial or trading activities, and the interpretation of these coins as a hoard is therefore more plausible.

Outside Lincoln, there are two other early assemblages that deserve particular mention in this context. These have been found at Torksey (Blackburn 2002; Brown 2006) and Flixborough (Archibald 2009). The finds from Torksey (appendix 9.1.41), the results of years of intensive metal detecting, included a large number of Northumbrian stycas, some continental and Anglo-Saxon coins, as well as Arabic dirhams and bullion. They probably formed part of one or more scattered mixed hoards, most of which would have been associated with the viking army that wintered at Torksey in 872-73 (*ASC A*) (Blackburn 2002; Brown 2006; Williams *pers. comm.*). In addition, two coins – *EMC* 2001.0999, a Long Cross penny of Æthelred II (minted c. 997-1003), and *EMC* 1994.0236, an anonymous halfpenny of the Helmet type from Dublin (minted c. 995-1020) – were much later in date, and should be associated with the late Anglo-Saxon settlement phase, when Torksey was an important pottery production centre (chapter 6) (for the other metal artefacts from Torksey, see appendix 12).

The coin finds from Flixborough (appendix 9.1.13), retrieved during the excavation of the site between 1989 and 1991 (Loveluck and Atkinson 2007), were mostly single coin finds found in stratified contexts, and are believed to represent intensive economic activity on this high-status site. The later ninth and tenth century examples include a large number of Northumbrian stycas, as well as other Anglo-Saxon coins, but no continental issues or dirhams (Archibald 2009). The number of coin finds from Flixborough diminishes dramatically after the late ninth century: in contrast to the c. eight silver pennies and 25+ stycas dated to the ninth

century, only one tenth-century coin has been found (appendix 9.1.13) (Archibald 2009). This suggests that the site underwent a change in character (Loveluck 1998; 2007; Loveluck and Atkinson 2007). As later ninth- and tenth-century pottery *has* been found at Flixborough (Loveluck 1998; Young and Vince 2009) (also see chapter 6), it is unlikely that the site was abandoned. In fact, the decline in single coin finds may merely be symptomatic of the general decline in single coin finds as noted by Metcalf (2007: 3), which is also noticeable at Torksey (see above), suggesting that the relationship between economic activity and the presence of single coin finds is not necessarily as straightforward as it might seem.

A third ninth-century hoard from Lindsey is the Walmsgate hoard (*Checklist of Coin Hoards*: 71a) (fig. 16), deposited in c. 873/4, which has been interpreted in the context of the viking campaigns in the region, presumably buried for safe-keeping (Blackburn 1993: 81). It contained "2 pennies of Burgred, 1 of Æthelred I and 6 of Alfred, all of Lunette type" (Pagan 1987: 209). No hoards pre-dating the 880s have been discovered in Kesteven or Holland. The largest coin assemblages from Kesteven were found at Grantham (appendix 9.2.1) and Heckington (appendix 9.2.2), both of which produced two ninth-century pennies (fig. 16).

4.3.3: Coin-finds from Lincoln and Lindsey: 880s-910s

Metcalf (2007: 8) has interpreted the decline in single coin finds that took place in the later ninth century in the context of a decrease in international trade, caused by the viking attacks. This suggestion is strengthened by a similar decrease in international pottery finds (see chapter 6) (Mainman 1993; Vince 2009). However, the decline of international trade did not necessarily entail a decline in economic activity, even if the focus of this activity may have shifted. Or, according to Metcalf (2007: 9),

If there was a significant change in English monetary history as a result of the Danish settlements, it would seem to be that the great Anglo-Scandinavian river-ports of England's North Sea coastlands, Stamford, Lincoln and especially York, prospered at the expense of London and the Channel ports.

The last two decades of the ninth century also saw the start of a number of independent 'Scandinavian' coinages that were struck in the Scandinavian-controlled regions of Anglo-Saxon England, which is an indication of the continued economic prosperity of these regions, although political factors would also have played an important role. These coinages can be subdivided into three broad geographical groups: the coinages of York, of East Anglia, and of the Midlands. This section will first outline the development of coin production in East Anglia and York, to provide context for the developments in Lincoln and Lindsey (see appendix 7).

Blackburn (2005) has argued that minting in East Anglia never ceased

entirely, but continued more or less continuously, if on a much smaller scale, throughout the period of Scandinavian settlement, until the 880s witnessed a significant increase in minting activity under King Guthrum, the first viking ruler of East Anglia.⁷³ Guthrum issued a substantial regal coinage that was based on the contemporary West Saxon Two Line issue, although the East Anglian weight standard of c. 1.3 g was maintained, rather than the heavier West Saxon weight standard of c. 1.6 g, which had been introduced by King Alfred of Wessex in the 860s.⁷⁴ Guthrum's Two Line coinage also bore his own, albeit baptismal, name *Æthelstan*, but was in all other aspects difficult to distinguish from the West Saxon coinages (Blackburn 2004: 339; Hadley 2006: 33-34). The earliest definite evidence for coin production after the decline of the *stycas* in York dates to the 890s, when the above-mentioned Sigeferth (section 4.2) began minting his regal coinage. This silver coinage, which was also produced to the weight standard of c. 1.3 g, showed influences of existing Anglo-Saxon coinages in terms of its iconography, but also revealed 'foreign' influences, most noticeably the various cross-designs, which were derived from designs on near-contemporary continental and Byzantine coins (Blackburn 2004; 2006).

A number of imitative coinages were also struck during this period, including the above-mentioned Canterbury (Doro) and Orsnaforda imitations (section 4.2), which copied existing coin designs, albeit often with 'blundered' legends (as occurred on the Orsnaforda coins) or other variations in the designs. Again, they were usually struck to a weight standard of c. 1.3 g. In addition to the Orsnaforda and Canterbury (Doro) imitations, these also included copies of Alfred's London Monogram type, including the above-mentioned Lincoln-monogram coinage (Blackburn 1998). This was the first mint-signed coinage that was produced at Lincoln during the Anglo-Saxon period. The production of many of these 'imitative' issues is now attributed to mints in the Scandinavian-controlled regions south of the Humber (Blackburn 2001b; 2006).

The vast majority of these early 'Scandinavian' coins have been found in hoards, most noticeably those from Cuerdale (Lancs.), deposited c. 905 (Graham-Campbell 1992; forthcoming; Williams and Webster 2009); Stamford (Lincs.), deposited c. 890 (Grierson 1957); Ashdon (Essex), deposited c. 895 (Blackburn 1989a); Morley St Peter (Norf.), deposited c. 925 (Rainbird Clarke and Dolley 1958)

⁷³ One of the earliest examples of an imitative Danelaw coin is a single coin from Guthrum, which has recently been identified by Blackburn (2005; also see Hadley 2006: 33). This coin imitated a Carolingian prototype from Quentovic, with a temple on the obverse. It also displays a number of similarities, in terms of their style and weight standard of c. 1.3 g, with the coinages of the East Anglian kings *Æthelred* and *Oswald*, who ruled the area during the preceding decade. It is thus suggestive of a greater degree of continuity between the period of Anglo-Saxon and viking rule within East Anglia than has hitherto been realised (Hadley 2006: 11-12, 34).

⁷⁴ The weight standard of 1.3 g had previously been established King *Offa* in the 760s (Blackburn 2001b: 128-30).

and, of course, the recent Vale of York hoard (Williams and Ager 2010; Williams in prep.).⁷⁵ All these hoards contained a number of different coinages, including Anglo-Saxon, 'viking' and Carolingian issues, whilst the Cuerdale and Vale of York hoards also included non-monetary inclusions. Together with the noted decline in single coin finds in the later ninth century, the composition of these hoards is suggestive of a decline in monetisation, whilst the increase in hoarding activity indicates an increased need to store wealth – possibly in the context of a status-economy – and may be a result of the social insecurity caused by the viking raids and the Scandinavian settlement of the ninth century.

Yet there are indications that Anglo-Saxon society did not become entirely demonetised, and that the imitative viking issues were used in monetary transactions as well. In recent years, the increased cooperation between archaeologists, numismatists and metal detectorists has resulted in the discovery of a small number of *single* coin finds that belong to the early imitative phase, and it is rapidly becoming apparent that these imitative issues were used over a much broader geographical area than had hitherto been suspected. As of January 2010, the *EMC* listed some 33 single finds of 'viking' imitative issues of Alfred's coinage. The Canterbury (Doro) imitations are still mostly known from the Cuerdale hoard, although a single specimen has now also been found near Chatteris in the Cambridgeshire fens (*EMC* 2003.0045). One of the Orsnaforda-imitations has been found in York (*EMC* 1009.0284). The imitative London Monogram coins, which were initially only known from the Stamford and Cuerdale hoards, have now also been found as single finds in Bedfordshire (*EMC* 1992.7759), Gloucestershire (*EMC* 2008.0409), Doncaster (*EMC* 1988.0241), Cambridgeshire (*EMC* 2004.0066), Suffolk (*EMC* 2004.0066) and Norfolk (*EMC* 2001.0650).⁷⁶

Three imitative Alfredian Two Line coins have recently been reported for 'Lincolnshire' (exact find spot unknown) (*EMC* 2009.0307, 2009.0308 and 2009.0309) (appendix 9.4). A fourth imitative Two Line coin, struck by a moneyer bearing the Frankish name Ludig, was found residually in a tenth-century context at Flaxengate in the Lower City (*EMC* 1983.9947) (appendix 8.2.3) (Blackburn 1989a: 19; Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 11; Steane *et al.* forthcoming) (fig. 17 a).⁷⁷ Although silverworking (Bayley 2008b: 44) and possibly coin production (Blackburn and Mann 1995) may have taken place at Flaxengate, it can be argued that these coins were produced in East Anglia rather than at Lincoln, as twelve additional examples

⁷⁵ The London Monogram imitations and Lincoln Monogram coins were found in the Cuerdale (Leics.) and Stamford (Lincs.) hoards, as did at least one of the other Lincoln mint-signed imitations. Other imitative coins in the same style were found both in the Stamford (Lincs.) and Ashdon (Essex) hoards, whilst the majority of the Oxford (Orsnaforda) and Canterbury (Doro) coins came from the Cuerdale hoard.

⁷⁶ These were imitations that left the mint signature unchanged, and should not be confused with the Lincoln Monogram coins.

⁷⁷ This coin was a residual find from a levelling layer (LUB32) covering structures 1-3, which dated to the early to mid tenth century (Steane *et al.* forthcoming).

have been found in East Anglia, six of which came from Norfolk.⁷⁸ Another imitative Two Line coin, struck by the same moneyer, was found during excavations in Stamford (*EMC* 1983.96251) (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 11) (fig. 18; fig. 17 b).⁷⁹ A third imitative Two Line has been found near Lincoln, struck by a moneyer with the Anglo-Saxon name *Ida* (*EMC* 1983.0011) (appendix 9.1.22; fig. 18).

The pattern of coin finds in Lincoln and Lindsey thus suggests that the economy in this region retained a limited level of monetisation. This is confirmed by the relative absence of coin hoards dated to this period (the only hoard from Lincolnshire that dates to this period was found in Stamford (appendix 9.5.7)). What is more, the distribution of the single finds suggests that economic activity involving monetary transactions had begun to shift towards regional centres such as Lincoln and Stamford. However, the coastal zone near the Humber estuary also retained some importance, as is shown by the two remaining early imitative coins that have been found in Lindsey, found at Tetney (*EMC* 1034.1265) and Swinhope (*PAS* NLM-8E52D1), and another early coin, found at Barton-upon-Humber (*EMC* 2000.0344). The coin from Tetney (*EMC* 1034.1265) was minted by a moneyer with the Frankish name *Rernart*, and bears the inscription *ELTANGERHT* on the obverse (fig. 17 c). As the lettering on the coin does not seem to be blundered at all – and it is therefore unlikely that this was a misspelling of the name of the West Saxon king – it is possible that *Eltangerht* was the name of a local ruler whose name was never recorded in the historical sources. Not every late ninth-century viking ruler entered the historical record, as is shown by the enigmatic King *Halfdan*, whose name (*VLFdene rex*) appears on two coins, one from the Stamford hoard, and one from the Cuerdale hoard (Blackburn 2004). The first of these combines a reverse die of the London Monogram type with a reverse die of the earlier West Saxon Two Emperors coinage (*BMA* 300), and the coin from the Cuerdale hoard is a halfpenny of the Two Line type (*BMC* 869). For a long time this *Halfdan* was identified with the only King *Halfdan* known from the historical records, the first Scandinavian king who ruled York briefly in the 860s. However, as Blackburn (2004: 327-28) has argued, the prototypes for these coins were not struck until the very late 870s or 880s, *after* the historically attested period of *Halfdan* of York's reign.⁸⁰ Consequently, it seems more plausible that these coins were struck by an otherwise unknown King *Halfdan*.

A similar explanation has been offered for two coins that were based on Alfred's Oxford-type, which were struck in the name of a *SITRIC COMEZ* (Allen

⁷⁸ Three imitative Two Line coins were furthermore found in York, whilst Kent, Peterborough and Hampshire each yielded a single example.

⁷⁹ Note that this coin was *not* part of the Stamford hoard, but a single find.

⁸⁰ An alternative explanation, however, could be presented by the possibility that *Halfdan* only began to strike coinage during the very last years of his reign, which would also account for the fact that only one of them survives today. This argument still requires a relatively early date for the original London Monogram coinage (for the debate, see Blackburn 1998).

1938: 175-77). Only two Sihtrics who struck coins are known from the historical record. These include Sihtric Caech, who ruled York in the 920s, and Sihtric Sihtricsson, who ruled York in the 940s. However, the two SITRIC COMEZ coins were found in the Cuerdale hoard, which was deposited c. 910, before Sihtric Caech had come into power, and long before Sihtric Sihtricsson was even born (Allen 1938: 177). The moneyer, Gundibertus, is furthermore known from the early tenth-century St Edmund's coinage from East Anglia (see section 4.3.4), and the lettering is similar to that on coins of Edward the Elder, placing this coinage in the early tenth century. Finally, the mint has been identified as Shelford (Cambs.), and there is no evidence anywhere that York ever exercised any form of control over any part of East Anglia (Allen 1938: 177).

The final imitative coin find from Lindsey, found at Swinhope (*PAS* NLM-8E52D1), is the most unusual, as it was struck of lead rather than the usual silver (appendix 9.1.37; fig. 17 d). It is possible that this coin was not a trial piece for a die, but an actual coin intended for use in monetary transactions, because, unlike the lead trial piece for the Louis the Pious solidus from Torksey (*EMC* 2001.0290) (appendix 9.1.41; fig. 17 e), it was actually cut to shape.⁸¹ In that case, this imitative coin could only have originated in a region that was used to base-metal coinages as well as to West Saxon coin designs (unless it was a forgery that was supposed to pass for a silver coin, but, in the context of the evidence for pecking on early viking coins, this is unlikely). The only region in England where a base metal coinage existed prior to the Scandinavian settlement was Northumbria and, as the distribution of the stycas revealed (fig. 16), Lincolnshire, which was also the northernmost region where the contemporary silver Lunette coins from Wessex and Mercia circulated (Williams *pers. comm.*). This provides a plausible context for experiments involving the production of base metal coins incorporating decoration modelled on the southern silver coinages. The experiment was clearly unsuccessful, however, as silver soon became the only acceptable material for coinage. Nevertheless, the discovery of a single imitative coin made of lead may create the need for a reinterpretation of the perceived 'value' of lead (also see chapter 5).

In addition to locally struck coins, a significant number of 'foreign' coins have also been found in Lincolnshire. These include Carolingian issues as well as Arabic dirhams, which came mostly from Torksey (appendix 9.1.41; fig. 18). In addition, four single 'foreign' finds were found in Lincolnshire (two Carolingian coins and two dirhams (fig. 18)), three of which came from Lindsey, from Barton-upon-Humber (*EMC* 2008.0229), Horncastle (*PAS* DENO-FB62F5) and Wood Enderby (*EMC* 2004.0236). Their presence *does* indicate economic activity, although their foreign nature suggests that this activity did not occur in the context of a closed monetary

⁸¹ The trial piece from Torksey is *not* included in fig. 18.

system, but a weight-based economy. The fact that the majority of these 'foreign' coins came from Lindsey suggests that the effects of the Scandinavian settlement were felt more acutely in Lindsey than elsewhere in Lincolnshire (also see chapter 5). At the same time, the absence of such finds from Lincoln, where coins were produced (section 4.4.2) and used in a monetary sense (see above), suggests that the degree of monetisation in Lincoln was higher than elsewhere.

4.3.4: Coin-finds from Lincoln and Lindsey: the early tenth century

In the early tenth century, a new type of coinage was produced in both Lincoln and York that was anonymous – in the sense that it was not dedicated to a ruler – and dedicated to either St Martin (for Lincoln) (fig. 17 l) or St Peter (for York). This type of coinage may have been inspired by the East Anglian St Edmund's coinage (section 4.2). The earliest St Peter's coinage is known as the Swordless St Peter-type (fig. 17 i) on the basis of the fact that it did not include a sword in its iconography, unlike subsequent St Peter's issues, which were struck in the 910s and 920s, and belonged to the so-called Sword St Peter-type (fig. 17 j). The Sword St Peter coins were roughly contemporary with two other regal coinages, struck in the names of the York rulers. One of these, the coinage of Ragnald (d. 921), was struck at York, but, as has been discussed in section 4.2, it has been argued that the regal coinage of Sihtric Caech of York (d. 927) (fig. 17 k) was struck at Lincoln (Blackburn 2004; 2006; Stewart 1967; 1983). This argument will be revisited in section 4.4.3.

In terms of their distribution, the various saintly coinages still largely occurred in hoards, although a larger number now also appeared as single finds.⁸² Within Lincolnshire, these have mostly been recognised in Lindsey to date, although a single find, now lost, of the related regal coinage of Sihtric Caech of York has been discovered at Threekingham in Kesteven (fig. 19) (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 13-14). One of the Swordless St Peter coins has been found at St Paul-in-the-Bail in Lincoln (EMC 1983.9941) (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 13) (appendix 8.1.2). Another of these coins was found more recently, at Yarburgh (EMC 2005.0040) (appendix 9.1.48; fig. 17 l), whilst two Sword St Peter coins have been found at Louth (EMC 1986.0113) (appendix 9.1.23) and Lusby with Winceby (PAS LIN-E8F617) (appendix 9.1.24; fig. 19). The distribution of these coins suggests that economic contacts involving coin between Lindsey and Northumbria took place via the coastal routes, as they occurred mostly in the North Sea coastal zone, and not along the Trent (see chapter 2.2.4).

Although early to mid ninth-century East Anglian single coin finds are extremely scarce within Lindsey (Blackburn 1993: 83), the East Anglian St

⁸² The majority of the St Edmund's coins have been found in the Cuerdale (Lancs.) hoard, the Morley St Peter (Norfolk) hoard, and a number of hoards from the Irish Sea region.

Edmund's coinage does occur, and has been recognised both at Lincoln and, again, in the coastal zone of Lindsey (fig. 19). Two single finds were found at the Flaxengate site in the Lower City (appendix 8.2.3) (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 12-13). A single fragment was found during the more recent excavations at Woolworth's Basement along the waterfront south to the Lower City (appendix 8.2.2). Other fragments have been found at East Kirkby (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 12-13) and Bonby (fig. 19). The find from Bonby (PAS WMID-ED3FC2) (appendix 9.1.8), especially, emphasises the continued importance of the coastal zone as a transport and communication route with the south. A similar conclusion had been drawn in the context of the distribution of funerary sculpture that was produced of stone from the Kesteven quarries, and the occurrence of a single Lindsey-type funerary monument in Norwich (chapter 3). An issue of Edward the Elder was furthermore discovered at Alford (appendix 9.1.1), likewise in the coastal zone. The paucity of contemporary West Saxon coins contrasts sharply with the evidence from the 860s and 870s (section 4.3.2), which may have been caused by the uneasy political relationship that existed between Wessex and the Scandinavian-controlled north during the first generation after the initial settlement.

The absence of any early Lincoln-minted coins in Lindsey deserves further comment. Both the Lincoln Monogram (section 4.4.2) and the St Martin's issues (section 4.4.3) were struck on an extremely small scale: fewer than ten individual coins of each issue are known today. In this respect the production of the St Martin's coins is very different from that of the St Edmund's and St Peter's coinages, both of which were very plentiful. The difference may be explained by reference to the preceding period, when Lindsey was the only one of the three regions that did not have a local coinage. As coin production serves economic as well as political purposes, the earliest Lincoln coinages may have been produced for political rather than economic reasons. A local, plentiful coinage had never existed, and there is no reason why it would suddenly have become essential to the local economy. Instead, the production of the Lincoln Monogram and St Martin's coins seems to represent a political statement, an assertion of status and identity, whose detail will be explored below (sections 4.4.2 and 4.4.3).

4.3.5: Coin-finds from Lincoln and Lindsey: 927-46 AD

In AD 927, King Athelstan of Wessex conquered the Scandinavian-controlled north, but, as discussed above (section 4.2), his two new coin types, the Circumscription Cross type and the Bust Crowned type (fig. 15 g-h), which were intended to emphasise his regal status as king of all England (see above: section 4.2), were never struck at Lincoln, where the traditional Two Line coins continued to be produced (fig. 15 d-e). This has been interpreted as an act of resistance to the recent unification of England, a suggestion that is strengthened by the fact that York

and part of the 'Scandinavian' territories south of the Humber briefly regained independence after Athelstan's death in 939, until Athelstan's successor Edmund finally conquered all of England in AD 944.

Despite the fact that a national coinage was imposed after Athelstan's political conquest of the north, the single coin finds from this period that occur in Lincolnshire, including those from Tattershall (*PAS* NLM6218) (appendix 9.1.38), Bardney (*EMC* 2000.0343) (appendix 9.1.2) and Gainsborough (*EMC* 1996.0143) (appendix 9.1.14), are still predominantly struck in York (fig. 20). This suggests that, to an extent, existing inter-regional economic and political networks remained unchanged. Contacts with East Anglia, however, are less obvious at this time. The only exception was the single coin from Stow, which was a Two Line coin, and therefore not mint-signed, although a case can be made for its attribution to a mint in East Anglia. Its moneyer was Abenel, who is also known to have struck coins in the Circumscription Cross and Bust Crowned type during Athelstan's reign, which were *not* struck at Lincoln or elsewhere in the East Midlands, and a moneyer with the same name is also known from several of the earlier East Anglian St Edmund's coins (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 282). However, Blunt *et al.* (1989: 282) also associate some of the Two Line coins struck by Abenel with the NE series, and it is also possible that this coin was struck at, for example, Stamford, which was in the East Midlands, but also close to East Anglia.

Subsequent coin finds confirm the notion that a close relationship between Lincoln and York continued to exist throughout the next decade. After Athelstan's death in AD 939, Olaf Guthfrithsson (939-41) from Dublin obtained power in Northumbria. The Scandinavian-controlled regions south of the Humber, with the exception of East Anglia, also broke free from the south, because the ASC refers to the re-conquest of the territory of *burga fife* (five boroughs), specified as Lincoln, Leicester, Derby, Nottingham and Stamford, by King Edmund (939-46) in AD 942. Meanwhile, Olaf Guthfrithsson proceeded to strike his own coins, known as the Raven-type. The raven is often associated with heroic legends, featuring as one of the 'beasts of battle', and although this imagery can also be interpreted in a Christian context – according to Gregory's *Dialogues* (II.viii: 3), a raven used to come and eat bread out of the hands of St Benedict each day – Olaf Guthfrithsson never converted to Christianity. One of his Raven-type coins has been found in 'Lincolnshire' (*EMC* 1996.0194) appendix 9.4; fig. 17 m), and Blackburn (2004; 2006) has suggested that some of them may even have been struck at Lincoln (appendix 7).⁸³ Other coin types that were produced under Olaf Guthfrithsson included a York-version of the Circumscription Cross type, and the Flower type, which was based on a coin type first introduced by Edward the Elder (d. 924), and

⁸³ No further information concerning the exact findspot has been recorded.

was also produced during the southern king Edmund's (d. 946) reign. These coin types that were based on southern prototypes have not been recognised in Lincolnshire at all.

Following Olaf Guthfrithsson's death in AD 941, his relative Olaf Sihtricsson – who *did* convert to Christianity in AD 943 – rose to power in York, and also struck his own independent coinages. These included the Triquetra-Banner type (fig. 17 n), which incorporated imagery that carried significance to both the 'Christian' and the 'Scandinavian' parts of the population (for example, the triquetra was often used on Scandinavian decorative artwork, but could also be interpreted as a symbolic reference to the Holy Trinity), in a way not dissimilar to the dual significance of some of the figurative sculpture from Yorkshire, discussed in chapter 3 (for a discussion of the significance of the imagery on the coins, see Blackburn 2004). None of these coins have been found in Lincolnshire to date, and it is possible that their absence is indicative of the growing political and economic control of the south over the entire region south of the Humber.

Like his predecessor, Olaf Sihtricsson also produced two coinages that were more overtly based on existing southern coin types, including (again) a copy of the Circumscription Cross type (fig. 17 o), and a variation on this known as the Cross Moline, one of which has been found in Lincoln, during the Flaxengate excavations (EMC 1983.9940) (Blackburn *et al.* 1989: 14; Mann forthcoming) (appendix 8.2.3; fig. 17 p). Finally, a 'Norse' version of the Two Line issue was also struck in Olaf's name (fig. 17 q), and Blackburn (2006) has again suggested that this may have occurred at a mint south of the Humber, possibly Lincoln. However, none of these coins have been found in Lincolnshire to date. King Edmund, Athelstan's successor, eventually conquered York in 944, and ruled the entire Anglo-Saxon realm until his death in 946. Only one single find from Edmund's reign has been found in Lindsey so far, at Stow, struck by the moneyer Ragnald, a known York moneyer (EMC 2001.0932) (appendix 9.1.35; fig. 20).

The regional distribution map of the single coin finds from Athelstan (d. 939), and to a lesser extent of the York rulers and his successor Edmund, is striking, in the sense that it is entirely focused on Lincoln, and distributed along the riverine transport routes towards the settlement (fig. 20). No single coin finds from this period have so far been found anywhere else in Lindsey, Kesteven or Holland. This may indicate that monetary transactions were increasingly restricted to 'towns', which were easier to control because of their well-defined spatial character. This is supported by one of Athelstan's law-codes (*II Athelstan*: 12-13), which decreed that both trading and minting has to take place in *burhs* (Middleton 2005). But if coins were not only a means of payment, but also a statement of political affiliation, the restriction of monetary transactions (and therefore of coinage) to *burhs* would have stimulated the significance of these *burhs* as the locations where political

rivalries were played out, and boosted their political significance as well as their economic prosperity.

4.3.6: Coin-finds from Lincoln and Lindsey: 946-73 AD

After Edmund's death in AD 946, political tensions between the southern Anglo-Saxon rulers and the rulers of York resumed in their full strength. However, there are no more indications that the York rulers struck any coins at mints south of the Humber (appendix 7). Edmund's successor Eadred (946-55) continued to strike the Two Line, Crowned Bust and Floral types (North 1980: plate IX, 29-31), and this period witnessed the first production of Bust Crowned coins with the Lincoln mint-signature (fig. 22 a-b), which can be seen as an explicit statement by King Eadred to emphasise his power over this settlement. Only two such coins are known. They were found in the Irish Sea region (*EMC* 1034.0686) and East Anglia (*EMC* 1997.0016) (fig. 22 a-b), and are thus indicative of continued contacts between Lincoln and other regions that had been subject to Scandinavian settlement.

In Lincolnshire itself, only three of Eadred's Two Line coins have been found as single finds (fig. 21). Two of these were found at Caistor (*EMC* 2001.0856 and 2001.1035) (appendix 9.1.9). In addition, a single cut silver halfpenny was found at Hibaldstow (*PAS-NLM-C86164* = *EMC* 2004.0134) (appendix 9.1.18), which was minted by Aculf. Their relatively northern distribution suggests that Lincoln initially was no longer a focal point for monetary transactions, but that these shifted back towards the Humber estuary, implying that Northumbria remained an important economic and political force as well (fig. 21).

Northumbria's continued influence on Lindsey is apparent from other coin finds from this period as well. In AD 947, during the first year of Eadred's reign, Erik Bloodaxe obtained power in York. During his first reign (947-48), Erik produced his own version of the Two Line type (fig. 22 d). A coin of this type has been found in the Tetney hoard (see below: this section) (appendix 9.1.39), although single coins of this type are absent from Lincolnshire. Erik was replaced with Olaf Sihtricsson in AD 948, who had previously ruled York between 941-44. After his return, and until his death in AD 952, Olaf only produced coins that were clearly modelled on the southern Anglo-Saxon coinages, including a version of the Circumscription Cross type, one example of which was found in, again, the Tetney hoard (appendix 9.1.39; fig. 22 e), and the Flower type. After Olaf's death in 952, Erik Bloodaxe was reinstated again, and continued to produce coins, but this time he revived the older 'Scandinavian' Sword-types of the 920s (fig. 22 f). Two single finds of this coinage have been found in Lincolnshire to date, at Belton (*EMC* 2001.0912) (appendix 9.1.6) on the Isle of Axholme, and at Barnetby (*EMC* 2001.0857) (appendix 9.1.3) near the Humber (fig. 21).

As argued in chapter 3, Eadred's solution for the continued troubles with

Northumbria may have involved the re-instatement of the bishop of Lindsey in the middle of the tenth century, which was intended to counteract the power of the archbishop of York, and, by default, of its secular rulers. Erik Bloodaxe was eventually expelled in AD 954, a year after the first recorded mention of the bishop of Lincoln in a charter dated to AD 953, and a year before Eadred's death in AD 955. For the remainder of the tenth century, Northumbria was to be officially incorporated into a united 'English' kingdom. Although this arrangement may not have gone unchallenged, no more independent coinages were produced at York, or, indeed, at Lincoln.

The pattern of single coin finds in Lincolnshire did not change significantly during the reign of Eadred's successor Eadwig (955-57/9). All reported finds came from the northern part of Lindsey, not far from the Humber. A total of three single coins of Eadwig are known, two Two Line coins from South Ferriby (*EMC* 2000.0345 and 1997.8918) (appendix 9.1.32), which were both minted at York, and a Two Line coin from Scunthorpe (*EMC* 1991.5023) (appendix 9.1.33), whose mint is unknown (fig. 21). Interestingly, one of the coins from South Ferriby (fig. 22 h) and the coin from Scunthorpe were both broken in half. If this was an intentional fracture, these coins could be interpreted as a type of hack-silver, which suggests that they were valued for the weight of the silver as well as for their denomination.

In 957, Eadwig's brother Edgar became king of the Mercians and the Northumbrians. For two years, Edgar ruled side by side with his brother, who was in charge of the southern half of the English realm, but after the latter's death in 959 he succeeded to the entire kingdom. The reign of Edgar (959-75) witnessed an increase in single coin finds in Lindsey, which was probably largely caused by the longer duration of Edgar's reign as compared to the reigns of his predecessors. Although his monetary reforms, which supposedly took place in c. 973, and were intended to eradicate local differences between various mints whilst supposedly putting a system for periodical re-minting into place that could be enforced more successfully (Blackburn 2001a; 2001c; Stewart 1990), may also have played a role, the majority of single coin finds from Lincolnshire that were struck in Edgar's name predate 973 (compare figs 21 and 23). The focus of single coin losses shifts slightly further south towards Lincoln as well, possibly as a result of an increase in the productivity of Lincoln's mint and/or a more active stimulation of Lincoln's role as a regional economic centre (for examples of Edgar's Reform-type coins struck at Lincoln, see fig. 24 j-l).

Almost all of Edgar's pre-reform coins are of the Two Line type, and are not mint-signed, but analysis of their probable origins suggests that the examples found in Lincolnshire were still mostly minted within the East Midlands and York, although the importance of the York mint was decreasing in comparison with the earlier tenth century (see sections 4.3.4 and 4.3.5). A single pre-reform Two Line coin of Edgar

was found in Lincoln at Flaxengate (*EMC* 1983.9948) (appendix 8.2.3; fig. 21; fig. 22 i). The moneyer responsible for its issue was Ingolf, whose name appeared on later mint-signed coins from Newark, and was one of the moneyers responsible for a number of coins from the afore-mentioned Tetney hoard (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 14).

Two other moneyers from Edgar's pre-reform coinage, whose coins have been found in Lindsey, can be associated with the East Midlands as well, centring on the Lincoln, Stamford and Newark mints. These are Asferth (*EMC* 1983.0014; 'Goltho' (appendix 9.1.15)) (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 15) and Winemaer (*EMC* 1994.0198; North Owersby (appendix 9.1.27)). Winemaer is also known from the Tetney hoard as well as numerous hoards in the Irish Sea region, which suggests a connection with western Britain, whilst Asferth is mostly known from hoards in the Irish Sea region (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 159-71). The remaining two moneyers responsible for coin finds of Edgar's Two Line issue in Lindsey, Heriger (*EMC* 1986.5025; Louth (appendix 9.1.23)) and Osmund (2005.0004; Barton-upon-Humber (appendix 9.1.5)) were known York moneyers.

In addition to the Two Line coins, a single mint-signed Circumscription Cross coin (*EMC* 1996.5003) from the early years of Edgar's reign was found in the parish of Caistor (appendix 9.1.9; fig. 22 j), which carried the mint-signature LIN. The identification of the mint signature of this Circumscription Cross coin as 'Lincoln' has, however, been questioned (Blackburn and Leahy 1996: 240). The coin is of a typical southern style, and the dies seem to originate from Winchester. Dies of this particular type were used mainly south of the Thames, but examples are also found in Bedford, Buckingham, Northampton and Tamworth, so a Lincoln origin is not impossible. The moneyer was a certain Athelverth, who may be the same moneyer as the Athelverth who is known to have worked in the East Midlands during Eadred's reign. However, there was also an Athelverth active at London, and this creates the possibility that the mint signature LIN could be an error for LVN. A counter-argument against this suggestion is provided by the provenance of the find, as well as the fact that the London-based moneyer Athelverth usually did not make mistakes (Blackburn and Leahy 1996: 241).

As alluded to previously, this period also saw the deposition of Lindsey's only tenth-century hoard, which almost exclusively contained coins of the Two Line type. It was deposited in c. AD 963 at Tetney (*Checklist of Coin Hoards*: 141), some ten miles south of Grimsby, and discovered in 1945 (Walker 1945) (appendix 9.1.39). It was found in a field, when the farmer's plough cut in half a hollow chalk receptacle that contained 420 silver pennies. With the coins were also found two silver 'clips', "which were presumably intended as small clasps for some article of wearing apparel" (Walker 1945: 81), and may represent hooked tags (see chapter 5). Although no other records of these two 'clips' survive, the possibility exists that they

were fasteners for a piece of now decomposed cloth, in which the coins had been gathered before they were stuffed into the hollow stone.⁸⁴

Apart from the 'clips', the hoard included coins of the Anglo-Saxon kings Eadred (946-55; 45 coins), Eadwig (955-59; 77 coins), and Edgar (959-75; 292 coins), mostly of the Two Line type, and the viking rulers Erik Bloodaxe (c. 948; 1 coin), and Olaf Sihtricsson (948-52; 1 coin), as well as four blundered Two Line coins, probably 'viking' imitations of uncertain mint (Walker 1945: 83). The majority of the Two Line coins belong to the NE series (section 4.2), whilst some of the moneymakers could be positively attributed to Lincoln itself (Walker 1945: 83). Of the 294 coins of Edgar alone, three were of the Circumscription Cross type from York, and the rest of the Two Line type from York and the East Midlands. This dominance of local issues has led Jonsson (2006: 332) to suggest that coins circulated on a fairly regional level, and that "coinage from southern England was not in circulation in northern England" (Jonsson 2006: 334). It also means that the hoard was assembled locally, and did not, for example, represent the booty of a viking warrior, assembled over his raiding career. As the preceding discussion has illustrated, the regional nature of coin circulation is confirmed by the provenance of most single coin finds from this period (also see Jonsson 2006: 338).

The occurrence of coins of several subsequent rulers suggests that the monetary system that was in place in Lindsey was *not* a closed system, as this would imply that only the current issue of the current ruler was considered legal currency. It is unlikely that someone would have held on to 45 coins of Eadred for a decade or so before finally depositing them in the ground if they had lost all value upon Eadred's death. It seems more plausible that the silver value of these coins overruled the value of their iconography. In this respect it is not so different from the much earlier Stamford hoard (*Checklist of Coin Hoards*: 85), deposited c. 890, which contained the issues of various different Scandinavian, Anglo-Saxon and continental rulers, and is usually seen as indicative of the absence of a closed monetary system.

A slightly different picture emerges from the dispersed hoard found at Welbourn (*Checklist of Coin Hoards*: 189), situated along Ermine Street to the south of Lincoln. Although the hoard had largely ended up on the antiques market before

⁸⁴ If not, the Tetney hoard should technically speaking be classed as a mixed hoard, but mixed hoards of such a late date are extremely rare in England, even if they continue to occur in Ireland and Scotland. The only mixed hoard post-dating c. 950 from England is the Chester (Castle Esplanade) hoard, discovered in 1950 (*Checklist of Coin Hoards*). Unfortunately no study has ever been carried out to determine whether any test marks, also indicators of a weight-based economy, were present on the coins. However, test marks are very unusual on the later Anglo-Saxon coinages, and Walker (1945) studied the coins quite closely, and he made no comment to suggest that test marks *were* present. In a study of test marks on the coins from the Cuedale hoard, Archibald (2007: 52-53) states that "systematic pecking was not practiced in Viking-held areas where the invaders were issuing their own coins", and suggests that the tradition of pecking may have begun in Viking Age Ireland, and then migrated from there into England and Scandinavia.

it was properly recorded, a reconstruction of its contents by Blackburn (1986) suggests it was deposited c. 1000, and contained some twenty coins of Æthelred (978-1016), belonging to four successive issues, ranging from the First Hand to the Long Cross types, but no coins from previous or rival rulers. This hoard may therefore be indicative of a more rigidly enforced closed monetary system, whereby only the issues of one single ruler are considered 'legal' tender. Alternatively, the absence of earlier or 'foreign' issues may be related to the fact that Æthelred had been in power for over two decades at the time of the deposition of the hoard, and had no rivals within England who produced coins during this period. In either case, the suggestion is raised that a closed monetary system can only be implemented successfully if the political situation in a particular region is relatively stable.

4.3.7: Coin-finds from Lincoln and Lindsey: after 973 AD

King Edgar's above-mentioned coin reforms, which aimed, amongst other things, to eradicate local differences between various mints, took place roughly two years after the bishopric of Lindsey was merged with those of Leicester and Dorchester (Everson and Stocker 1999: 12) (chapter 3.2), in c. AD 973 (Blackburn 2001a; 2001c; Stewart 1990). The reforms involved a full and national standardisation of both the weight standards and the previously highly variable designs of the coins, now finally incorporating the names of the moneyer and mint as standard practice. It supposedly also involved the imposition of a maximum circulation period of six years per issue, after which the coins were recalled and re-minted (Blackburn 2001a: 113; Dolley and Metcalf 1961: 152) (section 4.2).

Dolley and Metcalf (1961) assumed that this system of periodic re-minting, known as the 'six-year cycle', was fully developed and implemented at a single point in time (around 973 AD), but the effectiveness of this measure has been questioned (Stewart 1990: 460-63). The only written reference to Edgar's reform is from Roger of Wendover's thirteenth-century chronicle *Flores Historiarum* and, as such, is a much later interpretation of these developments. In particular, Stewart (1990: 464) has questioned to what extent the introduction of a new issue excluded the validity of older issues. One of Æthelred's (978-1016) law-codes (*IV Æthelred II*) decrees how "no one shall refuse pure money of the proper weight in whatsoever town of my kingdom it be coined" without mentioning the coin type, and, as mentioned in the previous section, the Welbourn hoard includes Æthelred II issues ranging from First Hand to Long Cross (Stewart 1990: 466). Stewart (1990: 480) concluded that

The sustained operation of such a [sexennial] system on a preordained pattern strikes me as an historical improbability: not because a well organised administration might not have managed it, if it was determined to do so at all costs, but because competent governments are normally ready to respond to circumstances and develop their policies in the light of experience, while incompetent

governments are forced to do so. I am not therefore surprised to find clear evidence of the evolutionary development that is natural in such a system.

The establishment of a number of new minor mints in Lincolnshire, at Torksey, Caistor, Louth, and Horncastle, all situated in Lindsey, and Grantham in Kesteven, has also been attributed to Edgar, and was supposed to facilitate the process of re-coinage at six-yearly intervals (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 15-16; (Dolley and Strudwick 1956) (fig. 23). The attribution of their origins to Edgar's reform rests again entirely on (again) a reconstruction of the events from Roger of Wendover's *Flores Historiarum*, and should therefore be treated with some caution, even if the available numismatic evidence indeed suggests that these mints were established at some point in the later tenth century. The area of Lindsey is unique in terms of the number of new mints that were established, placed at a much greater density than anywhere else in the previously Scandinavian-controlled regions of England. Their construction meant that Lindsey became more like the southern parts of Anglo-Saxon England, where different mints were generally speaking placed much closer together than had hitherto been the case in the East Midlands. This undoubtedly had an effect on the perceived significance of Lincoln, which, until then, had enjoyed a monopoly on coin production in Lindsey. The 'minor' mints will be discussed in more detail in section 4.4.5.

Whatever the overall success of Edgar's coin reforms, they nevertheless transformed the periodical re-coinages from a regional into a national event, thus taking the organisation of the coinage to a different level (Jonsson 2006: 330). The pattern of single coin finds from the period after c. 973 in Lincolnshire (fig. 23) suggests that the area was gradually becoming more firmly incorporated into England as a whole, even if coins with the Lincoln and York mint signatures remained dominant amongst the single finds from Lindsey. Nevertheless, single coin finds with southern mint signatures, including Winchester, now also began to appear, whilst single coin finds became increasingly common throughout the county. Many of these came from Lincoln or its immediate vicinity, suggesting that, for the first time since Athelstan's reign, the settlement was regaining its importance as a centre for monetary transactions (compare figs. 20, 21 and 23). The evidence for manufacturing activities that were carried out within the settlement, with the exception of pottery production (chapter 6), increased in the course of the later tenth and eleventh centuries as well (Jones *et al.* 2003).

Only two post-reform Portrait-type coins of Edgar have been found in Lincolnshire to date, both in southern Lindsey, not far from the River Witham. One of these, minted at Lincoln itself, was found at Stixwould and Woodhall (*PAS LIN-A0BF53*) (appendix 9.1.34). Another single post-reform coin from Edgar, minted at London under Æthelweald, was found in the Lincoln region (*EMC 2000.0054*)

(appendix 9.1.21) (fig. 23). The subsequent short reign of Edward the Martyr (975-78) produced two single coin finds as well. One of these was found in Binbrook (PAS NLM6391) (appendix 9.1.7) in Lindsey, whilst the other was found in Waddington in Kesteven (fig. 23). The find from Waddington was possibly minted at Lincoln (mint-signature LNDLOIG), by the moneyer Leofwing (EMC 2004.0247) (appendix 9.2.10).

The reign of Æthelred (978-1013) witnessed a noticeable increase in the amount of single coin finds, which, for the first time, reached levels comparable to that of the stycas of the later ninth century (section 4.3.2). This increase is mirrored in a rise of different moneyers and dies (see Mossop 1970: pl. II-XVI), and is thus indicative of an actual increased productivity of the mints.⁸⁵ Only coins that were minted prior to c. 1000 AD will be considered in this context. These include his First Small Cross issue, minted c. 978-79; the First Hand issue, minted between 979-85; the Second Hand issue, minted c. 985-91; the Benediction Hand issue, minted around 991; the Crux type, minted c. 991-97; and the Long Cross issue, minted between 997 and 1003 (fig. 22 m-p). The Second Hand issue and the Benediction hand issue do not seem to have been minted at Lincoln at all, a point which will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

A total of 39 coins of Æthelred that belong to these issues have been found in Lindsey alone, seven of which came from Lincoln, although the majority were found at St Paul-in-the-Bail, and none were found at Flaxengate. This is in contrast to the period of early 'viking' coins, when the majority of single coin finds came from Flaxengate. As the evidence for manufacturing activity at Flaxengate seems to increase in the eleventh century (chapter 2), and the evidence for production of any type remains small in the Upper City (an exception being the limited evidence for metalworking from St Paul-in-the-Bail (chapter 5)), the decrease in single coin finds can mean one of two things. The first possibility is that coins were produced at Flaxengate until some point in the tenth century, possibly the time of Edgar's coin reforms, after which it was moved elsewhere. In that case, it seems plausible that the 'mint' was moved into the Upper City, as no less than three of the four coins of Æthelred that were found on this site – a First Hand coin (EMC 1983.9951), a Crux coin (EMC 1983.9952) and a Long Cross coin (EMC 1983.9954) – were definitely minted at Lincoln (appendix 8.1.2). What is more, the evidence for metalworking activities at St Paul-in-the-Bail included the refining of silver (Steane *et al.* 2006: 164-65) (appendix 1.1.1.4), and it seems possible at least that minting occurred here, even though the only coin die found in Lincoln – an obverse die for a

⁸⁵ It is tempting to attribute the increased productivity of the mints to the large sums of tribute the ASC claims Æthelred was forced to pay to the vikings. However, the first recorded payment was after the defeat at Maldon in AD 991 (ASC E-F: 991), and the increased productivity of the mints *prior* to this date may therefore also be seen as indicative of relative political stability and economic prosperity.

Crux penny of Æthelred (991-97) – was found at Flaxengate (Blackburn and Mann 1995: 202; Vince 2006: 535) (see below: section 4.4.6). A second possibility is that the distribution of these coins only reflects their *use* and not their production, in which case monetary transactions were increasingly limited to the Upper City.

In addition to the finds from St Paul-in-the-Bail and one antiquarian find of unknown provenance, only two other sites within Lincoln have produced Æthelred's coinage. The first of these is Danes' Terrace in the Lower City (*EMC* 1983.9953) (appendix 8.2.1).⁸⁶ This coin belonged to the Crux-type, and was minted at Stamford. Another penny of Æthelred was found at St Mark's Station in Wigford (Steane 2001: 193) (appendix 8.3.1).⁸⁷ The coin was heavily degraded, and identified as belonging to either the First Small Cross (978-79) or the First Hand (979-85) type. Despite the evidence that Wigford housed a prosperous mercantile community (chapters 2 and 3), the Wigford find is so far the only post-Roman coin find from this part of the settlement. This confirms the idea that prior to the later tenth century, coinage was not the only type of payment that could be used in economic transactions.

In addition to the seven coins from Lincoln, two additional examples have been found in the immediate vicinity. These included a First Hand coin (*EMC* 2003.0127) minted at Thetford, and a Crux issue (*EMC* 2004.0224) from the Winchester mint (appendix 9.1.21). The absence of any York-minted coins in or near Lincoln contrasts sharply with earlier periods, and suggests that the economic and political relations between Lincoln and York had decreased and made way for a stronger integration of the Lincoln area with the south. Outside Lincoln itself, however, Lincoln-minted coins and York-minted coins occur in roughly equal numbers. York-minted coins occur throughout Lindsey, at Grimsby (*EMC* 1984.0010 and 1986.0105); Alford (*EMC* 1985.0002); Stow (*EMC* 2001.1144); Market Rasen (*EMC* 2001.0040); Edlington (*EMC* 2001.0913); Gainsborough (*EMC* 1997.0020) and Swallow (*EMC* 2001.1169). One York-minted coin has furthermore been found in Sleaford in Kesteven (*EMC* 2001.1254) (appendix 9).

Lincoln-minted coins also occur throughout Lindsey, at Willingham (*EMC* 1988.0169); Gainsborough (*EMC* 1996.0217); Horncastle (*EMC* 1980.0040); Wrawby (*EMC* 2001.0861); Stow (*EMC* 2001.1146); Caistor (*EMC* 1986.0084); Osgodby (*PAS* NLM6312); Hatton (*PAS* LIN-FE43E7) and Welton le Marsh (*PAS* LIN-9AB3B4) (appendix 9). With the possible exception of (some of) the coin(s) from Welbourn, which may have formed part of a dispersed hoard, no single Lincoln mint-signed coins have been found in Kesteven to date. In contrast, in addition to

⁸⁶ The maximum depth of the trenches during this excavation was such that the Anglo-Saxon layers were never reached (Steane *et al.* forthcoming; chapter 2), and this coin was a residual find from a post-medieval context.

⁸⁷ It was found during the 1986 excavations (z86), and is the same coin as mentioned by Vince (2006: 535), which he placed at the Magistrates Court site (Mann *pers. comm.*).

the coin from Danes' Terrace, one other Stamford-coin has been found in Lindsey, at South Ferriby (*EMC* 2001.1042) (appendix 9.1.33). The distribution pattern of these coins reflects the distribution of the sculpture (chapter 3), whereby Kesteven-products do occur in Lindsey, but not *vice versa*. A single coin find from the Lincoln mint occurred in Holland as well, at Long Sutton, not far from the border with East Anglia (*EMC* 1983.8056) (appendix 9.3.1). Again, this reflects the distribution of the stone sculpture, as the only Lindsey product that has been found outside Lindsey (and was exported there as a piece of sculpture rather than as rubble) was found in Norwich in East Anglia (chapter 3).

The remaining coin finds from Lindsey are either from unknown mints, or have southern mint-signatures, including Rochester (*EMC* 1980.0041, found at Horncastle); Chichester (*EMC* 2001.0999, found at Torksey); and Wallingford (*PAS* LIN-3A0D22, found at Saltfleetby) (appendix 9). The increase in southern mint signatures is the result of the greater standardisation of coin designs, itself a consequence of the political unification of England. This is also reflected in the distribution of definite Lincoln-minted single coin finds across the rest of the country (appendix 10), which likewise reveals a decline in the regional nature of coin distribution patterns. A similar decline in regionality was observed in the context of the development of the various sculpture groups in Lincolnshire in the course of the tenth and eleventh centuries (chapter 3).

Finally, the only single coin find from one of the minor mints has been recognised in Kesteven, at Stoke Rochford (*EMC* 1794.0001) (appendix 9.2.8). This coin belonged to the First Hand issue, and was minted at Torksey. The only 'foreign' coin find from this period, a late tenth- to early eleventh-century halfpenny from Dublin, has been recognised at Torksey (*EMC* 1994.0236) (appendix 9.1.41). This is the only Dublin coin of this period from England to date (Blackburn *pers. comm.*), so it seems that by the turn of the millennium, a closed monetary system was finally enforced with some degree of success. As Torksey had a mint during this period, it is possible that this coin had arrived in order to be re-minted, but was lost before that actually happened.

4.3.8: The coinage from a spatial perspective: conclusions

Despite the absence of evidence for minting activity, the pattern of single coin finds minted before c. 880 suggests that a relatively high level of monetisation existed in Lincolnshire before the period of Scandinavian settlement, in particular in Lindsey, which produced the majority of the finds. The joint circulation of Northumbrian base-metal stycas and West Saxon and Mercian silver pennies in this region furthermore suggests that this monetary system was relatively complex, with different denominations used either for transactions with different socio-cultural groups (*i.e.* 'Northumbrian' or 'southern' merchants), or for transactions that were

perceived to be of different 'value'.

After the Scandinavian settlement, Lincoln's economic importance increased as levels of monetisation dropped. The first evidence for Lincoln-based coin production belongs to this period. In the early tenth century, independent 'viking' coinages were produced in York, Lincoln and East Anglia, which were in relatively close economic and political contact, communication taking place mostly via the North Sea coastal zone. Very few 'southern' coinages of this period have been found, which suggests that Lincolnshire did not engage much with the south. The joint occurrence of the various coinages at Flaxengate, which also produced most of the evidence for craft-working activities, reveals that all the various silver coinages were considered legal tender in Lincoln at this stage.

Athelstan's conquest of the north in the 920s did not bring an end to the close relationship between Lincoln and York. The distribution of single coin finds in Lindsey focuses heavily on Lincoln now, suggesting that Athelstan did manage to enforce a system whereby monetary transactions were mostly confined to '*burhs*'. This changed drastically after his death, when the weight of economic activity in Lindsey shifted back towards the Humber estuary. Only during Edgar's reign did this begin to change, but it was not until Æthelred's reign that the degree of monetisation reached a comparable level to what it had been prior to the Scandinavian settlement. The majority of coin loss now occurred in the Lincoln area and along riverine transport routes, in particular towards the Trent, at Gainsborough, Willingham and Stow, suggesting that Lincoln had regained its importance as an economic centre, but also that inter-regional transport now took place along the major rivers, rather than along the North Sea coast (chapter 2.2.4).

4.4: Lincoln's mint

4.4.1: Lincoln's mint: introduction

In addition to the *use* of coins, which has been the focus of the previous section, the *production* of coins can also shed light on the changing identities of Lincoln and its secular rulers. This section will focus primarily on the designs of the coins produced by the Lincoln elite in the later ninth and tenth centuries. Coins occupy the space between history and archaeology. They are artefacts, with decoration that can be analysed using art-historical techniques, and made of materials that may carry significance in their own right, but they also incorporate text, frequently including the earliest written references to individual 'towns', which can be studied in both historical and linguistic terms. As aspects of this have already been referred to above in some detail, the discussion in this chapter will focus primarily on the designs of the two independent Lincoln-coinages (the Lincoln Monogram and the St Martin's coinages), although later regional characteristics in the 'national' coinages will be referred to in as far as they have not yet been discussed.

The final part of this section will focus on the organisation of coin production in Lincoln, and its implications for the status of the settlement. There is no evidence for the existence of designated mint-buildings at any time prior to the Norman Conquest, which suggests that minting did not take place in one designated mint-building, but was executed in the workshops of craftsmen involved in non-ferrous metalworking on a more general level (Blackburn 2001c: 318). Some scholars, most noticeably Stenton (1979), therefore prefer the term 'minting-place' rather than 'mint' (Blackburn 2001c: 318). However, the term 'mint' is still widely used as well, and this thesis will employ the latter terminology, but with the understanding that it may involve a number of independent workshops where all sorts of non-ferrous metalworking activities took place.

4.4.2: The production of the Lincoln Monogram coins

As mentioned previously, the first evidence for coin production at Lincoln dates to the 880s, and the earliest coins that were struck at Lincoln were imitative, based on contemporary West Saxon prototypes. It is tempting to view these early imitative issues as an initial compromise, born out of necessity in the absence of a firm understanding of the technicalities of minting. Nevertheless, the idea that the imitative viking coinages were a necessary compromise has recently begun to go out of fashion (Hadley 2006: 33). As Blackburn (2004: 327) has stated,

It is not unusual for newly formed states to establish their first monetary system by emulating the coinage of a successful neighbour. In due course they would normally replace this with a new coinage of distinctive design that would provide both a symbol of independence and a means of excluding the foreign coin from circulation, enabling the state to exploit a closed currency.

More recently, Gannon (2006: 193) has suggested that

It might be interesting to explore the concept of imitation as an intellectual exercise, a way of embracing new ideas and mastering concepts; a creative force rather than, at best, a passive, easy option or, at worst, a way of cheating.⁸⁸

She emphasises the way in which the design of these coins is vital to their being accepted and recognised as legal tender (Gannon 2006: 194), and defines the imitative nature of the iconography of coins "as a necessity for commercial credibility, as a guarantee of authenticity, and intrinsically as a disseminator of ideas and concepts" (Gannon 2006: 195).

⁸⁸ The same ideas have been applied to the study of Romano-British coinage. Creighton (2000: 36) has pointed out the following: "What we see as slavish copying, with the occasional mistake leading to variation, viewers of the time may have seen as wonderfully subtle variations on a theme. In a world starved of the richness of constantly changing imagery that television has brought to us, such subtle variations would have been far more noticeable than we perhaps imagine".

The names of the earliest moneyers provide another argument in favour of the suggestion that the imitative character of early viking coinages was achieved through choice. The occurrence of Frankish moneyers' names on the coinage suggests that continental craftsmen were employed for the production of the earliest coins, and it would make little sense to do this unless these craftsmen actually knew how to mint coins.⁸⁹ The introduction of specialist Frankish craftsmen in the early years of the Scandinavian settlement also occurred in the context of pottery production (chapter 6). Continental names were particularly fashionable amongst the moneyers associated with the mints at Lincoln and East Anglia (Smart 1970: 25-27; 1985). For example, one of the Lincoln Monogram coins (Mossop 1970: I 1 = BMC 81) was struck by the moneyer Erifer ('Herbert'), which is a continental Germanic name. Despite the involvement of continental craftsmen, certain aspects of local minting practices continued. In addition to the designs, these included a continuation of the traditional weight standard of 1.3 g, rather than the continental standard of c. 1.75 g, or the West Saxon standard of c. 1.6 g, established by King Alfred in c. 880 (Blackburn 2001b: 128-30). Consequently, the weight of a coin can help to distinguish imitative issues from their prototypes (Blackburn 2004: 339).⁹⁰

The above-mentioned Lincoln Monogram coinage (fig. 24 a) is the only imitative ninth-century coinage that can be unequivocally attributed to the Lincoln mint on the basis of its mint signature (appendix 10.1). In total only three specimens of the Lincoln Monogram penny survive.⁹¹ They are relatively close copies of the roughly contemporary and plentiful West Saxon London Monogram type (fig. 24 b; for this coinage, see Blackburn 1998). Alfred's London Monogram coinage was copied widely in the period of Scandinavian settlement, although most copies did not change anything about the design, not even the king's name or the mint signature (only the weight standard was habitually lowered to c. 1.3 g). These other imitations occurred in both the Cuerdale hoard, deposited in c. 910 (see for example BMC 95-110), and the Stamford hoard, deposited c. 890 (see for example BMC 445-46).⁹² A variation on these imitations adds the moneyer's name, which usually does not occur on the original London Monogram coinage, in two rows

⁸⁹ According to Smart (1970: 21), it is likely that the names on these early coins actually denote a continental Germanic 'ethnic' origin, even if later on they may have become fashionable amongst the Lincoln moneyers regardless of their 'ethnic' origin.

⁹⁰ However, there was a certain degree of variation within each established weight standard, and subsequent abrasion or corrosion may also affect the weight of the surviving coins. The identification of imitative viking issues is therefore best based on a number of indications, such as a combination of lower weight standards and blundered inscriptions.

⁹¹ These are Mossop 1970: I 1 (struck by Erifer), 2 (= BMC 82) and 3 (= SCBI 1027.0002). The latter two of which were both struck by the moneyer Ercener. These coins are of unknown provenance. The specimen held in the British Museum was purchased in 1802. The other specimen is listed in the Lincolnshire collections volume in the SCBI series.

⁹² Also part of the Cuerdale hoard was a blundered London Monogram halfpenny (BMC 112). The British Museum acquired two more unprovenanced specimens of the London Monogram halfpenny in 1935 and 1955.

above and below the monogram on the reverse, reducing the monogram itself significantly in size.⁹³

The Lincoln Monogram coins differ from both the West Saxon London Monogram coins and the various Scandinavian imitations in two ways. First, unlike other imitative issues, they substitute the London monogram for a monogram of LINCOLLA. Second, they replace the name of King Alfred – which surrounds the king's bust on the obverse – with the moneyer's name.⁹⁴ Although the Lincoln Monogram coins are usually characterised as 'imitative' issues, a better understanding of the significance of their design can be reached if the differences, *not* the similarities, with their prototypes are emphasised. As Orton (2003: 92) has argued in the context of stone sculpture, "insisting on difference and disjunction over resemblance and repetition ... must lead to a closer and less obfuscated engagement with the historical and cultural specificity of the individual monument [or artefact]".

The message the Lincoln Monogram coins convey is interesting. The similarities between this coinage and the West Saxon London Monogram coins were sufficient for them to be acceptable within the economic networks that already existed within Anglo-Saxon England. Yet the Lincoln Monogram coins omitted any reference to the West Saxon king, taking care not to imply he was recognised as ruler over Lincoln. The rulers who were in charge over Lincoln chose to remain nameless, thus drawing the attention not to them, but to a place. In this respect they are unusual amongst the earliest Scandinavian issues from England; the only other early Scandinavian mint that was named (correctly) on the early 'imitative' and anonymous (in the sense that no ruler was mentioned) Scandinavian coinages was Leicester (Blackburn 2001b: 130). Meanwhile, contemporary issues from East Anglia bore Guthrum's own (baptismal) name but no mint signatures (Blackburn 2004: 339; Hadley 2006: 33-34).⁹⁵

This emphasis on place rather than people compares interestingly with the earliest coinages from Trondheim in Norway, which are dated to c. 1050. The

⁹³ The British Museum holds two examples from the Cuerdale hoard, one of which adds the moneyer's name HEAE VVLF (Heawulf) (BMC 115), and the other a blundered fragment (BMC 117). An even better example is provided by BMC 116, purchased by the British Museum in 1873, which adds the words TILEVINE MONETA, 'Tilewine the moneyer', to the reverse.

⁹⁴ Although the name on the Lincoln Monogram obverses is not followed by the customary MONETA or its abbreviated form MO, it is still practically certain that the name refers to a moneyer, and not to a ruler. Firstly, the name is not accompanied by RE ('rex', king) either, and secondly, it is unlikely that such a small and reasonably uniform coinage as the Lincoln Monograms would be issued under two different rulers, Erifer and Ercener. Finally, Erifer's status as a moneyer is well attested by the other imitations of the London Monogram type, which do copy the original king's name, and add his.

⁹⁵ It is unclear what the viking rulers of York were doing at this stage. There is no evidence that any coinage was produced at York itself until the mid-890s, when an overtly independent, mint-signed coinage began to emanate in the name of King Sigferth (895-900), characterised by a rich and varied Christian iconography with strong continental and Byzantine influences (Blackburn 2006: 205).

earliest mint-signed coins bore the name NIDARNES, the name of the royal manor. To Risvaag and Christophersen (2004: 88), this implies that

The early urban settlement was the most important medium for the king to establish and uphold economic and political power in the region. Consequently, the need to stress the name of the royal manor and royal presence was of utmost importance.

In the 1090s, however, the mint name changed to COVPAM or COVPAN, meaning 'merchant town'. Risvaag and Christophersen (2004: 89) interpret this as evidence that "the town gradually shifted from being a royal staple place, strongly dominated by the king's manor, to a trading-town with widespread small-scale trade", whilst "the coins shifted from being primarily a medium of royal control and propaganda to the foremost medium of exchange on a day-to-day basis – the focus thus being on the township and not on the royal manor". These are two different interpretations for the significance of a mint signature, as a statement of royal power over a particular settlement, or as an emphasis of the economic significance of that settlement. Seen in this light, the question arises how the Lincoln mint signature on the Lincoln Monogram coins should be interpreted.

There are a few other early coins with the Lincoln mint signature that are based on the London-monogram type (appendix 10.1), and their similarity to a coin that is commonly attributed to one of the York rulers has led to the suggestion that Lincoln fell under the direct jurisdiction of York.⁹⁶ Two of these coins display the inscription LIIII COLLA or LIII COIIA in two lines above and below what may be a garbled monogram of the moneyer's name HEREBERE ('Herbert') (BMC 83 = Mossop 1970: I 4; BMA 443) (fig. 24 e).⁹⁷ The first of these, from the Cuerdale hoard, had an O with radiating lines in the COLLA on the obverse, typical of a style that seems to be connected with the Scandinavian-controlled East Midlands.⁹⁸ An

⁹⁶ Two of these coins still bore the West Saxon king's name, ELFRED RE[X]. The first of these, a halfpenny (Mossop 1970: I 6 = SCBI 1027.0004), fits into the group of imitations of the London Monogram type that added the moneyer's name in two rows above and below the monogram on the reverse, although in this case it was a monogram of LINCOLA that was wedged between the two parts of the moneyer's name ERI and FER (fig. 24 c). The second was a fragment (Mossop 1970: I 5 = SCBI 1027.0003), whose moneyer and mint signature have tentatively been identified as, again, Erifer ('Herbert'), who was also responsible for one of the Lincoln Monogram coins, and LINIC for Lincoln (fig. 24 d). Both coins came from antiquarian collections, and their find spots are therefore unknown.

⁹⁷ Significant variations in the spelling of moneyers' names occur on the coinage, leading Smart (1970: 176) to suggest that it was mainly the die-cutters who were of continental origin, and who habitually 'normalised' Old English names so that they became more recognisable to them.

⁹⁸ A similar O with radiating lines has been found on an imitative Two Line coin found at Flaxengate in the Lower City, struck by the moneyer Ludig, another name that betrays continental influences, and which may have been minted at Lincoln (appendix 8.3.3; section 4.3.3) (Blackburn 1989: 19; Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 11; EMC 1983.9947). Other coins in this style include a blundered halfpenny from the Stamford hoard (BMA 490) and a group of coins bearing the moneyer's name Theie (Blackburn 1989: 19). In addition to the O with radiating lines, these coins are characterised by a larger plain inner circle than the original Alfredian coins, leaving a narrow margin with small letters. This style is also shared by Erifer's Lincoln Monogram coin, and it seems likely that the dies for all these coins were provided by the

additional Two Line coin that is *not* mint-signed, with the same East Midlands style lettering, bears the obverse inscription XGVDEF[]RE, "Gudef(...) Rex", and has been attributed to the first viking ruler of York, Guthfrith (883-95) (Blackburn 1989a: 19; 2001b: 128; 2004: 327).⁹⁹ The identification of the "Gudef(...) Rex" as Guthfrith of York, in conjunction with the absence of evidence for the existence of a mint at York prior to the mid 890s, has led to the suggestion that the earliest rulers of York struck their coinage south of the Humber, somewhere within the East Midlands. Lincoln has been suggested as the location of this mint, as there is unequivocal evidence for coin production at Lincoln at this time, and coins in similar style were produced here. This would suggest that Lincoln fell under the control of the York rulers in the 880s; however, this leaves the question unanswered why not *all* the Lincoln coins were struck in the king's name. What is more, the "Gudef(...) Rex" coin does *not* bear the Lincoln mint signature, and therefore cannot be seen as an explicit statement of political power over Lincoln. An alternative explanation may be that Lincoln and York existed in close political and economic contact with each other, possibly to the extent that the same die-cutters were employed to produce these early coinages, but that neither was directly in control of the other (also see chapter 3). Finally, it is possible that this "Gudef(...) Rex" was *not* Guthfrith of York. After all, not every late ninth-century viking ruler entered the historical record, as is shown by the coins of the above-mentioned Halfdan and Sihtric (section 4.3.3)

In short, although the size of the issue suggests that they served a political rather than an economic purpose, the earliest Lincoln mint-signed coins were *not* a statement of royal power, but instead were used to create a communal identity that depended on place rather than person. This situation fits well with the context of the Scandinavian settlement, which would have placed territory, and the acquisition and control of territory, in the front of people's minds. At the same time, frequent changes in the power balances amongst the landholding elite may have resulted in a stronger sense of identity according to place, rather than alliance to a person, as the latter may be replaced any day.

The question that remains concerns the identity and status of the people who commissioned the production of these mint-signed coins. It is possible that they chose not to name themselves on these coins because their power was disputed. It is also possible, as Williams (2007: 210) has suggested, that they did not perceive themselves to be of 'royal' status. Perhaps late ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln was governed through a different system, such as a collective leadership, not dissimilar to the organisation of the Icelandic *Althing*, established in the 930s (Ari

same die-cutter (Blackburn 1989a: 19; Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 11).

⁹⁹ This was struck by the moneyer Theie, and came from the Ashdon (Essex) hoard, deposited in c. 895 and discovered in 1984.

the Wise, *Íslendingabók*; Byock 2002: 3-4). In that case, it is possible that the 'moneymen' themselves were amongst Lincoln's ruling elite. After all, on the Lincoln Monogram coins the moneymen's name actually features on the obverse, in the same location as the king's name on the original prototype, suggesting a significant degree of social aspiration on the moneymen's part. In this respect, the Lincoln Monogram coins are unique, and that may be where the significance of their message lies. Rather than emphasising regal control over the settlement, comparable to the NIDARNES coins from Trondheim, the Lincoln Monogram coins actively enhance the *economic* significance of the settlement, *not*, like the COVPAM coins from Trondheim, through the mint signature, but by placing the name of the moneymen, members of the new artisan elite, in the same location where usually the king's name would be placed (also see chapter 3.7).

4.4.3: The production of the St Martin's coinage

The next mint-signed coinage that was produced at the Lincoln mint is the above-mentioned anonymous St Martin's coinage of the 920s. A total of eight specimens survive. In as far as their provenance is known, all were found in viking hoards.¹⁰⁰ If their low survival rate is an indication of the scale of their production, it is likely that the main reasons behind their production were political rather than economic. As mentioned previously (section 4.2), the St Martin's coinage was similar in design to the Sword St Peter's coinage (fig. 17 j), which was produced – on a relatively significant scale – at York from c. 919 onwards, during the reign of Sihtric Caech (d. 927), who also produced a similar 'regal' issue (fig. 17 k). The St Peter's coinage did not include any reference to the king, but bore the inscription SCI PETRI MO instead, whilst Sihtric Caech's 'regal' issue replaced the dedication to St Peter by SITRIC or SITRIC RE(X). Sihtric's regal coinage is similar to the Sword St Peter coinage, but some have blundered inscriptions, which suggests that they were copied from an earlier prototype (in this case the Sword St Peter coinage) (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 107). Stewart (1967: 49) has argued that the Sword St Peters were also the prototypes for the St Martins, as "the natural direction of influence, politically and numismatically, would be from greater to lesser ... from the relatively abundant and varied St Peters to the extremely rare and uniform St Martins".

The St Peter's and St Martin's coinages – as well as the East Anglian St

¹⁰⁰ In his overview of Lincoln coins Mossop (1970: II 7-11) listed five. Only one of these was of known provenance, from a hoard in Terslev on Zealand, Denmark, found in 1911, which also contained West Saxon and York-minted viking coins dating to the period between the late ninth and mid tenth centuries. The other four coins were acquired on the antiques market between the 17th and early 19th centuries (Stewart 1967: 52). A sixth coin was found in Ireland in 1973, as part of the Dunmore Cave hoard, whilst a seventh appeared on the antiques market in 1978, and is now held by the University of Oslo's Coin Cabinet (Blackburn 2006: 222-23). In January 2007, an eighth St Martin's coin was retrieved from a hoard found near Harrogate in Yorkshire, the first of this type to be found north of the Humber (Williams *pers. comm.*). The first seven of these coins have been published by Blackburn (2006).

Edmund's coinage – have, on the basis of their anonymity and dedication to a saint, been interpreted as ecclesiastical issues. This is not very likely in the context of the York-based St Peter's coinage, nor the St Edmund's coinage. As Blackburn (2004: 332) has pointed out, these were the only coinages that were produced in York and East Anglia for over a decade, and whereas it is not unthinkable that the Church may have exercised a significant influence on the coinage of a particular region, it seems unlikely that a king would ever cede total control to the Church. It has also been proposed that these issues should be seen as indicative of the increasing integration of Christianity into the secular policies of the viking rulers (Blackburn 2004: 332; Hadley 2006: 35-36). Both these suggestions work on the assumption that the choice to include the name of a saint on a coinage was by definition an expression only of devotion and Christianity. Yet in the early medieval period, when religion and everyday life were integrated to a much larger degree, saints may have played a more complicated role in people's perceptions than purely as an expression of allegiance to the Church.

Many writers, from late Antiquity to the present, have interpreted the saints' cults as reinterpretations of pagan gods and heroes (Wilson 1983: 2). As the American folklorist Henken (1983: 58) has pointed out in the context of Welsh hagiography, saints "were rather the Christianized form of the folk hero". Their stories, like that of the pagan gods and heroes, circulated orally. That such stories were widely known and understood is apparent from written texts such as *Deor* and *Waldere*, which "refer allusively to many stories" (Cubitt 2006: 204). The inference of a whole narrative from one element of iconography is often referred to as "implied text" (Gannon 2006: 199).

In order to understand the significance of the dedication of the St Martin's coins in its entire complexity, it is necessary to know the biography of this saint. St Martin of Tours, who was born in central Europe and grew up in Italy during the later days of the Roman Empire, became the patron saint of soldiers and of France, and one of the most popular continental saints. Martin, whose name was related to *Mars*, the Roman god of war, was the son of a soldier from Sabaria, and was from a young age obsessed with the desire to become a monk (Watt 1928: 10). He was nevertheless forced to become a soldier, but even then he lived a saintly and humble existence (Watt 1928: 10). He became famous for cutting his cloak in half and presenting one half to a beggar whilst stationed at Amiens, after which Christ appeared to him in a vision, and Martin decided to be baptised (Watt 1928: 11). He was eventually allowed to leave the army when, after refusing to fight, the enemy miraculously sued for peace (Watt 1928: 13). He subsequently became a great defender of the Christian faith and converted many heathens (also see the *Encyclopedia of Catholic Saints*). Wilson (1983) has described him as

An ascetic and a miracle worker, too, but, more significantly, he was a missionary, an uprooter of paganism, and a bishop, a member albeit reluctant of the regular government of the Church ... He was the Apostle of Gaul, known sometimes as the Thirteenth Apostle, and many local churches in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages ... rested their prestige and their authority on such apostolic claims.

It is clear from his *vita* that the choice of this saint was fitting for the new Lincoln elite, many of whom came from a Scandinavian 'pagan' background and had arrived in England as 'soldiers' (read: pirates), and now sought ways to present their pagan and violent background in a different light. The Lincoln elite was not alone in this respect. The sanctification of the East Anglian King Edmund, previously killed by the viking invaders, is one example. Another is represented by Dudo of St Quentin's version of the journey of the viking raider Rollo, who became the first Duke of Normandy, in the *De Moribus et Actis Primorum Normanniae Ducum*, commissioned by the Norman dukes in the 990s. Dudo (*De Moribus* II: 5-6) portrayed Rollo's journey to the continent – which was no different from that of any other contemporary viking leader – as a journey that was inspired by a divine vision that told him to find religion and 'spread the word'. St Martin was an attractive choice for another reason too, which was associated with his cult. His saint's day was the 11th of November, which is also the first day of Advent, traditionally known as *quadragesima sancti martini* ('the forty days of St Martin'). This day marked the first day of the period of fasting leading up to Christmas, the celebration of the nativity of Christ, which deliberately was held on the same date as the winter solstice, celebrated in 'pagan' societies.

The St Martin's coinage also sheds light on the political relationship between Lincoln and York. St Martin technically speaking occupied a space below St Peter in the hierarchy of saints, and its choice (rather than, for example, St Paul, another convert-saint, but of comparable importance to St Peter) would fit well with the above-mentioned suggestion that Lincoln fell under the control of York (Stewart 1967; 1983). However, this argument rests in part on the attribution of Sihtric's regal coinage to the Lincoln mint (section 4.2), which is untenable from a numismatic perspective. First, the attribution of Sihtric's coinage to Lincoln is based – to a significant degree – on the fact that the retrograde mint signature on some of these coins, CASTRA EORT (fig. 17 k), does not seem close enough to the CIVITAS EBORACE of the Sword St Peter's coins (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 107). However, CASTRA EORT is not particularly similar to the LINCOLLA CIVITAS of the St Martin's coinage either, and it is more likely that it refers to a different, possibly unidentified mint (for a discussion of this issue, see Carroll and Parsons forthcoming; Williams forthcoming). What is more, the inscriptions on Sihtric's regal coinage were often retrograde or blundered, whereas those on the St Martin's coinage displayed excellent levels of literacy.

The case for the attribution of Sihtric's regal issue to the viking-controlled regions south of the Humber rests in part also on the hoard evidence, analysed by Blackburn (2006: 212). At the time of his writing, no coins of this type had been found in Northumbria. However, the recent Vale of York hoard, discovered near Harrogate, contained two specimens of Sihtric's regal issue (Williams *pers. comm.*; Williams and Ager 2010). Further north, a hoard discovered near Penrith in 2005, which had not been included in Blackburn's (2006) paper either, contained three more specimens (Williams *pers. comm.*). A final argument for the specific attribution of Sihtric's regal issue to Lincoln is based on the evidence of the moneyers' names. Amongst the names that are mentioned on Sihtric's regal coins are Eric, Are and Mana, which reappear on coins from the NE series, which were struck in the East Midlands during the reigns of Athelstan (924-39) and his successors (Blackburn 2006: 212). However, these are common names; for example, 'M[]nne' also occurs on some of the irregular mid ninth-century stycas from York, including EMC 1996.0144, found in Kirmington (appendix 9.1.22).

Most of the work carried out on the Sword St Peter (Sword/Cross type) coinage, Sihtric's regal coinage and the St Martin's coinage (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 14; Stewart 1967; 1983) has focused on their similarities. Yet – as was the case with the Lincoln Monogram coins and the London Monogram coins – there are also significant differences. In addition to the different mint signatures and dedications, the cross design on the reverse of the St Martin's coinage is different from that on the other two coinages. The question presents itself whether the St Martin's coins, like the Lincoln Monogram coins, could not be an imitative yet independent issue as well, albeit one that imitated contemporary York issues rather than contemporary West Saxon issues. Williams (2007: 200) has drawn attention to the fact that the earliest coinage of the viking controlled regions *north* of the Humber always showed more innovation than those *south* of the Humber. Lincolnshire was wedged between the Anglo-Saxon south and the Scandinavian-controlled territory of York, and there is no reason to assume that the only acceptable region to look for prototypes was the Anglo-Saxon south. In that case, the St Martin's coinage could be interpreted as a statement of independence and political allegiance to York in the face of the West Saxon conquests (also see chapter 3.4.2).

The cross design on the St Martin's coinage deserves further comment (fig. 17 l). It is entirely unique within early medieval European monetary history (Stewart 1967: 47). Stewart (1967: 47) has summarised the possible parallels for this cross type. These include a cross on a mid-eleventh-century sundial, built into the wall of a church at Kirkdale in Yorkshire, which claims that the church was re-built by a Danish settler, as well as certain runic monuments in Scandinavia. However, the cross at Kirkdale post-dates the St Martin's coinage by more than a century, whilst the majority of rune stones are also too late to provide a relevant parallel to the

coins. Hill (1965: 78) alternatively mentioned the double cross on the two Lindsey-type Lindsey markers from Lincoln Cathedral (now at The Collection) as a potential parallel for the cross on the St Martin's coins (*Lincoln Cathedral 1a-b; Lincoln Cathedral 2a*; chapter 3). Again, these were of later tenth-century date, but more importantly, the cross-design from the sculpture actually shows very few similarities to that on the St Martin's coins.

A much closer parallel to the cross-design on the St Martin's coinage, and one that has so far gone unnoticed, comes from a small group of late Anglo-Saxon strap-ends that have been found in various locations along the North Sea coast of England and Scotland. The geometric pattern of this type of strap-end varies greatly, but on at least two, found in a female viking grave at Westness, Rousay (Orkney) (Thomas 2000b: 504, cat. no. 615 and 616, fig. 3.14 E, F), the geometric design is somewhat similar to the cross-design on the St Martin's coinage (compare fig. 17 l to fig. 24 g). This type of strap-end is difficult to date with any precision on art-historical grounds, but the grave at Westness was attributed a ninth-century date on the basis of the other grave goods it contained. Although it is somewhat far-fetched to argue in favour of a direct connection between these strap-ends from Rousay and the St Martin's coinage from Lincoln, it is possible that this type of geometric cross design was part of a more general North Sea repertoire, and that its inclusion on the St Martin's coinage was a deliberate departure from more established cross designs from the Anglo-Saxon south or York. In this case, the message it conveyed was one of political affiliation to York and opposition to the south, but also of a relative degree of independence.

Whilst the differences and similarities between (near-) contemporary coinages can shed light on the political relationships that existed between various regions in Anglo-Saxon England, the differences and similarities between successive coinages from the same mint can shed light on the changing role of the settlement where these coins were produced. As suggested above, the Lincoln Monogram coins were a secular coinage that emphasised Lincoln's economic significance. The St Martin's coins, on the other hand, were an overtly Christian issue that dropped any reference to its moneyers, and referred to a famous convert saint's *vita*, probably in order to place the background of the Scandinavian settlers in a different light. This change would have affected Lincoln's perceived significance, as it developed from an economic centre into a centre of Christianity from where, several decades later, the process of parish formation in the surrounding region would be directed (chapter 3). This change in Lincoln's significance is made explicit in the mint signature on the St Martin's coins as well. Whereas the mint signature on the Lincoln Monogram coins reads LINCOLLA, the St Martin coins render it as LINCOLLA CIVITAS.

The significance of the term 'civitas' – which at once referred to Classical notions of 'civilisation' and to the Christian idea of the earthly and heavenly

Jeruselems, explored in Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* – has been discussed in chapter 3.5.2 (see Blair 2005: 248; La Rocca 2001: 425; Reynolds 1987: 299-300; Yorke forthcoming). The use of *civitas* terminology on coinage was an Anglo-Saxon invention. Roman coinages typically used *urbs*, which referred to "that assemblage of walls, traffic arteries, and 'infrastructure' that materially constitutes an urban place", and not to *civitas*, which, to the Classical reader, would have implied "the city as a symbol of human collectivity, as a 'container' of corporate identity in which individuals find themselves (however imperfectly) 'at home'" (Hawkins 1986: xii).¹⁰¹ In this context it is worth noting that the earliest mint-signed regal coinage from York, struck during Sigeforth's reign in the 890s, which was overtly Christian in its iconography, already referred to its mint as CIVITAS EBORACUM, the *civitas* of York.

A closer look at Augustine's *De Civitate Dei* sheds further light on the significance of the addition of the *civitas* label to the mint signature on the Lincoln coinage. Augustine wrote his *De Civitate Dei* in response to the sacking of Rome by the Visigoths in AD 410, and his treatise focuses on two conflicting notions of *civitas*, those of the heavenly Jerusalem and the earthly city, "whose god is the self, whose *civitas* is both driven and initiated by the lust for domination, whose fullest expression is hell" (Hawkins 1986: xii). Although the earthly city was not altogether bad, "Augustine's profoundly psychological treatment of *civitas* helped to fix in the imagination of the West a notion of the earthly city as a place of the deepest conflict and the most momentous choice – a place where 'outer' and 'inner', public and private, are interchangeable realities" (Hawkins 1986: xii). Augustine's work was hugely influential throughout the early medieval period. Not only had it influenced King Alfred's writings only a few decades earlier, it was also part of the oral repertoire of Anglo-Saxon England, and was referred to in (near-) contemporary sermons such as Ælfric's *Depositio Sancti Martini Episcopi Excusatio Dictantes* (first series, XXXIV), which, incidentally, has the life of St Martin as its subject. It is, therefore, unlikely that Augustine's understanding of *civitas* did not affect the minds of the moneyers of the St Martin's coinage as well.

The complex meaning of the term *civitas* sheds an interesting light on the changing identity of the settlement at Lincoln. It has been argued that late ninth-century Lincoln was a place primarily of economic significance. Is it possible that, to the minds of the early tenth-century Lincoln elite, late ninth-century Lincoln was a bit too close to Augustine's vision of the earthly city? In that case, the production of the St Martin's coinage could be interpreted as an attempt to change this reputation into something more admirable. Providing an excuse for the 'errors' of the ancestors of the current inhabitants of Lincoln through reference to the *vita* of a convert saint,

¹⁰¹ One of the most common Roman coinages found in England was the *Urbs Roma* type of Constantine I, which depicted a wolf being suckled by Remus and Romulus, and which was widely copied by the Anglo-Saxon rulers of Kent and East Anglia. This coinage, however, described Rome as an *urbs* (Gannon 2003: 145-47).

they dropped all reference to any mortal human beings, both rulers and moneyers, thus emphasising the relationship between saint and settlement. This highlighted Lincoln's role as a *civitas* in the positive sense of the word, as a centre of Christianity and civilisation (also see chapter 3). At the same time, the complexity of the *civitas* terminology would have carried a more sinister message as well, as it reminded people of the dangers of the earthly city, and the need to move away from the lust for domination, a message that is even more poignant in the context of the West Saxon expansion.

4.4.4: The production of the 'national' Anglo-Saxon coinages at Lincoln before c. 973 AD

The most important aspects of Athelstan's coin reforms, which involved the introduction of two new coin designs that were aimed to promote his new position as King of all England, and were instigated after his conquest of the north in AD 927, have been discussed in section 4.2 (fig. 15 g-h). The reluctance of the mints in the East Midlands to produce the new coin types has been interpreted as evidence for a continued and significant resistance against the incorporation of the region into the southern Anglo-Saxon realm (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 108-09). Economic concerns may also have played a role. As Stafford (1978: 41) has pointed out, the centralisation of die production that would undoubtedly accompany any national coinage also potentially implied a loss of income for centres of die production such as Lincoln.¹⁰² In this respect the Lindsey elite took a more independent stance than the York elite, who *did* produce the new coinages. It is unlikely, however, that resistance against southern overlordship was any less pronounced at York than in Lincoln, especially given the immediate revival of the independent viking coinages at York following Athelstan's death in AD 939 (section 4.3.5). A more plausible explanation is that the resistance against the West Saxon conquests was actually so great at York that Athelstan took extra care to impose his coin reforms to their full extent (Stafford 1978: 37-38).

That Athelstan exercised great control over minting north of the Humber is confirmed by the fact that York was the only active mint in this area during his reign. What is more, only *one* moneyer seems to have worked here, bearing the name of Regnald (Stafford 1978: 37-38). By comparison, in East Anglia, the only named mint that was active during Athelstan's reign was Norwich, but here, at least seven moneyers were working, whilst fifteen moneyers were active at the London mint, and no less than 25 at Chester (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 109). The fact that only one moneyer was active in York during Athelstan's reign sheds interesting light on

¹⁰² In fact, Lincoln and York continue to produce some dies locally up until 1016 despite the 975 reforms. Stafford (1978: 41) explains this in terms of their location on the fringe of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom, but adds that "in other cases local die-cutting may represent the grant of a local privilege under special political circumstances".

the occurrence of the moneyers that were known from Sihtric's regal coinage – Eric, Are and Mana – on the NE series during the reigns of Athelstan and his successors (Blackburn 2006: 212) (see above). If these are indeed the same moneyers, it is possible that they were York moneyers who were forced to move elsewhere (for example to Lincoln) after Athelstan's conquest of York, providing another counter-argument to the suggestion that the jurisdiction of the York rulers extended to include Lincoln as well.

Although the exact nature of the political relationship between York and Lincoln prior to Athelstan's reign may be open to debate, the ASC (A-D) entry for 942 depicts the reconquest of Lincoln, Stamford, Leicester, Nottingham and Derby by Athelstan's successor Edmund (d. 946) as a process of liberation, whereby these *burga fife* are freed from "heathen's captive fetters" (*on hæþenra hæfteclommum*). This suggests that, at this time, Lincoln *did* fall under the control of the York rulers, a situation that may have developed *after* Athelstan's death, when a number of regions he had previously conquered broke free again. A similar argument has been suggested on the basis of the independent coinages of the York rulers Olaf Guthfrithsson and his successor Olaf Sihtricsson, some of which have been attributed – again – to a mint or mints south of the Humber. Plausible candidates for this mint (or these mints) include Derby, Lincoln and Stamford (appendix 7) (Blackburn 2004: 326-27, 337; 2006: 218-20; Blunt *et al.* 1989: 213).¹⁰³ The attribution of these coinages to the region south of the Humber is partially based on stylistic grounds, and partially on the names of their moneyers, some of whom also struck coins for the southern Anglo-Saxon rulers in the NE style.¹⁰⁴ Of course it is also possible that these moneyers moved back to York once Athelstan's death had lifted the restrictions on minting activity in York, which may be enough in itself to account for stylistic similarities between the various coinages. Alternatively, it suggests that moneyers might remain stationary as the leadership over 'their' mint changed at the highest political level. Another example of this is provided by the moneyer Ingelgar, who struck coins at York for both the viking rulers and for King Edmund after the latter conquered York in the mid-940s (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 117).

After Edmund's conquest of Lincoln in 942, the southern Two Line issue became the predominant coinage throughout England south of the Humber, whilst the Bust Crowned type began to spread northwards as well, gradually replacing the Two Line (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 111, 118) (appendix 7). During the reign of King

¹⁰³ These coins were struck at the traditional Danelaw weight standard of c. 1.3 g, although this was now the same as the current West Saxon weight standard, which was in decline (Blackburn 2004: 336, 340; Blunt *et al.* 1989: 213).

¹⁰⁴ These included Baciager, who is also known to have struck coins for Edmund within the area of the Five Boroughs, and Faraman. The argument for the association of one of these regional groups, NE1, with the East Midlands, is strengthened by the appearance of the moneyer Are, who is also known from mint-signed coins from Lincoln from the reign of Edmund's successor Eadred (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 118).

Eadred (946-55), the organisation of the mints in the East Midlands and at York became radically different from that of those in the south, characterised by a considerable coin output but very few individual moneyers (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 130). As mentioned previously, such measures indicate a high level of centralised control over coin production. Nevertheless, a new regional sub-group emerged, known as NE4, which centred on Lincoln, and was well represented in the Tetney hoard and the hoards from the Irish Sea region (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 149, 153-54). It revealed stylistic similarities with the 'national' coinages that were struck at York, suggesting that contacts between York and Lindsey persisted (also see section 4.3.6). Some of its moneyers, including a certain Svertinc, would move to York in the later tenth century, during the reigns of Edward the Martyr and Æthelred (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 148), suggesting that moneyers could and *did* move between mints (see above). The first regular mint-signed coins from Lincoln can also be dated to this period (appendix 10.3; fig. 22 a-b).¹⁰⁵ All three belong to the Bust Crowned type of Eadred, which had finally become firmly established within the East Midlands, emphasising royal control over the settlement (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 192).

4.4.5: The production of the 'national' Anglo-Saxon coinages at Lincoln after c. 973 AD

The various changes in the organisation of coin production that are usually attributed to Edgar's (973) reforms have already been discussed in section 4.3.7. The most important of these changes in the current context is the establishment of the 'minor' mints at Torksey (Dolley and Strudwick 1956), Louth, Horncastle and Caistor in Lindsey, and Grantham in Kesteven. Their output was comparatively small, almost negligible compared to that of the mints at Lincoln and Stamford. Torksey was the most productive of the lot but, for the others, less than ten coins for each mint are known today (Williams *pers. comm.*). This suggests that the rationale behind their establishment was political rather than economic in nature, as has also been argued for the earlier 'viking' coinages, and may represent an attempt to curtail the power of the Lincoln elite.

No Edgar issues are known from any of the minor mints, but as they were (presumably) only established around 973, two years before Edgar's death, this may be related entirely to the short duration of Edgar's remaining reign. Torksey is first recorded on the coinage of Edward the Martyr, and again on those of Æthelred

¹⁰⁵ Three examples are known, two of which were found in hoards in the Irish Sea region. SCBI 1034.0686 formed part of a hoard found at Dalkey, co. Dublin. Another example was found at Ballaquayle, and is now at the BM (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 198). A third was found in isolation by a metal detectorist near Newmarket, Suffolk (EMC 1997.0016). The mint signature on these coins, albeit somewhat blundered, still characterise Lincoln as a *civitas*. The coin from Ballaquayle bears the inscription +AREIIICOIAlIIIVIT (which combines the moneyer's name 'Are' with the mint signature), and the single find from Suffolk states IINCOIA CIVIT (EMC 1997.0016) (Blunt *et al.* 1989: 192). The coin found at Dalkey (SCBI 1034.0686) reads LCOIAIIV.

(including the coin found at Stoke Rochford (appendix 9.2.8) (also see figs 22 n and 24 f) and the eleventh-century King Cnut (Dolley and Strudwick 1956). Louth is known only from the coins of Edward the Martyr. Horncastle is known from Edward the Martyr's and Æthelred's coins (fig. 24 i). Caistor is first recorded on a coin of Edward the Martyr (fig. 24 h), and subsequently recurs on the coinages of Æthelred, and the eleventh-century coins of Cnut and Edward the Confessor. Finally, Grantham in Kesteven is only known from Æthelred's coins (see Jonsson and van der Meer 1990 for an overview of the coins from these mints).

Various explanations have been offered for the rationale behind the construction of these mints, including the suggestion that they were of administrative rather than economic significance, or that they were only used when the major mints could, for some reason, no longer keep up with the demand, for example when large amounts of tribute had to be paid to the invading vikings (Stafford 1978: 36-40). It is difficult to establish a common denominator between these different settlements that would explain why *these* sites, and not others, were chosen for the establishment of new mints. Torksey (appendix 2.20) was a possible middle Anglo-Saxon trading site that became the location of a viking winter camp, and subsequently developed into a *villa* or small 'town' (chapters 2 and 6). Almost nothing is known about Louth (appendix 2.10.19). Horncastle (appendix 2.15.10) was originally a small Roman fortress, as was Caistor (appendix 2.3 46). On the basis of a fragment of middle Anglo-Saxon sculpture (Everson and Stocker 1999: 124) (appendix 4.1.7), Blair (2005: 150) has furthermore suggested that Caistor was a minster site during the middle Anglo-Saxon period.

The late eleventh-century *DB* can shed light on the identities of these various settlements. As mentioned in chapter 1.2, it makes a broad distinction between the 'towns' of Lincoln, Stamford and Torksey on the one hand, and 'the rest', which includes the manors at Louth, Caistor and Horncastle. As the latter three all had a mint in the later tenth and early eleventh century, it is clear that a mint was not necessarily located in a settlement that was regarded as a 'town', but that it may also be located on a 'rural' manor or estate (compare to Biddle's (1976b: 100-101) definition of 'the town' (chapter 1.3)), even if the description of landholdings in the Lincolnshire *DB* indicates that Caistor and Horncastle both had an unusually high amount of *sokeland* – tributary estates – which suggests that they had a relatively large amount of 'free' peasants as well, and thus took up a distinctive place in the surrounding region (Roffe 1986; Symonds 2003a: 233).¹⁰⁶

The three 'towns' of Lincoln, Stamford and Torksey are depicted in different terms (chapter 1.2). Lincoln is a *civitas*, whilst Stamford is a *burgus regis* ('royal burh'), and Torksey is a *villa*. Although such 'town'-related terminology seems to

¹⁰⁶ The landholdings for Grantham in Kesteven also include an unusually high amount of *sokeland* (Symonds 2003a: 233).

have been used interchangeably (Yorke forthcoming) (section 4.4.3), a closer look at the description of the three settlements reveals that there were certainly some differences between them. One of these is related to population size. The *civitas* of Lincoln was by far the largest settlement, with 970 residences occupied prior to 1066.¹⁰⁷ Assuming that the number of burgesses equals the number of residences, in other words, that only the head of a household counted as a burgess, Torksey was somewhat smaller, with a total of 213 burgesses listed as being in residence prior to 1066 (*LDB*: 337a). In that case also, the *burgus regis* of Stamford was the smallest of the three. Here, no more than 141 residences were occupied prior to 1066 (*LDB*: 336d).

The notion that Stamford may have been less densely populated than Torksey may come as a surprise, especially because the mint at Stamford was far more productive than the mint at Torksey (the Lincoln mint was over twice as productive again as the mint at Stamford). To give a comparison, the number of coins listed on the *EMC* (including the on-line version of the *Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles*) from Edward the Martyr's and Æthelred's reigns from the Lincoln mint amounts to 833, whilst those of the Stamford mint amount to 344, and of the Torksey mint to six. As mentioned above, the outputs of the mints at Louth, Horncastle and Caistor were even smaller.

The *DB* entry for Torksey (*LDB*: 337a) sheds further light on the identity of its inhabitants, and its relationship with Lincoln:

They [*i.e.* the *burgenses* of Torksey] all had the same customary dues as the men of Lincoln, and so much more, since whoever of them had a residence in this town (*villa*) did not pay toll on entering or leaving nor a customary due. However, this was their (duty): if the King's officers should come there the men of this small town should conduct them with their ships and other equipment for navigation as far as York, and the Sheriff should find supplies for the officers and sailors out of his revenue. But if any of the burgesses wished to go away anywhere and sell (his) house which was in this town, he could do it, if he wished, without the knowledge and permission of the reeve.

This entry suggests that the burgesses were indeed all male, and therefore probably represented the heads of households only. In addition, it reveals that the burgesses of Torksey enjoyed a relatively free status. Another passage in this entry furthermore reveals that Torksey's taxes were linked to those of Lincoln (*LDB*: 337a): "Before 1066 Torksey and Hardwick [a manor just outside Torksey, previously held by Queen Edith] paid in Lincoln the fifth penny from the City's tax

¹⁰⁷ "This number is reckoned by the English method, (that is) 100 for 120" (*LDB*: 336a). Only 760 residences were occupied in 1086. According to the *LDB*, "Of the said unoccupied residences 166 were destroyed because of the castle; the remaining 74 are unoccupied outside the castle's perimeter, not because of the oppression of the Sheriffs and officers, but because of misfortune, poverty and the ravages of fire" (*LDB*: 336c).

(*de geldo civitatis*). Towards this fifth part Torksey paid two pennies and Hardwick the third". This has led Jones *et al.* (2003: 143) to suggest that Torksey functioned as a sort of *wic*, or strand, for Lincoln. However, in a style that is characteristic for most entries on towns in *DB*, nothing is explicitly mentioned about the economic activities that may have taken place in either settlement (Darby 1987: 118). In fact, the only information that is recorded in the case of Lincoln refers to landholdings, which has led Darby (1987: 118) to comment that "some [of the towns] ... had a strong agricultural flavour". The agricultural character of (parts of) Lincoln is attested by the evidence from St Benedict's Square in Wigford (appendix 1.3.1.1), which included wattle enclosures identified as animal pens, and a hoe and cattle bell found at Saltergate (appendix 11).

The fact that Queen Edith at one point held a manor just outside Torksey is interesting. *LDB* (I: 338 v, 339) reveals that in the later eleventh century the king held property in Caistor, whilst 3 carucates of land in Horncastle were in the possession of, again, Queen Edith. The bishop of Lincoln furthermore claimed the church and priest in Caistor (*LDB* I 338 v) and a mill at Louth (*LDB* LXVIII: 375). If it can be accepted that the royal and episcopal presence in these places dated back to roughly a century before the compilation of *DB*, it is possible to suggest that the establishment of the minor mints occurred under the control of the king or the bishop. As the bishopric of Lincoln was merged with that of Leicester and Dorchester in 971, two years before the supposed date of Edgar's coin reforms, it seems likely that the bishop was one of the king's most loyal followers in the area, not only because he had recently been granted an enormous increase in property, but also because it was in his interest to support the notion of a united England.

There is some tentative evidence to suggest that experiments with coin production had already been carried out in some of the 'minor' mints, which suggests that the elite component of the population of these settlements was relatively powerful, or at least wealthy and ambitious, making them perfect allies in the king's attempt to curtail the power of the Lincoln elite. Torksey (appendix 9.1.41) has produced the above-mentioned lead trial piece for a gold coin of Louis the Pious (*EMC* 2001.0290) (section 4.3.3). In addition, a half coin was found that was tentatively identified as either a Carolingian Temple-type denier, or a local copy of a Carolingian Temple-type denier (*PAS* SWYOR-2D8B67) (Williams *pers. comm.*). A single *Christiano Religio* coin (named after the occurrence of the inscription XPISTIANARELIGIO on the obverse), identified on the *PAS* website as a ninth-century Anglo-Saxon or 'viking' imitation of the coinages of either Louis the Pious or Charles the Bald, struck to a weight of 1.58 g, was found at Horncastle (*PAS* DENO-FB62F5) (appendix 9.1.19). A ninth- to tenth-century silver ingot has also been found in the Horncastle area (*Treasure* 2000: 49; Lincolnshire HER findspot 44497), but its significance is problematic, as it could be indicative either

of coin production, or of the existence of a bullion economy as a result of the Scandinavian settlement more than a century earlier.

A final piece of information about Lincoln's political allegiances can be gleaned from certain continuing regional trends in die production, which increased again during Æthelred's reign (978-1016) (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 18). Lincoln was the most important centre for die production within the East Midlands (Stafford 1978: 43).¹⁰⁸ Two of the new coin types that Æthelred introduced in the 980s and 990s, the Second Hand issue (985-91) and the Benediction Hand (991), never really took off in this region (Blackburn *et al.* 1983: 17), suggesting that Lincoln did not produce the dies for these coinages.¹⁰⁹ The Benediction Hand may have been issued in the context of the Anglo-Saxon defeat at Maldon in AD 991 – which became the subject of a contemporary poem, now known as *The Battle of Maldon* – as an overt expression of Christianity to win God's favour in the battle against the pagans. The unpopularity of this issue may have been caused by a persisting 'Scandinavian' identity amongst the Lincoln die-cutters and moneyers: 25 out of the 55 moneyers working at Lincoln during Æthelred's reign bore Scandinavian names (Smart 1986: 179). Lincoln's continued 'Scandinavian' sympathies are also confirmed by the ASC (E) entries for AD 1013-14, which claims that the inhabitants of the area 'immediately submitted' to the invading Svein Forkbeard and his son Cnut (chapter 1.2), although admittedly they had good reason to do so. The skaldic poem known as *Knútsdrápa*, attributed to the skald Óttar Svarti, gives a different impression of the ease with which Svein and Cnut 'conquered' Lindsey, as it praises Cnut's exploits in the following words: "Prince, you made war in green Lindsey; the vikings wrought such violence there as they could" (*gunni létzt í grœnni / gramr Lindisey framða, beldu viðr þeir's vildu / víkingar því ríki*).

4.4.6: Coin production and settlement development

The preceding discussion has revealed that mints could be established in settlements of varying character. The final part of this section will discuss the relationship between coin production and settlement development in more detail.

¹⁰⁸ Stafford (1978: 43-44) explains this by reference to the powerful position that Ælfhere of Mercia (d. 983), who controlled the region of Lindsey at this time, held at Æthelred's court. She suggests it was in reward for his services that Lincoln was allowed to have its own local die-cutting centre, whilst it also meant that York's power would be curtailed.

¹⁰⁹ Stafford (1978: 44) believes that the mint at Lincoln was closed for a number of years, and places this in the context of the political turmoil that ensued from the troubled relationship between King Æthelred and Ælfric, ealdorman of Mercia, whom he exiled in 985. She believes that Ælfric's exile may have led to a near-complete closure of the mints at Lincoln and York, an argument that is strengthened by the discontinuity in moneyers between the First Hand and Crux issues. In her opinion, the mints at Lincoln and York did not resume active service again until 993, when Æthelred appointed Ælfhelm, who was originally from the region south of the Humber, as ealdorman of York. Blackburn (1983: 17), on the other hand, suggests that the introduction of Æthelred's Second Hand issue was never intended as an attempt at re-coinage on a national level, even if the large number of dies used for this issue in the south does suggest an attempt at re-coinage on at least a significant level.

Coin production took place in the context of more general metalworking activities. The Flaxengate site, which revealed the only late Anglo-Saxon coin die found in Lincoln (section 4.3.7), also produced significant evidence for non-ferrous metalworking (Bayley 2007b; Blackburn and Mann 1995: 202). Although Blackburn and Mann (1995: 206) have speculated that it is also possible that Flaxengate was a centre for die production, or that the die was merely scrap-metal, intended to be melted down, its association with a number of crucibles used for the melting of silver has led Vince (2006: 535) to conclude that coin production must have taken place at Flaxengate. Alternatively, the number of single coin finds from St Paul-in-the-Bail and the associated evidence for silver-working render the Upper City a likely location for minting activity as well. It is possible that several metalworkers would have been commissioned to produce a certain number of coins at the same time, or that the location of coin production in Lincoln moved over time.

If minting occurred on sites with general evidence for metalworking, the identity of the moneyers whose names appear on the coins remains uncertain. Nightingale (1982: 43) has suggested that there were different types of moneyers, some of whom were citizens of a particular town, whilst others were royal appointees who moved around, a suggestion that fits well with the evidence discussed in this chapter. Either way, moneyers were of relatively high status. By the time of the *DB*, they were at the top of the social scale amongst the burgess class, certainly financially and probably also socially (Smart 1986: 180), and it has been suggested that the post was inherited from father to son (Nightingale 1982: 34). Many were initially of continental origin, although over time the use of Scandinavian names became increasingly popular at Lincoln, but this may be indicative of their adoption of a 'Scandinavian' identity (possibly to associate themselves with the ruling elite) rather than indicating Scandinavian descent.

The high status of the moneyers renders it unlikely that they personally struck any coins, and Nightingale (1982: 48) has suggested that, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, they did not even have the technical expertise to work a mint, but usually left the 'dirty' work to the silversmiths they employed. This implies that there was a social hierarchy amongst the inhabitants of settlements like Lincoln, with, at the top, those moneyers whose allegiance was to the settlement where they lived rather than to a particular ruler, and who were members of the upcoming artisan elite. The existence of an elite whose allegiance was to a place rather than to a ruler contrasts starkly with the impression raised by Old English poems such as *The Battle of Maldon*, *Beowulf*, and *The Wanderer*, all written down in the tenth century. These poems emphasise the personal bond that existed between a lord and his followers as the basis for existing social hierarchies. It is possible that the emphasis on the concept of personal loyalty in Old English poetry is a response to changing social values, which increasingly saw loyalty to person being replaced with

loyalty to place, as concentrated settlements like Lincoln could provide an alternative to the protection and social networks previously offered by a lord.

4.4.7: Lincoln's mint: conclusions

Analysis of the iconography of the coins that were produced at Lincoln allows for a reconstruction of the changing identity of the settlement. In the late ninth century, when the Lincoln Monogram coinage was produced, the economic role of Lincoln was emphasised, even if the coinage itself may not have filled an economic need. The designs were based on the West Saxon coinages, which suggests that the Lincoln elite was making an effort to become involved in the socio-political and economic networks that existed in the Anglo-Saxon controlled regions of England. The message of the early tenth-century St Martin's coinage was radically different. The various elements in its design provided an alternative explanation for the Scandinavian settlers' pagan and violent background, which was reinforced by the overtly Christian character of the coinage. Whether or not Lincoln fell under the direct control of the rulers of York, the St Martin's coinage clearly expressed allegiance to York rather than to the Anglo-Saxon south.

During the period of production of the 'national' coinages, the various regional alliances that were expressed through the coinage became subtler. Lincoln remained opposed to southern overlordship, and may have sought the protection of the York rulers after Athelstan's death in 939. York was finally incorporated into the Anglo-Saxon realm in the 950s. This is the first period during which a limited number of mint-signed coins were produced at Lincoln that were struck in the name of a West Saxon ruler. During Edgar's reign, efforts were made to reduce the power of the Lincoln elite (possibly including the moneymen themselves). These included an increase of centralised control over coin production, and the establishment of the minor mints, which brought an end to Lincoln's regional monopoly on coin production. The presence of a mint was not dependent on the population size of a particular settlement, nor did it transform a settlement into a 'town'.

4.5: The use of money in late ninth- and tenth-century society

The final section in this chapter will briefly discuss the role of money in late Anglo-Saxon society. It is clear that levels of monetisation in ninth- and tenth-century Lincolnshire varied both regionally and over time. As discussed previously, the presence of Northumbrian base-metal stycas in ninth-century Lincolnshire suggests that coinage was used on a relatively significant scale. This came to an end in the later ninth century, during the period of Scandinavian settlement. The late ninth-century 'Scandinavian' coinages were produced in relatively small numbers, and were made of high-quality silver, which implies that their significance was primarily political rather than economic. This is confirmed by the fact that they occur

primarily in hoards. In the course of the tenth century, however, single coin finds of the 'national' and plentiful Anglo-Saxon silver coinages occur in ever increasing numbers, suggesting that coin use for monetary purposes was also on the increase.

But what were these coins used for? A quick look at metalwork production in general, which will be discussed in the following chapter, may shed some light on the function of coinage. The tenth century also saw a significant increase in the mass production of copper- and lead-alloy dress accessories in settlements like Lincoln, which is believed to have added significantly to their economic growth. These base-metal dress accessories may have been produced in the same workshops as the silver coinages, although, as different types of material required different expertise, not necessarily by the same smiths. Hinton (2003: 263) has argued, on the basis of his analysis of a number of Old English texts including *The Gifts of Men* and Alfred's law-codes (see Attenborough 1922), that the Anglo-Saxons made a distinction between various types of smiths:

The 'Gifts of Men' ... refers both to the "cunning craftsman in gold and gems, when a leader of men bids him prepare a jewel in his honour," and to the "skilled smith [who] can make many weapons for the use of men". This certainly implies distinct craft specialisms at least by the tenth century. Nor would every ironsmith necessarily have the skill to make a pattern-welded sword-blade; King Alfred's law-code referred to a "sword-furbisher [who] receives a weapon or a smith [who] receives a tool" for repair.

According to Hinton (2003), the status of a smith depended on the materials he worked with, with gold and silver occupying the space above non-ferrous base metals, and iron at the bottom of the scale. If this is a correct assumption, the logical conclusion is that, like today, precious metals were valued over non-ferrous base metals which, in turn, were valued over ferrous metals. If this is correct, it would have been impossible to buy, for example, a lead- or copper-alloy disc brooch of relatively simple workmanship with a silver coin.

There are two possible explanations. The first of these is that the modern difference in *economic* value between different types of metal did not exist. This option seems highly unlikely in the light of the occurrence of test-marks on the silver (Archibald 2007; Duczko 2002; Kilger 2006), which suggests that the Scandinavian settlers brought a weight-based economy with them that valued precious metal over non-precious metals. The second possibility is that there was a difference in the economic value of different metals, and that the trade in copper- and lead-alloy dress accessories took place through non-monetary exchange. In that case, care must be taken not to assess the economic prosperity of a settlement or a region by reference to single coin finds alone. After all, the trade and manufacture of items that were too 'cheap' for monetary transactions would have stimulated the economy as well, albeit on a different level, as it produced

goods that were affordable for all members of society, rather than exclusively for the elites.

4.6: Conclusions

This chapter has analysed the production and use of coinage from an economic and political perspective. Analysis of coin distribution patterns in Lincoln and Lindsey revealed that the Scandinavian settlement caused a decrease in monetisation. However, the settlement also had a positive effect on the economic significance of Lincoln (possibly partially as the result of the portrayal of Lincoln as an economic centre on the first coins that were produced by its moneyers), as single coin finds were increasingly found in Lincoln rather than in the coastal zone of the North Sea and the Humber. This was particularly noticeable during periods of strong centralised political control, such as the reigns of Athelstan and Edgar. In the course of the later tenth century, the degree of monetisation was on the increase, with single coin loss occurring rather more frequently across Lincolnshire.

In the first decades of the tenth century, the relationship between Lincoln's ecclesiastical and secular elites was of extreme importance, as is obvious from the iconography of the St Martin's coinage. The relationship between Lincoln and York was also close throughout the late ninth and tenth centuries, possibly as a response to the West Saxon expansion, although it is debatable to what extent the York rulers exercised direct political control over Lincoln. The political use of coinage for the consolidation of power relations in Lincolnshire stimulated the rise of a class of 'urban' professionals – the moneyers – who, like the sculptors discussed in chapter 3, were indispensable to the landholding elite. However, on an economic level, coinage could only be used for certain types of transaction in late Anglo-Saxon England, and its heavily regulated nature suggests that the amount of work (and therefore economic prosperity) of the moneyers and silversmiths was entirely dependent on the aristocracy. The next chapter will turn to the production and use of other metal artefacts, which were not subject to the same degree of political control as coins.

CHAPTER 5: THE METALWORK

5.1: Introduction

The evidence for non-ferrous metalworking in late Anglo-Saxon Lincoln is significant (appendix 11), confirming its importance for the socio-economic development of later ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln. What is more, the *PAS* lists a growing number of late Anglo-Saxon metal artefacts from the 'rural' areas of Lincolnshire (appendix 12), which can be studied in order to determine to what extent Lincoln was integrated in the surrounding region. The start and subsequent increase of metalwork production in Lincoln coincides with the demise of metalwork production on 'rural' sites such as Flixborough, which Loveluck (2001: 117; also see Loveluck 2007: 105) has interpreted as evidence of "a change in the [economic] relationship between urban and rural centres during the tenth century". But the significance of the production of metalwork in Lincoln transcends the economic sphere. As discussed in chapter 2.4.5, the metalwork assemblage from Lincoln includes a significant number of dress accessories and related artefacts. These dress accessories were vehicles for the expression of identities, on both an individual and a communal level. Changing fashions or 'trends' were dictated by consumer demand, which necessarily existed within the limits of social, religious and political acceptability. The choice to wear something *in* a particular style could be an active means of expressing one's affiliation to a certain social group or community, or, failing that, an assertion of one's individuality.

The following chapter is structured in the same way as previous chapters. It will first provide a brief overview and critique of existing work on the ever-growing metalwork assemblage from Lincoln and Lindsey (section 5.2). As the majority of evidence for metalworking from Lincoln consists of non-ferrous metalworking involving base metals, the emphasis will rest on artefacts made of copper- and lead-alloys, although artefacts made of precious or ferrous metals will be included where relevant. Following that, this chapter will discuss the distribution patterns of these artefacts (section 5.3). Special attention will be paid to the identification of local and regional trends. Section 5.4 will take a step back from the artefactual detail, and focus on the relationship between developments in the production process and changes in consumption patterns, which will be placed in the broader context of social theories about dress and identity. The increased use of base metals, and the changing role of the smith in Anglo-Saxon society will also be analysed. Finally, section 5.5 will conclude this chapter.

5.2: The metalwork: existing research

Previous research into the late ninth- and tenth-century metalwork from Lincolnshire has treated the objects primarily as indicators of ethnic identity,

placing the emphasis on the artefacts themselves, rather than on the dynamics of production and consumption (Leahy 1993; 2004; 2007; Leahy and Paterson 2001). This certainly holds true for the work of Leahy (1993; 2004; 2007), a key figure for the improvement of the mutual cooperation between archaeologists and metal detectorists, and Finds Advisor (early medieval metalwork) to the *PAS*. As a result of his employment with the North Lincolnshire Museum prior to his retirement from this post in 2007, Leahy's (1993; 2004; 2007) work has focused entirely on Lindsey, with the exception of the settlement of Lincoln itself. Other scholars have incorporated the metalwork from Lindsey in broader studies (see Hadley 2006: ch. 3; Kershaw in prep.; Thomas 2000a; 2000b; 2001), or have looked at individual sites within Lindsey (Blackburn 2002; Brown 2006; Thomas 2009a; 2009b), but Leahy's exclusive focus on the whole of Lindsey is unique. Leahy's work will therefore be used as a starting point for the discussion in this chapter. The remainder of this section will first provide a chronological overview of the different types of metal artefacts that were produced in Lincoln and Lindsey during the middle and late Anglo-Saxon periods (c. 650-1066 AD), in order to provide a context for the developments that took place in the period that stands central to this thesis (c. 870-1000 AD). This section will conclude with a brief review of existing work on the evidence for metalwork production in Lincoln.

At the time of the publication of his most recent book, entitled *The Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*, Leahy (2007: 147) estimated that there were about 600 items of middle Anglo-Saxon (c. 650-850 AD) metalwork from Lindsey, plus some 900 non-ferrous finds from the site at Flixborough, whose date range included the seventh to the tenth centuries (although the majority of finds should probably be placed in the middle Anglo-Saxon period) (now published in Evans and Loveluck 2009). These middle Anglo-Saxon objects varied from silver-gilt objects of high craftsmanship (Leahy 2007: 149, fig. 54), to simple copper-alloy pins and brooches with very little decoration (Leahy 2007: 146, fig. 51.4). Simple dress accessories made of base metals made up the vast majority of middle Anglo-Saxon finds from Lindsey. A review by the current author of the finds from Lincolnshire as a whole, as listed on the *PAS* database, revealed that Lindsey was no exception in this respect. Some 80-85% of middle Anglo-Saxon metalwork finds from the entire county were made exclusively of copper-alloys, with no traces of gilding.¹¹⁰ Further comparison to finds from other regions produced similar percentages for the use of base metals during the middle Anglo-Saxon period (also see Ten Harkel

¹¹⁰ Metalwork finds from the *PAS* with a rough date range of AD 600-850 were included here, *excluding* finds whose date range did not stretch beyond the seventh century (although finds whose date range stretched into the eighth century *were* included). Finds with a definite date range of AD 700-900 were excluded on the basis of the high number of Irish and continental imports (possibly related to viking activity), some of which were gilded and thus would have 'contaminated' the sample. No distinction was made between finds from Lindsey, Kesteven or Holland.

forthcoming a).¹¹¹

Leahy (2007: 148; also see Owen-Crocker 1986: 206) has interpreted the dominant use of base metals for the production of dress accessories – which was used most noticeably for the production of pins and brooches – as evidence “that the use of these pins and brooches was not restricted to the aristocracy, and that the lower orders also had access to [them]”. Although this may be true to an extent, such an equation of material and social status is too simplistic, as the evidence of copper-alloy objects from (presumably) high-status burials shows. For example, the seventh-century burial from Caenby (appendix 6.1.6) included a copper-alloy buckle in addition to a sword and a shield that was decorated with silver mounts, as well as horse-bones and a possible helmet (Buckberry 2004: 353; Geake 1997: 167). In other words, even if gold was an indicator of high status, copper-alloys did not necessarily indicate low(er) status (section 5.4.3).

Leahy (2007) has commented that the use of gilding on dress accessories found in Lindsey gradually disappeared altogether in the course of the eighth and ninth centuries. This pattern is confirmed by analysis of the finds from Flixborough (Evans and Loveluck 2009; Thomas *pers. comm.*), and Lincoln. The only possible pre-Conquest object with gilding from Lincoln is a gilt copper-alloy disc-brooch (<ae58>) of ninth- to eleventh-century date, found at Holmes Grainwarehouse in Wigford, but the present author failed to locate this object during the data-collection process. The only other near-contemporary gilt objects are three later eleventh- to twelfth-century copper-alloy studs with gilt inlay, <106> from Castle Westgate in the Upper City (fig. 28 h); <44> from Saltergate/Silver Street in the Lower City, and <ae243> from Flaxengate in the Lower City. In addition, <455> from Hungate in the Lower City was a small, gilded circular mount made of copper-alloy, with geometric decoration consisting of applied copper-alloy gilt strips. It came from an unstratified context. Finds specialists of the CLAU assigned it a late Anglo-Saxon date on art-historical grounds but, according to Leahy (*pers. comm.*), this type of object is difficult to date, and could be post-medieval as well. Finally, excavations at St Mark’s Station in Wigford produced a set of copper-alloy balances with possible traces of gilding, but this was almost certainly post-Conquest, possibly even twelfth- or thirteenth-century in date (see appendix 13).

The gradual disappearance of gold in the course of the eighth and ninth centuries was not restricted to Lindsey, but can also be observed in southern Lincolnshire and further afield (Walton Rogers 2006). The use of gold for sixth- to

¹¹¹ A rough comparison with contemporary finds from the PAS website from other parts of England (in this case the assemblages from the modern counties of Hampshire, the heartland of what used to be the Kingdom of Wessex, and Kent, situated outside the Scandinavian controlled regions of England even if the area yielded many finds of ‘viking’ character, as well as Yorkshire) suggested that copper-alloys were the preferred material throughout middle Anglo-Saxon England.

seventh-century dress accessories and other types of ornamental metalwork is attested from elsewhere in England. Two well-known examples include the grave goods from the Sutton Hoo burials (Carver 1992; 1998) and, of course, the finds from the recent Staffordshire hoard (<http://www.staffordshirehoard.org.uk>). Seventh-century dress accessories from Lincolnshire that are made of gold include NLM-B895B4, a gold buckle; NLM4319, and unidentified piece of gold jewellery; NLM6885, the gold hilt of a sword; LIN-871CD5, a gold sword pommel; and NLM-7CDDF5, a gold sheet decorated with filigree). However, there is a notable lack of comparable finds that can be attributed to the eighth and ninth centuries. What is more, based on a qualitative assessment of the execution of the ninth-century objects in general, Leahy (2007: 153; also see Owen-Crocker 1986: 206) has identified a 'decline' in workmanship in this period. It may be possible to view this decline in quantity *and* quality as a result of the devastation caused by the Scandinavian campaigns.

Analysis of the finds listed on the *PAS* database revealed that, in the course of the ninth century, artefacts with gilding in Lincolnshire are increasingly restricted to Lindsey, and that this concentration in Lindsey may, to some extent, be related to 'viking' activity. Of the c. 115 artefacts from Lincolnshire that are securely dated to the ninth century, ten objects (or less than 9%) have traces of gilding. Eight of these are from Lindsey, including three from Torksey (DENO-4F69E4; NLM873; and NLM874)) (see chapter 4.3.2), which also produced several pieces of hack-gold and hack-silver (Brown 2006: nos 205, 211-14) (chapter 4.2). In addition, there are a significant number of gilt artefacts from Torksey that are earlier in date but can probably also be associated with viking activity.¹¹² The only late ninth- to tenth-century solid gold artefact from Lincolnshire, a solid gold finger-ring (LIN-D251F2), was found at, again, Torksey (appendix 13). Elsewhere in Lindsey, a gilt mount was found in the parish of Riby (LIN-4997F4), which also produced three ringed pins, of a type that is common in the Irish Sea region and York (LIN-143411, LIN-134231 and LIN-145C85) (appendix 12.1.4.1; section 5.3.2.3). This gilt mount was of possible Irish manufacture, and therefore probably also indicative of 'viking' activity (see below) (also see chapter 3.3). A fourth object (NLM7254) from North Thoresby was a lead weight with an inset of a fragment of gilt jewellery. This type of weight was also found in Torksey (appendix 12.11.1), and is generally held to be of 'viking'

¹¹² These include Brown 2006: 316 (*PAS*-DENO-4F59E7), a cast copper-alloy mount fragment with traces of gilding on the upper surface; Brown 2006: 318 (*PAS*-DENO-4F8407), a gilded copper-alloy mount fragment with two ring-and-dot motifs; Brown 2006: 320 (*PAS*-DENO-4F73D6), a gilded copper-alloy chip-carved mount fragment; Brown 2006: 322 (*PAS*-DENO-4F69E4), a gilded copper-alloy mount fragment with interlace chip-carving; Brown 2006: 323, a copper-alloy mount fragment with thick gilding and interlace decoration; and Brown 2006: 324, a gilded silver mount with a central circular cross-motif. Also from Torksey were Brown 2006: 335, a silver gilded boar's head; Brown 2006: 336 and 337, two plaque fragments with traces of gilding; and Brown 2006: 338, a small fragment of gilt copper-alloy, possibly from a brooch. Also see appendix 13.

manufacture (for a list of gold and gilt objects, see appendix 13).

Of the c. 87 definite tenth-century artefacts found in Lincolnshire, six (just under 7%) are gilded, and five of these are of possible Scandinavian or 'viking' manufacture (appendix 13). The remaining example of a tenth-century object with gilding, LVPL500 from Tallington in Kesteven, is a gilt cloisonné finger ring. The cloisonné technique was used more frequently in the later tenth and eleventh centuries on disc-brooches. Many of these so-called cloisonné brooches bore traces of gilding, and, as such, they represent the only type of artefact that was commonly gilded during this period (Leahy 2007: 179-80; appendix 13). Although cloisonné brooches occur throughout England (Buckton (1986: 15) noted a marked concentration in the southeast of England, but suggested that this may be the result of more intensive metal-detecting activities), they seem to copy tenth- and eleventh-century Byzantine, Ottonian and Frankish examples, and similar brooches have been found in Denmark and Sweden (Buckton 1986: 15-16). As has been noted in chapter 4, the Scandinavian settlers had brought Frankish, Ottoman and Byzantine influences to England in the late ninth century, as evidenced by finds of Arabic dirhams and the designs on the earliest regal coinages from York, as well as the occurrence of continental moneyers' names on the earliest 'viking' coinages from Lincoln, East Anglia and York. It is possible that the expertise to create enamel brooches reached England via similar channels, albeit a century later, potentially in the context of the Scandinavian attacks and political conquests of the later tenth and eleventh centuries. Although no production centre for these brooches has been identified to date, the evidence for glass working from, for example, Lincoln (Bayley 2008a; Foley 1981) may suggest that these specialist activities took place in emerging 'urban' centres.

Whilst the use of gold and gilding was in decline in the eighth, ninth and tenth centuries, the use of silver peaked in the ninth century. Ninth-century silver(ed) artefacts from Lincolnshire consist largely of strap-ends, predominantly those executed in the Anglo-Saxon *Trewhiddle* style (Thomas Class A) (appendix 14). In the tenth century, however, the use of silver for dress accessories also went in decline (appendix 14). Base metals, particularly copper- but also lead-alloys, were now practically the only materials used for dress accessories. The use of lead-alloys peaked during the tenth century. As appendix 15 indicates, which lists all lead artefacts dated to the period c. 700-1100 found in Lincolnshire, the vast majority of lead objects came from Lindsey. In the course of the eleventh century, however, the use of lead for dress accessories decreased in Lindsey, but increased in Kesteven. As there is evidence for the production of lead dress accessories from both Lincoln (section 5.3.2.2) and York (Mainman and Rogers 2000; York Archaeological Trust 2009: 12, 18), it is possible that the use of lead for these objects found its origins in the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England, before

spreading south. This is confirmed by the designs on these lead-alloy brooches, many of which are based on Scandinavian, continental and Byzantine prototypes (Reynolds and Ten Harkel forthcoming; York Archaeological Trust 2009: 18-19).

Even if the introduction of certain 'new' types of dress accessories – such as lead disc-brooches and cloisonné brooches – in Lincolnshire in the ninth and tenth centuries was arguably a result of the Scandinavian settlement, it was long held that clear evidence for the Scandinavian settlement in Lincolnshire in the form of 'Scandinavian' dress accessories was absent (see Leahy 2007: 167). This was largely due to the absence of significant quantities of surface finds, many of which are now available through the *PAS*. Eventually it was Leahy himself who identified the first ever 'viking' find from the region, a fragment of a copper-alloy trefoil brooch (the trefoil shape being a common shape for Scandinavian brooches of the period), found by a metal detectorist at Keelby in 1979 (Leahy 2007: 166). Many more discoveries followed. At the time of the writing of his (2007) book, Leahy (2007: 167) had identified some 274 'viking' or 'Anglo-Scandinavian' objects from Lindsey. According to Leahy (2007: 167), these included 59 objects in the *Borre* style (c. 850-980), eight in the *Jellinge* style (c. 875-975), 25 in the *Ringerike* style (c. 980-1070), and a further 47 objects in the eleventh- and twelfth-century *Urnes* style (c. 1050-1100). Leahy (2007: 168) noticed that the styles seemed to "keep up to date with what was being used in the Scandinavian homelands", and concluded that contacts between Lindsey and Scandinavia must have been maintained throughout the tenth and eleventh centuries. Since the publication of Leahy's (2007) book, more finds have come to light. All relevant finds that were listed on the *PAS* database in 2009 are included in appendix 12. Unfortunately, however, Leahy (2007) does not provide any *PAS*-numbers or detailed descriptions of the majority of the objects that he lists, and it is therefore not possible to cross-reference the artefacts that form the basis of his conclusions with the finds listed on the *PAS* database (also see chapter 2.4.5).

Although the amount of recognised 'viking' or 'Anglo-Scandinavian' artefacts has thus increased enormously in recent decades, the nature of the assemblage was nevertheless not what Leahy had expected. To quote his own, published response (Leahy 2007: 166-67):

It consisted, not of weapons, but of small, trashy dress fittings. Many of these came from women's dress and, while there was the occasional fine piece, most of them were of poor quality, cheaply made, using poor materials [such as copper- and lead-alloys] ... At first I thought that these were locally made copies of Danish brooches; the reference books tended to show only the finest and best, the gold and the silver. It was when Caroline Paterson, with whom I worked on these finds, visited the National Museum in Denmark did we discover that the Lindsey finds were really Viking: the reserve collections in Copenhagen were full of the same tatty little

brooches that we were getting.

Leahy's words suggest that he believes that these objects were actually produced in Scandinavia. This is untenable in the light of the evidence for the production of copper- and lead-alloy dress accessories from settlements in the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England, including Lincoln (section 5.3.2.2), York (Mainman and Rogers 2000; York Archaeological Trust 2009: 12-19) and possibly Norwich or another production centre in East Anglia (Margeson 1997; Oakley in prep.).

There are more issues with Leahy's (2007: 166-67) interpretation. His approach to the material is entirely culture-historical, and equates 'ethnic' styles with 'peoples', an approach that has received important criticism since the New Archaeology of the 1970s (Johnson 1999; Thomas 2000a; 2001; Webster 2008). His culture-historical emphasis is particularly obvious when he discusses his deductions about the character of the Scandinavian settlement, based on the growing assemblage of "tatty little brooches":

The low quality of these finds is important as it points to an influx of Danish peasant women during the later ninth and tenth century. No Dane is going to be able to give his English girlfriend one of these tatty little brooches and expect her to be impressed, a woman needed to be brought up as a Dane and see wearing them as part of her culture (Leahy 2007: 166-67).

The presence of Scandinavian women in England is attested by the *ASC* (A: 896), which discusses how the raiders secured 'their women' in East Anglia. The presence of Scandinavian women in the viking armies was not unusual. For example, the *Bella Parisiaca Urbis*, written by Abbo of St Germain-des-Prés in the 890s, which describes the siege of Paris by the viking invaders in AD 885-86, refers to the invaders' women cheering their men on as they attacked the city. However, even if Leahy's conclusion is correct, his equation of decorative style with biological descent is, at best, deeply problematic. Research into the issues of identity and ethnicity, carried out over the course of the last two decades or so, has revealed that both are social constructs that can be adopted or rejected to fit an individual's purposes and/or needs (Thomas 2000a; Trafford 2000). In other words, even if these base metal dress accessories were perceived to be 'typically' Scandinavian, there is no reason to assume that an Anglo-Saxon woman would not adopt a 'Scandinavian' identity if, for example, she decided to marry a Scandinavian settler. What is more, many of these supposedly 'viking' dress accessories actually revealed both Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon influences. Margeson (1997) has pointed out that, although the base metal flat disc brooches were often decorated in Scandinavian *Borre* and *Jellinge* style, their shape was essentially Anglo-Saxon, as most disc-brooches produced in Scandinavia prior to this point were convex rather than flat.

Leahy (2007: 177) also states that there was a sizeable assemblage of ninth-

century 'Irish' metalwork from Lindsey. This was traditionally assumed to be viking loot but, as many of the artefacts were horse-harness fittings made of copper-alloy and not of precious materials, Leahy (2007: 177) has posed the question: "Who would steal this stuff?" His explanation was as follows:

I think that this points to there being Irish Vikings. Viking is a job description and not an ethnic label, and Danes, Norwegians and Swedes all played their part. A Viking leader, if confronted by a large red-headed man with a battle-axe asking if he could come along 'for the crack', is not going to turn him away. We have other evidence for an Irish presence in Lindsey, as Scotter, Scothern, Scotton and Irby (twice) are all Irish placenames. Of course the word 'Scot' also means a native of 'north Britain' but, as these Gaelic speaking peoples were considered to be the same, it does not matter.

Although Leahy has a point in regarding the term 'viking' as a job description (the term originally derives from OE *wikingas* meaning pirates; Clark Hall 2000: 407), and there is indeed evidence for contacts with Ireland (via York) at this time (chapters 3 and 4), his equation of decorative styles and 'peoples' is somewhat paradoxical in the context of his amalgamation of Ireland and Scotland, to say the least. It must also be noted that the entries in the *PAS* database do not explicitly list many horse-harness fittings of Irish manufacture for the period between the ninth and eleventh centuries; on the contrary, the vast majority was of local manufacture, and many were decorated in the Scandinavian-derived *Urnes* and *Ringerike* styles (appendix 12.6). It is possible that the lack of Irish horse-harness fittings on the *PAS* database is an omission on the part of the database, but until the discrepancy between Leahy's (2007) published account and the database is clarified, Leahy's conclusions must be taken with caution (see chapter 2.4.5).

Leahy (2007: 179) has also identified 126 items of tenth- to eleventh-century 'Anglo-Saxon' (read: West Saxon) metalwork in Lindsey, including eleven artefacts in the tenth-century *Winchester*-style (appendix 12.2.1 lists at least fourteen strap-ends in the *Winchester*-style from Lindsey, but as appendix 12 was compiled a few years after Leahy wrote his (2007) book, this should not come as a surprise). A significant proportion of these were made of lead (appendix 15). These were traditionally believed to imitate silver examples, but no silver artefacts have so far been found (Leahy 2007: 179) and, in the light of the growing number of lead dress accessories of tenth- to eleventh-century date from England, it is now generally accepted that lead-alloy was considered a perfectly acceptable material for dress accessories (York Archaeological Trust 2009: 12, 18; Mainman and Rogers 2000; Reynolds and Ten Harkel forthcoming). Having said that, some of the lead-alloy brooches from the eleventh-century Cheapside hoard from London (Reynolds and Ten Harkel forthcoming), which contained some 32 lead-alloy brooches, had such a high tin content that their appearance was almost indistinguishable from

silver, which suggests that lead alloys were used, at least in some cases, to create a 'silver' effect (also see York Archaeological Trust 2009: 12-13, 18-19) (also see chapter 4.3.3).

The final categories of dress accessories that Leahy (2007: 155) discusses are imports of continental metalwork. In his opinion, these include ansate brooches (Leahy lists some 27 examples in total) and tongue-shaped strap-ends with acanthus-leaf decoration. Leahy (2007: 155) states that these artefacts mostly occur along transportation lines, but *not* in Lincoln, Torksey and Flixborough. In 2009, the PAS database listed thirteen ansate brooches from Lindsey (appendix 12.5.1.1), plus an additional seven from Kesteven (appendix 12.5.1.2). This came to a total of only 20 examples, which rendered seven of Leahy's brooches unaccounted for (also see chapter 2.4.5). In addition, two or three were found in Lincoln itself (<ae107> and possibly <ae23> from Flaxengate in the Lower City, plus one example from St Mark's in Wigford) (appendix 11.2.14; 11.3.6). The brooch from St Mark's Church in Wigford had a clear parallel from the late ninth- to tenth-century circular fortress or *ringwalburg* at Domburg in the Netherlands (Mann 1986: 41), which is traditionally interpreted as a defensive structure against the vikings (Van Heeringen *et al.* 1995), although it has also been argued that the *ringwalburgen* were built by the vikings themselves (Van Heeringen 1988: 7; also see Ten Harkel 2002; in prep. a). The date range of these ansate brooches stretched from the seventh to the tenth centuries, but their use in England, based on the absence of such brooches from furnished graves of the seventh and early eighth centuries, was restricted to the period after c. 720 (Geake *pers. comm.* on PAS database (entry for NLM1010)). As there is no production evidence for these brooches from England, and they occur in relatively low numbers, it is possible that they arrived as the personal possessions of Scandinavian or continental settlers. Their presence in Lincoln contradicts Leahy's (2007: 155) assertion that finds of continental manufacture did not occur here (see above).

Leahy's (2007: 155) assertion that many continental strap-ends were found in Lindsey as well cannot be confirmed through analysis of the finds listed on the PAS database. The only definite strap-end that is explicitly listed as being of continental manufacture is NLM-C222A7 from Nettleton (appendix 12.2.1), which depicts a central foliate motif on a tongue-shaped object with a hollow back. Another possible strap-end or decorative mount (SWYOR-1AA507), found in the parish of Lea, was triangular in shape, with foliate motifs and remnants of gilding. Again, Leahy (2007) does not provide any PAS database numbers or descriptions of the strap-ends that he considers to be continental imports, and tongue-shaped strap-ends with acanthus-leaf decoration also include strap-ends in the so-called *Winchester*-style, produced in England in the eleventh century (Margeson 1997: 31).

This is not to say that finds of continental manufacture did not occur in

Lindsey. Analysis of the finds listed on the *PAS* database by the current author revealed that finds of continental origin were more varied in nature than consisting only of ansate brooches and strap-ends. They also included an eleventh-century continental copper-alloy buckle from the parish of Healing (NLM5420) (appendix 12.3.1), as well as NLM2720, an eighth- or ninth-century continental copper-alloy gilt pendant from Elsham (appendix 12.8.1; appendix 13), and a continental copper-alloy mount from Horncastle (NLM-BAB507) (appendix 12.12.1.1). In addition, Jones *et al.* (2003: 151, 154) report a silver Carolingian buckle from St Paul-in-the-Bail in Lincoln's Upper City (appendix 11.1.2; appendix 14), whilst Brown recorded a silver-gilt continental scabbard mount (Brown 2006: 314) from Torksey (appendix 12.10.4.1), as well as a gilded mount or fitting of continental manufacture (DENO-872273) (appendix 12.12.1.1). Again, the occurrence of these objects in Lincoln and Torksey contradicts Leahy's (2007: 155) assertion that finds of continental manufacture are not known from these sites. Finally, comparison with the rest of Lincolnshire reveals that continental artefacts from Kesteven are less common than those from Lindsey, amounting to only three objects. These include LIN-5FCA06, a ninth-century rectangular copper-alloy brooch fragment from Heighington (appendix 12.5.8.2); DENO-184477, a continental brooch with gilt and silver inlay from Sleaford (appendix 12.5.8.2); and NLM4620, a continental scabbard from Honington (appendix 12.10.2.2). The district of Holland, on the other hand, has yielded none.¹¹³

In addition to Leahy's (1993; 2004; 2007) work on the metal artefacts from Lindsey, a study of the technological evidence for metalworking at Flaxengate in the Lower City has recently been published as well, which focuses on the crucibles, heating trays, parting vessels, ceramic and stone moulds, scrap metal, slags and unfinished objects (Bayley 2008b). Some preliminary work was undertaken in the late 1970s and 1980s (Bayley 1979; 1984; White 1982), and originally a monograph was intended to bring together the evidence for metalworking in Lincoln as part of the *Archaeology of Lincoln* series. In 1992, White carried out another assessment of the material, and concluded that the evidence for metalworking in Lincoln occurred on a greater number of sites than had previously been realised. However, as mentioned in chapter 2.4.5, plans to publish the metalwork never materialised. Many of the finds presented in appendix 11 have therefore never been published (although the current author has obtained preliminary permission to publish the material (Ten Harkel forthcoming b; in prep. b)). The evidence for

¹¹³ It was beyond the scope and remit of this thesis to verify Leahy's (2006) statements regarding objects of continental, Irish or Scandinavian manufacture with any more precision beyond the most preliminary level. In the process of this preliminary verification, however, it was noted that although some entries on the *PAS* database are very limited in terms of the amount of information they provide, standards of recording are on the whole adequate, and the discrepancy between Leahy's (2006) statements and the information recorded on the *PAS* database therefore remains problematic.

metalworking in Lincoln is summarised in appendix 16.

Section 5.4 will address the evidence for metalwork production in Lincoln on a more interpretative level, but the remainder of this section will highlight some of the conclusions that can be drawn from existing published and unpublished research. In short, it seems that non-ferrous metalworking occurred in the Lower City from the later ninth century onwards, in particular in the area near Flaxengate, Silver Street and Saltergate (Bayley 2008b) (appendix 16). As discussed in chapter 2.2.3, the late Anglo-Saxon layers at Silver Street and Saltergate were removed by machine. Only the Silver Street kilns were excavated with care, and here, some evidence for eleventh- to twelfth-century metalworking was found in layers overlying the kilns, consisting of a number of Stamford-ware crucible sherds with traces of debased silver and (in one case) gold were found in the pits on the site (Miles *et al.* 1989: 198). However, subsequent analysis of late Anglo-Saxon crucible residues from Saltergate and Silver Street only revealed evidence for copper-alloy and silver working (Bayley 2008b: 44). In fact, the only evidence for gold working in late Anglo-Saxon to Saxo-Norman Lincoln was identified in the Upper City, at The Park (Bayley 2008b: 43-44). It must be kept in mind, however, that Bayley's (2008b) report focused primarily on Flaxengate, with comparative data from 16 other sites in Lincoln, but was not intended to be comprehensive. As a result, some sites with attested evidence for metalworking activities, such as St Paul-in-the-Bail, were excluded from Bayley's (2008b) study.

At Flaxengate, evidence for metal casting and sheet-metal production could be associated with individual structures (structures 13, 16, 17 and 20). Structure 20 produced a concentration of hooked tags, mostly made of copper-alloys (appendix 11.2.14), as well as a stone mould and two silver objects, suggesting that silver was worked here (Perring 1981: 41). The first evidence for iron smithing came from slightly later, tenth-century deposits (Jones *et al.* 2003: 274-75). Ironworking also took place at Silver Street (Bayley 2008b: 35; Steane *et al.* forthcoming) (appendix 1.2.1.22), Michaelgate (Steane *et al.* forthcoming) (appendix 1.2.1.5), as well as a number of sites in Wigford and the Upper City (Bayley 2008b: 35), whilst iron smelting may have been carried out at Broadgate East in Butwerk (Steane *et al.* forthcoming) (appendix 1.4.1.1). However, unlike at Stamford (Burchard 1982) or York (Ottaway 1992), ironworking was never carried out on a large scale. Finally, evidence for lead working was identified on a number of sites, including Flaxengate and Hungate (appendix 16). As mentioned previously, lead was also worked in York (Mainman and Rogers 2000; York Archaeological Trust 2009). Both York and Lincoln furthermore produced evidence for high-lead glass working (Bayley 2008a: 35; Foley 1981; Mainman 1990: 469), which would account for some of the scrap lead that was found. Unfortunately lead working is difficult to identify because the relatively low melting temperature does not leave

residues, and it is therefore possible that normal cooking pots would have been used as crucibles (Bayley 2008b: 35). This thesis will focus on the evidence for non-ferrous metalworking, although relevant iron objects, such as the iron hooked tags that were found at Flaxengate (appendix 11.2.14) and Woolworth's Basement (appendix 11.2.10), will also be included.

The range of metals worked in Lincoln was thus fairly comprehensive, and included iron, copper- and lead-alloys, silver and gold. In this respect the settlement does not differ from the middle to late Anglo-Saxon rural settlement at Flixborough, where the same range of metals was also worked, at least until the middle of the ninth century (Fenwick *et al.* 1998: 161-63; Loveluck 2001: 117; Evans and Loveluck 2009). It is worth noting in this context that, after the middle of the ninth century, non-ferrous metalworking activities at Flixborough came to an end, whilst ironworking, in particular iron smelting, increased in the course of the tenth century, although the scale on which this took place suggests that it was intended primarily for local use (Loveluck 2007: 104-05). As Loveluck (2007: 105) has stated: "in the tenth century, craft-working and specialist production, beyond the needs of artisans and their immediate patrons, seems to have become much more concentrated in the new urban centres at the expense of rural estates". The next section will look at the distribution patterns of metalwork and metalworking evidence from Lincoln and the rest of Lincolnshire in more detail.

5.3: The metalwork from a spatial perspective

5.3.1: The metalwork from a spatial perspective: introduction

Previous analysis of the distribution of the metalwork by Leahy (2007: 180) concluded that the distribution patterns of 'Anglo-Saxon' and 'viking'/'Anglo-Scandinavian' metalwork overlap, leading him to suggest that "the two people were living together [but] they were still 'celebrating their diversity'". Only the area immediately surrounding Lincoln, with a radius of about 10 km, was identified as a gap in the distribution patterns of both (Leahy 2007: 180; Leahy and Paterson 2001: 186-90, figs 10.3 and 10.4). Leahy and Paterson (2001: 198-90) consider this to be a real reflection of the situation, "perhaps due to a depressed population", and not influenced at all by retrieval factors such as land-use or intensity of metal detecting activities (also see Leahy 2007: 180). This gap in metal artefacts supposedly corresponds to a similar gap in the distribution of Scandinavian placenames in same area (Leahy and Paterson 2001: 183; Hadley 2006: 121). This does not mean that Scandinavian placenames and artefacts are entirely absent. For example, the settlement of Riseholme, just to the north of Lincoln, incorporates the placename element *-holm*, which may be derived from ON *-holmr*, meaning 'island' (Sawyer 1998: 102), whilst Skellingthorpe, just west of Lincoln, is a Scandinavianization of *Schellinghop* ('the dry land in the fen that

belongs to Sceld's people') (Ekwall 1960: 424). What is more, the *PAS* lists a number of finds of 'Scandinavian' character from the immediate vicinity of Lincoln as well, including LIN-DFAF06, an incomplete lozenge-shaped openwork copper-alloy brooch in *Borre* style; and NLM2686, a *Borre*-style strap-end, and it is possible that future metal detecting activities in this area will bring more finds to light (also see chapter 2.4.5).

Although Leahy's focus on metal-detected finds from Lindsey has brought important facts to light about the situation in 'rural' Lindsey, his work does not, generally speaking, include finds from Lincoln, nor does it look at differences between Lindsey and other parts of Lincolnshire (or, indeed, the rest of England). One important difference between the assemblages from Lincoln and the rest of Lindsey is the copious evidence for late ninth- and tenth-century metalwork production from Lincoln. As discussed in chapter 2.4.5, it is possible that this is at least partially a result of a lack of recognition of late Anglo-Saxon metalworking scrap outside Lincoln, as the unstratified nature of most 'rural' finds means that they can only be dated on art-historical grounds. A more productive method of investigation to determine the scale at which the metalworking industry at Lincoln operated is to compare the artefacts from Lincoln for which there is positive production evidence with the number of identical (or very similar) finds from the surrounding region, whose production centre can be identified (with reasonable certainty) as Lincoln. Such an approach has not been attempted before, nor has a more straightforward comparison between the assemblages from Lincoln and the finds listed on the *PAS* database for the rest of Lincolnshire been carried out. These comparisons will therefore stand central to the remainder of this section, as will comparison between the assemblages from the various parts of Lincoln, and between the assemblages of Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland.

Outside Lincoln, the same two 'rural' sites stand out in terms of the amount and nature of the metalwork they produced as were flagged up in chapter 4.3.2. These are, first, Flixborough, which has yielded a significant amount of seventh- to ninth-century metalwork (Evans and Loveluck 2009) (also see appendix 12 and chapter 4), with some tenth-century material as well (Ottaway 2009d; Rogers 2009b: 28-29; 2009c; 2009d: 422; Rogers and Ottaway 2009: 24-28; Thomas 2009a: 19-22; Wastling 2009). The second site is Torksey, which has produced a significant amount of mostly eighth- to eleventh-century metal artefacts that are commonly interpreted as being deposited, as part of one or more viking hoards, when the viking army overwintered at Torksey in AD 872-73, or during the subsequent period of Scandinavian settlement (Brown 2006).

The remainder of this section will discuss the distribution patterns of the metal artefacts, which are subdivided into broad categories determined by their use. Section 5.3.2 will focus on dress accessories (here including pins, strap-ends,

buckles, hooked tags, brooches and pendants) found in Lincoln, and compare their nature and distribution to dress accessories found in the rest of Lincolnshire. As this section covers a significant amount of data, it is subdivided into three sub-sections. Section 5.3.2.1 places the material from the Upper City in its regional context. Section 5.3.2.2 places the material from the Lower City and Wigford in its regional context. Finally, section 5.3.2.3 looks at some regional trends within Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland that are not covered by sections 5.3.2.1 and 5.3.2.2. After the dress accessories, this chapter will discuss the remaining categories of metalwork that are included in this thesis. These include so-called 'Norse' bells (section 5.3.3); equestrian equipment (section 5.3.4); weapons and knives (section 5.3.5); balances, weights and gaming pieces (section 5.3.6); and 'other' objects (section 5.3.7). Section 5.3.8 will briefly rehearse the main points that emerged from the spatial analysis of the various types of artefact. As has been the case in previous chapters, because of the inherently incomplete nature and limited quantity of the data, the analysis will focus on the qualitative, rather than the quantitative, aspects of their distribution, with the aim of identifying similarities and differences between sites and regions as a key to their functions and (perceived) identities. For detailed information about the artefacts discussed, see appendices 11 and 12.

5.3.2.1: 'Foreign' treasure: the Upper City in its regional context

The distribution patterns of metal dress accessories from the various parts of Lincoln vary greatly. The Upper City stands out in comparison to the rest of Lincoln for its near-complete lack of ninth- to early eleventh-century copper-alloy dress accessories, despite the evidence for non-ferrous metalwork production (mostly consisting of copper-alloys) at St Paul-in-the-Bail (see above and appendix 16). St Paul-in-the-Bail (appendix 11.1.2) and possibly West Bight (appendix 11.1.3) were the only sites in the Upper City to produce pre-Conquest dress accessories.

Excavations at West Bight (appendix 11.1.3) produced a single copper-alloy hooked tag (<ae13>) (the above-mentioned gilt copper-alloy stud from Castle Westgate (appendix 11.1.1) is almost certainly of later eleventh-century post-Conquest date), but finds from St Paul-in-the-Bail (appendix 11.1.2) were more numerous. In addition to the above-mentioned scrap-metal and two copper-alloy hooked tags (<ae46> and <ae170>), excavations at St Paul-in-the-Bail produced three ninth-century silver dress accessories. These include two buckles, one of continental manufacture and the other in *Trewhiddle* style, and a strap-end, also in *Trewhiddle* style (illustrated in Jones *et al.* 2003: 151, figs. 8.9 and 8.10). As discussed in chapters 3 and 4, they have been interpreted as elements from a mixed hoard or, alternatively, as dispersed grave goods (Jones *et al.* 2003: 151). Other examples of silver objects from Lincoln are rare, and comprise only a silver hooked tag from West Parade in the Lower City (<ae62>) (fig. 25 g), and a possible

fragment of a set of silver scales (<1533>) (fig. 27 a) from Castle Westgate in the Upper City, but this latter object was almost certainly of post-Conquest date. Finally, Steane *et al.* (forthcoming) mention some silver scrap from Flaxengate, including wire, a possible bracelet fragment, and a silver ring.

Silvering does not occur very often in Lincoln either. Objects with silvering have been found at Flaxengate, which produced a silvered copper-alloy hooked tag (<ae45>) with *Ringerike*-style decoration, similar to an eleventh- to twelfth-century example found at Coppergate in York (Tweddle 2004: 455, fig. 115) (fig. 25 c). The only pre-Conquest object from Lincoln that may have been silvered (although the identification is at best tentative) was <57> from Granta Place, an iron-plated hinged box- or book-mount with some possible traces of silver inlay (fig. 27 b) (although scientific analysis of the inlay has not been carried out, and it is possible as well that the silver-grey inlay was tin).

The lack of definite pre-Conquest metalwork finds from sites other than St Paul-in-the-Bail in the Upper City corresponds well with the lack of contemporary coinage (chapter 4; with the exception again of St Paul-in-the-Bail), pottery (chapter 6), or, indeed, any non-ecclesiastical and non-funerary structural remains (chapter 2.2.2). This confirms the suggestion by Jones *et al.* (2003: 192, 201) that the Upper City was largely unoccupied throughout the tenth century. The tenth-century evidence for metalworking from St Paul-in-the-Bail may seem out of place in this context, but as will be discussed below (section 5.4.3), there is evidence that metalworking activities were increasingly associated with the Church in the late Anglo-Saxon period.

St Paul-in-the-Bail also stands out because of the relatively high percentage of early ninth-century dress accessories made of silver. Other middle Anglo-Saxon finds from Lincoln are rare, and those that have been found were made entirely of base metals. Definite examples include a middle Anglo-Saxon buckle, made of copper-alloy, from Michaelgate in the Lower City (Jones *et al.* 2003: 153, fig. 8.14) (appendix 11.2.12). The above-mentioned ansate brooch from the site of St Mark's in Wigford (Jones *et al.* 2003: 154, fig. 8.15; Mann 1986: 41) (appendix 11.3.6) and two additional copper-alloy ansate brooch fragments (<ae107> and <ae23>) from Flaxengate in the Lower City may also belong to this period, but, as the ansate form was in use from the seventh to the tenth century, they may also belong to the later end of the spectrum. Finally, Flaxengate produced a copper-alloy polyhedral-headed pin (<ae64>), but again, Jones *et al.* (2003: 154) have stated, this could be either of middle or late Anglo-Saxon date (although Leahy (*pers. comm.*) assigned it an eighth- to ninth-century date) (appendix 11.2.14).

The suggestion that the silver artefacts from St Paul-in-the-Bail formed part of a viking hoard can be tested through comparison to the material from Torksey. At least some of the material from Torksey can be interpreted as 'loot', deposited as part of one or more viking hoards (Brown 2006). As discussed in section 5.2, finds of foreign

manufacture that were made of precious metals are particularly likely to fall into this category. Torksey has produced several such objects, as well as a significant amount of Arabic *dirhams* (appendix 9.1.41). Artefacts of possible continental origin from Torksey include a gilt copper-alloy and silver mount (Brown 2006: no 317; DENO-872273) (appendix 12.12.1.1) and a solid silver gilt scabbard mount (Brown 2006: no 314) (appendix 12.10.4.1), as well as several other gilt artefacts of ninth-century date, including hack-silver and hack-gold and silver and gold ingots (appendix 13). As the ninth-century objects from St Paul-in-the-Bail were also made of precious metal and included one artefact of continental manufacture, and were probably associated with four coins and coin fragments of similar date, it seems likely that they were part of a hoard, albeit a relatively small one. Cemeteries are not unusual locations for finds of buried treasure. A near-contemporary example was found in Croydon (Brooks and Graham-Campbell 1986). Here, no less than 250 coins, three ingots, a cut section of a fourth ingot, and four pieces of hack-silver were wrapped in a coarse linen bag and tied with a string before being deposited inside a stone chest or coffin, where it remained until it was found by workmen in 1862 (Brooks and Graham-Campbell 1986: 92) (for other examples of viking hoards deposited in churchyards, see Graham-Campbell 1982).

As the coins from St Paul-in-the-Bail were dated to the 860s and 870s, the hoard cannot have been buried before the 870s, which is roughly contemporary with the dates that the ASC provides for the Scandinavian settlement of Northumbria, Mercia and East Anglia, and which is arguably also the date for the Scandinavian settlement of Lindsey. The St Paul-in-the-Bail hoard may therefore be interpreted as treasure that was buried during the early years of settlement, when the nature of Scandinavian activity had changed from hit-and-run tactics to permanent occupation, but relations between the native population and the Scandinavian settlers were still uneasy at best. The question remains whether the presence of a viking hoard in this cemetery indicates early contacts between the viking raiders and the local ecclesiastical elite, or whether it should be taken as evidence that the ecclesiastical elite had fled the Upper City as a result of the viking incursions. The radiocarbon dates for the skeletal evidence from St Paul-in-the-Bail are not numerous or precise enough to state with certainty that the use of this cemetery was continuous (see appendix 5.1.1). However, as discussed in chapter 3, the stratigraphic sequence was characterised by continuity rather than abrupt change, at least until the second half of the tenth century, which renders it unlikely that the Upper City was completely deserted as a result of the viking raids and subsequent settlement.

5.3.2.2: Lincoln as production centre: the Lower City and Wigford

Whilst the metalwork from the Upper City can be placed in a similar light as the earliest material from Torksey – as loot – the metalwork from the Lower City and

Wigford is of a very different character, and includes a significant amount of evidence for late ninth- and tenth-century metalwork production, in particular of dress accessories made of copper and lead alloys. This section will focus primarily on the finished and part-finished dress accessories, whilst the production *process* will be discussed in section 5.4. Finds of possible middle Anglo-Saxon date from the Lower City and Wigford will not be mentioned again, as they have already been discussed in section 5.3.2.1.

Evidence for late ninth- and tenth-century metalwork-production from the Lower City was found on numerous sites (appendix 16). This raises the possibility that different production sites specialised in different types of artefact. The most significant production evidence has been recognised in association with structure 20 at Flaxengate (Mann 1999b: 226-27; Perring 1981: 41), and consists of some 62 finished and unfinished hooked tags (appendix 11.2.14.1). Some 45 of these were made of copper-alloy, and seventeen of iron. They were produced in a variety of shapes, including triangular as well as circular plates (fig. 25 a-e).¹¹⁴

The function of these so-called hooked tags is unknown, although they were probably fasteners of some sort (Mann 1999b: 226). The decoration on the Lincoln tags typically consists of a double or single row of punched dots – known as ‘ratchet decoration’ – in various patterns, around the outside perimeter of the plate, around the attachment holes, and sometimes across the centre of the plate in the shape of a cross (most clearly illustrated on fig. 25 d-e). This type of decoration is by no means typically ‘Scandinavian’, but has been found in the south of England as well (Thomas *pers. comm.*). Hooked tags in typically ‘Scandinavian’ styles are unusual anyway, and, in addition to the above-mentioned eleventh- to twelfth-century example from Flaxengate that was decorated in the Scandinavian-derived *Ringerike*-style (<ae45>) (fig. 25 c), plus a possible parallel from Thimbleby (<NLM-E7A805>) (fig. 25 m), the only possible example from Lincolnshire is NLM5725 from Ludford (appendix 12.4.1), whose decoration may be inspired by *Borre*-style motifs, especially from a type of *Borre*-style flat disc-brooch that was produced in East Anglia (see below; this section), which combined four symmetrical strands of interlace set around a central lozenge (fig. 25 i).

Small numbers of finished and unfinished hooked tags were also found at other sites in the Lower City. In addition to the above-mentioned solid silver hooked tag from West Parade (<ae62>), this site also produced an unfinished copper-alloy hooked tag, <ae24> (appendix 11.2.6) (fig. 25 g-h). Other sites from

¹¹⁴ The evidence for the production of triangular-plated hooked tags at Flaxengate is derived from Bayley 2008b, White 1982 and the finds catalogue of the CLAU (now integrated into the catalogue of The Collection). This evidence sheds new light on Leahy’s (2007: 153) assertion that “the triangular form is eighth century (some long, narrow examples being found in seventh-century graves) and the small round examples are late, being made in Lincoln in the tenth century”, and suggests instead that the distinction was less hard and fast.

the Lower City that yielded evidence for the production of hooked tags include Granta Place, which produced a single unfinished hooked tag <147> (appendix 11.2.3). Just outside the Lower City, the site at Woolworth's Basement also produced two possible unfinished iron hooked tags (<162> and <210>) (appendix 11.2.10), and from the immediate vicinity, at Waterside, an additional five hooked tags were retrieved, two made of iron (<306> and <2116>), and three of copper-alloy (<577>, <1225> and <193>) (appendix 11.2.11). Broadgate East produced one finished copper-alloy hooked tag <ae37> with a triangular body and punched decoration, displaying great similarities with some of the examples from Flaxengate, such as <ae213> and <ae546> (fig. 25 f), as well as a single possible unfinished tag <ae10> (appendix 11.4.1). Finally, Danes Terrace produced two finished copper-alloy hooked tags (<ae177> and <ae116>) with rounded plates (appendix 11.2.1). The number of hooked tags from other parts of Lincoln was even smaller. Wigford yielded one possible unfinished iron hooked tag (<fe365>) from the site at St Mark's (appendix 11.3.6). Another site at 170 High Street produced <34>, a hooked tag made of copper-alloy (appendix 11.3.9). The only hooked tags from the Upper City were the above-mentioned examples from St Paul-in-the-Bail (<ae46> and <ae170>) (appendix 11.1.2) and West Bight (<ae13>) (appendix 11.1.3). The evidence therefore suggests that Flaxengate was, indeed, the main production centre for these objects.

According to White (1982: 7), the reason that so many unfinished tags were discarded was related to variations in the lead content of the metal, which, when too low or too high, could cause the objects to be too brittle or too soft to work with (according to White (*pers. comm.*), an average of 2% lead in copper-alloys is ideal). White believes that such variations in metal composition were caused by the fact that late Anglo-Saxon metalworking in Lincoln was restricted to smithing rather than smelting. In other words, rather than using ores as raw materials, the smiths who worked in Lincoln during the later ninth and tenth centuries used discarded scrap-metal, which necessarily resulted in a process of trial and error (White 1982: 7).¹¹⁵ Evidence that such recycling also occurred during the middle Anglo-Saxon period is provided by the so-called 'smith's grave' from Tattershall Thorpe, in which an individual was buried with a box containing a random collection of pieces of scrap-metal (Hinton 2000) (appendix 6.1.21; chapter 3).

In the case of Lincoln, scrap-metal was readily available in the form of residual Roman copper-alloy artefacts, in particular coins, which were found in large

¹¹⁵ A similar argument has been proposed in the context of Foley's (1981) analyses of the glass and scrap metal from Flaxengate, which concluded that there also was a high variability in the technological composition of the glass, suggesting that their production was often determined by trial-and-error rather than by following fixed recipes. As Foley (1981: 70) stated, "it is probable ... that the glass workers did not perhaps fully understand the use of metals or metal oxides as colorants so that the effects produced were rather random".

quantities in late ninth- to eleventh-century deposits, although artefacts of ninth- and tenth-century date were presumably also recycled. White (1982: 68) identified 403 residual third- to fourth-century Roman copper-alloy coins in the late ninth- and tenth-century layers at Flaxengate, 5% of which came from the demolition phase of the late Roman buildings (assigned a ninth-century date), with an additional 23% from levelling layers that were deposited prior to the first construction phase (which was initiated in the late ninth century). Another 23% came from the pits on the western end of the site (that could not be closely associated with any particular building phase (appendix 1.2.1.15)), and 18% came from levelling layers between building phases (dated to the late eleventh century). The remainder was later, or unstratified.

The sheer quantity of available residual copper-alloys allowed metalwork production at Lincoln to take on (semi-) industrial dimensions. In other words, whilst the ruins of the Roman settlement at Lincoln may have contributed to the development of the late Anglo-Saxon settlement on an ideological level (chapter 3.5.2), at the same time the debris of the Roman settlement also contributed positively to Lincoln's development as a 'town' on an economic level. At the same time, however, the active process of transforming the remnants of a distant past, in this case residual metalwork, into something new had symbolic significance as well, even if the symbolism was not necessarily the driving force behind the action. In other words, the transformation of debris left behind by an ancient civilisation into dress accessories that contributed to the socio-economic success of a new *civitas* and a new order can be viewed in the same light as the similar process of *deconstruction* and *reconstruction* as was noted in the context of the transformation of old Roman building stone into funerary sculpture (chapter 3.6.3).

Moving out of Lincoln itself, as discussed in chapter 1.3, Astill (2006) has argued that the socio-economic success of the West Saxon *burhs* depended to a significant degree on their level of integration with pre-existing transport networks. If this is the case for Lincoln as well, one may expect to find evidence of the socio-economic integration of the settlement in the surrounding region. As stated previously, for that reason comparison was undertaken in the context of this PhD research between finds from Lincoln for which there is clear production evidence with finds listed on the *PAS* database for the rest of Lincolnshire. A significant number of hooked tags have been found outside Lincoln, including some 35 examples from Lindsey, and at least nine from Kesteven. Thirteen of the Lindsey examples and three of the Kesteven examples show clear stylistic similarities to the hooked tags from Lincoln, including the same 'ratchet'-type decoration around the perimeter and attachment holes. These include NLM18 from Elsham (fig. 25 j); NLM-99F413 from Haxey (fig. 25 k); NLM4715 from Thimbleby (fig. 25 l); DENO-601C85 from Torksey (fig. 25 o); and NLM-6EFB28 from the parish of Willoughby

with Sloothby (fig. 25 n) (appendix 12.4.1).

If all hooked tags with this type of decoration that occur in Lindsey and Kesteven were produced in Lincoln, it is possible to analyse their distribution in order to assess the extent to which Lincoln functioned as a supply centre for the surrounding region. Fig. 26, which plots their distribution, reveals that their occurrence is biased towards Lindsey, although they were not restricted to that region to the same extent as, for example, the Lindsey-type funerary sculptures (chapter 3). However, as is apparent from appendix 12, the number of reported finds for Lindsey (which produced 65 tags in total, or 38 excluding the assemblage from Flixborough) is so much higher than that from Kesteven (which yielded a total of ten hooked tags) and Holland (which produced none) that the distinction therefore probably reflects the relative intensity of metal-detecting activities in these regions (chapter 2), rather than an actual difference, as was observed in the context of the sculpture distribution patterns. Nevertheless, it is clear that Lincoln did function as a regional production centre for hooked tags during the later ninth and tenth centuries, even if the scale of redistribution was not very significant. At this point it may be worth briefly drawing attention to the two hooked tags with silver niello decoration in *Ringerike* style, <ae45> from Flaxengate and NLM-E7A805 from Thimbleby (fig. 25 c, m). Even though both were arguably made in the same workshop, there is no clear production evidence for hooked tags in this style from Lincoln, and as a similar example was also found at Coppergate in York (Tweddle 2004: 455, fig. 115) (but again no production evidence was found), it is equally plausible that they were produced elsewhere.

If the regional distribution of hooked tags that were produced at Lincoln was relatively limited, that of other dress accessories from Lincoln is even more limited. Two dress accessories from Lincoln that have been interpreted as indicative of late Anglo-Saxon metalwork production are a couple of openwork pendants from Granta Place <44> (appendix 11.2.3) and The Park <ae171> (appendix 11.2.7), both made of copper-alloy and depicting a (possibly winged) quadruped with gaping jaws gripping the circular frame (fig. 27 c-d) (Colyer *et al.* 1999: 152; Mann 1999b: 152). They were originally published as being decorated in *Borre* style – a ninth- to tenth-century Scandinavian-derived art-style – even though they were dated to the eleventh century (Colyer *et al.* 1999: 152) (see the information summarised in appendices 11.2.3 and 11.2.7). However, the decoration of these pendants, in particular the shape of the body of the animal and its sideways-looking head (fig. 27 d), is more typical of the tenth-century Scandinavian-derived *Jellinge* style (see examples in Graham-Campbell 1980). It was also suggested that both pieces may have come from the same mould, and were produced at the nearby Flaxengate site (Colyer *et al.* 1999: 152; Mann 1999b: 152).

In this case, comparison to pendants from the rest of Lincolnshire produced

no specimens that were similar enough to argue they came from the same production centre. Of the ten late Anglo-Saxon pendants recorded for Lindsey, only one, from the parish of Melton Ross in North Lincolnshire (PAS NLM922), may be decorated in *Jellinge* style and bears a faint resemblance to the two pendants from Lincoln, but the resemblance is not necessarily close enough to suggest any connection with the two pendants from Lincoln in terms of their production centre (appendix 12.8.1; fig. 27 e). Objects in *Jellinge* style were produced in more significant numbers in York (Bayley 1992; Mainman and Rogers 2000; Mann 1999b: 152; York Archaeological Trust 2009: 12-19), and as Melton Ross is located in the Humber zone, which, it has been argued, was characterised by a strong cultural affinity with York rather than Lincoln, it is also possible this object was made in York, or, indeed, in a different unidentified production centre. Finally, of the six pendants and possible pendants from Kesteven and Holland, only PAS LIN-DE3493 from Heckington was possibly zoomorphic but, as fig. 27 f illustrates, in this case any resemblance with the objects from Lincoln is entirely absent, and even its attribution as early medieval must remain open to speculation (appendices 12.8.2 and 12.8.3).

The Lower City produced more evidence for the production of dress accessories as well, in the shape of two cast lead-alloy flat disc-brooches, one from The Park (<pb13>) (Colyer *et al.* 1999: 158) (appendix 11.2.7; fig. 28 a), and a near-identical example, this time almost certainly from the same mould, from Grantham Street <386 (131)> (Mann 1999b: 157) (appendix 11.2.8). It has been suggested that both were produced in the tenth century at Flaxengate, where a double-sided stone mould was found which may have been used for casting such objects (<m85>; Mann 1999b: 157, 168, no 19), whilst the presence of scrap-lead suggests that lead-working indeed took place on this site (Bayley 2008b) (appendix 16; section 5.2). Colyer *et al.* (1999: 158) identified the decoration on these brooches as a derivation from the tenth-century Scandinavian *Borre* style but, according to Thomas (*pers. comm.*), the lozenge-shaped centre is not restricted to objects in *Borre* style, and the geometrical decoration on these objects can be found widely across early medieval Europe. In other words, the decoration of these two disc-brooches was no more overtly 'Scandinavian' in character than that of the hooked tags with 'ratchet'-type decoration discussed above. Analysis of the distribution of these brooches across the rest of Lincolnshire revealed that their distribution was entirely restricted to Lincoln (fig. 29).

A type of flat disc-brooch that *is* decorated in the *Borre* style is <ae302> from Flaxengate (appendix 11.2.14.1; fig. 28 b). It was made of copper alloy, and decorated with four symmetrical strands of knotted interlace set around a central lozenge. This type of flat disc-brooch, which seems to have been mass-produced, is particularly common in East Anglia, leading to the suggestion that their production

centre is located in Norwich (Margeson 1997: 23, fig. 28; Hinton 1974: 20, fig. 13). Analysis of the distribution of these brooches across the rest of Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland confirms the suggestion that they were produced in East Anglia, as a concentration of six of these brooches was found near The Wash (fig. 29), including four from Kesteven (appendix 12.5.3.1.2; fig. 29), as well as LIN-57B041 from Sibsey, near the border between Lindsey and Holland (appendix 12.5.3.1.1; fig. 28 c), and a complete example from NLM956 from Sutterton in Holland itself (appendix 12.5.3.1.3; fig. 28 d). An additional eight examples were found elsewhere in Lindsey, including a lead-alloy example from North Ormsby (NLM-743AB7) (fig. 28 e); a copper-alloy example from Bonby along the River Ancholme (NLM-1DDC81); two copper-alloy examples from Manton (NLM402) and Roxby cum Risby (NLM6994) along the Lincoln Edge and Ermine Street; another lead-alloy example from Torksey along the River Trent (NLM-72D1C7); and three copper-alloy examples from the Lincoln vicinity, from Newball (LIN-A35B75) (fig. 28 f), Hatton (LIN-FA4AF2) and Wickenby (DENO-FB8444) (appendix 12.5.3.1.1). The distribution of the northernmost of these examples is thus restricted to transport routes that connect to the Humber, and it is possible to suggest that they were transported, from their production centre in East Anglia, via the North Sea and the Humber to Lincoln, and from there to other settlements further inland (although an alternative route via Kesteven may be suggested as well on the basis of fig. 29).

The widespread occurrence of brooches that may have been produced in Norwich in Lincolnshire should not come as a surprise, as contacts between Lindsey and East Anglia were apparent from the distribution of the sculpture and coinage too (chapters 3 and 4). What is more, as has been discussed in chapter 2.2.3 and presented in appendix 1.2.2.1, it has been suggested that the Fosdyke, connecting Lincoln to the Trent, became navigable at some point in the tenth century, possibly after the construction of a dam at Stamp End (Jones *et al.* 2003: 237-38), which means that the postulated route via which these presumably East Anglian brooches reached Lindsey was indeed possible.

More surprising than the occurrence of products from East Anglia is the near-absence of flat disc-brooches in *Jellinge* style, which were produced at York during the tenth century (see above: this section). As discussed in previous chapters, there is evidence for contacts between York and Lindsey in the tenth century in the form of sculpture produced in York along the Humber estuary (chapter 3.2). The similarities between the early tenth-century St Martin's coinage from Lincoln and the roughly contemporary St Peter's coinage from York, as well as the regal coinage of York's ruler Sihtric Caech have also been noted (chapters 4.2 and 4.4.3); however, as was argued in chapter 4.4.3, stylistic similarities between different coinages do not necessarily imply direct political control. The paucity of brooches from Lincolnshire that can be attributed to a production centre in York strengthens

the suggestion that contacts between York and Lincoln were not as strong in the later ninth and tenth centuries as is sometimes argued (see chapters 3 and 4).

Only one flat disc brooch in *Jellinge* style has been found in all of Lincolnshire. It was found in the parish of Walcot near Folkingham in North Kesteven, and made of lead alloy, depicting a *Jellinge*-style animal within a pelleted rope-like border (LIN-FC1347) (appendix 12.5.3.2.1; fig. 28 g; fig. 29). However, even this single disc-brooch cannot be attributed to York with certainty. As stated previously, flat disc-brooches made of lead-alloy were also produced in Lincoln, as were objects (in this case pendants) in *Jellinge* style (also see below and appendix 11.5). What is more, the rope-like border is reminiscent of the rope-like border on the Lindsey-type sculpture (fig. 11), and recurs on some of the late Anglo-Saxon metal artefacts found in Lincoln itself as well, including the above-mentioned eleventh- to twelfth-century copper-alloy stud from Castle Westgate with gilt inlay in devolved *Ringerike* style (<106>) (fig. 28 h), and a possibly tenth-century copper-alloy mount with enamel inlay from Flaxengate (<ae296>) (appendix 11.2.14.1; fig. 28 i). Of course, pelleted or beaded borders were common during this period, and also occurred on lead-alloy brooches from York (see for example Tweddle 2004: 452, fig. 111; York Archaeological Trust 2009: 11, 19), and these, in turn, were identified as copying southern English and continental fashions (Tweddle 2004: 452) (for two examples of lead brooches with pelleted borders from the eleventh-century metalworker's hoard from Cheapside in London, see nos 3903 and 3904 in Reynolds and Ten Harkel forthcoming).

As mentioned previously (section 5.2), flat disc-brooches with *Borre*- and *Jellinge*-style decoration arguably represent a mixture of Anglo-Saxon – the flat shape – and Scandinavian – the nature of the decoration – styles (Margeson 1997: 23). Convex disc-brooches that may actually be of Scandinavian manufacture also occur in Lindsey. One such example was <442> from St Mark's Station in Wigford, a domed disc-brooch with possible *Jellinge*- or *Urnes*-style interlace-decoration (appendix 11.3.5). The object was never cleaned, but an x-ray was available for inspection by the current author, which suggested that decoration consisted of ribbon-like animals. Leahy (*pers. comm.*) identified it as the tenth-century *Jellinge* style, and suggested that it was of Scandinavian manufacture. Other examples of convex disc-brooches from Lindsey and Kesteven that may be of Scandinavian manufacture are rare, but occur in larger numbers *outside* Lincoln than in Lincoln itself. Three additional domed brooches decorated in *Jellinge* style and made of copper alloy were found in the parishes of Roxby cum Risby (NLM-0F69C5), also with ribbon-like animals (fig. 30 a); Sixhills (NLM4529; with gilding) (fig. 30 b); and South Ferriby (published in Leahy and Paterson 2001: 196: fig. 10.7). A fourth domed disc-brooch in *Jellinge* style, but this time made of silver with traces of gilding, was found in Whitton near the Humber estuary (*Treasure* 2000: 30-31)

(appendices 12.5.4.2.1 and 13).

No domed disc-brooches in *Jellinge* style were found in Kesteven and Holland (fig. 31). Comparison to other objects that were identified as *Jellinge* style revealed that the vast majority came from Lindsey. Only the above-mentioned flat disc-brooch in *Jellinge* style from Walcot near Folkingham (LIN-FC1347) (fig. 28 g; fig. 29), which was probably produced in England rather than Scandinavia, came from Kesteven. The above-mentioned pendants from Melton Ross (NLM922) as well as those from The Park <ae171> (appendix 11.2.7) and Granta Place <44> (appendix 11.2.3) in Lincoln, which were probably locally produced, also came from Lindsey, as did a possible trefoil brooch fragment in *Jellinge* style from Hibaldstow (NLM-6AFAC0), as well as a fragment of another trefoil brooch that was possibly decorated in *Jellinge* style from Roxby cum Risby (NLM6529), and a single openwork (bridle) mount from Caistor (NLM794), potentially decorated in *Jellinge* style. This may suggest one of two things: either, the *Jellinge* style was primarily associated with the Scandinavian settlers who settled in Lindsey and north of the Humber (where, as has been mentioned previously, they inspired the local production of brooches in this art-style as well); or, the Scandinavian settlement of Lindsey was more dense than that of Kesteven and Holland.

Copper-alloy domed disc-brooches in *Borre* style, possibly also of Scandinavian manufacture, have been recognised in Gainsborough (NLM260) (fig. 30 c) and Revesby (NLM4191), both in Lindsey (appendix 12.5.4.1.1), as well as a gilt example, NLM617, from Osbournby in North Kesteven (appendices 12.5.4.1.2 and 13). No such finds were recorded for Holland. However, as has been discussed above, the *Borre* style did have a widespread distribution further south, in Kesteven, Holland and East Anglia (fig. 29), which strengthens the suggestion that these two near-contemporary Scandinavian art-styles enjoyed different levels of popularity in different regions. The high amount of gilding on brooches of possible Scandinavian manufacture – which occurred on three of the six domed disc brooches presented above – confirms the suggestion that the occurrence of gilt was increasingly related to Scandinavian activity (section 5.2).

A number of later tenth- or eleventh-century 'saucer' brooches, made of lead alloy, have also been identified in Lincolnshire. These are probably of local manufacture. One of these is a possible miscast from Lincoln itself (appendix 11.5). Unfortunately the exact provenance is unknown, and the object itself is now lost, but an image of it has been published, which reveals how the lead partially overspilled the mould, thus causing the object to be rejected as a miscast (Frick 1992: 376; Leahy and Coutts 1987) (fig. 30 d). The decoration of this brooch is reminiscent of continental and Byzantine examples (Frick 1992).

A limited number of similar but not identical examples have been found elsewhere in Lincolnshire. They include two examples from Lindsey, PAS

NLM-64E8D7 from Osgodby, a lead-alloy brooch with a cross design made of petals, reminiscent of Byzantine styles (Reynolds *pers. comm.*) (fig. 30 e), and NLM396 from Elsham (fig. 30 f), with decoration in a style that showed similarities to the flat disc-brooches in *Borre*-style with knot-work set around a central lozenge shape (appendix 12.5.4.4.1). Similar to the example from Elsham was PAS SWYOR-939E21 from Weston in Holland (appendix 12.5.4.4.3; fig. 30 g). No examples are known from Kesteven. The decoration on the example from Osgodby is similar to the decoration on a group of flat lead-alloy disc brooches from Lincolnshire, including NLM-CF5DC7 from Binbrook in Lindsey (fig. 30 h), DENO-6C04E1 from Fulletby, also in Lindsey, and LIN-900B71 from Osbournby in Kesteven (fig. 30 i), the latter of which had an upstanding border (appendices 12.5.3.3.1 and 12.5.3.3.2). A single, tenth- to eleventh-century copper-alloy domed disc-brooch with unusual geometric decoration in high relief, creating a flower-like design, is also known from Lincoln. It was found at Flaxengate in the Lower City <ae184> (appendix 12.2.14.1; fig. 32 a). Although the decoration is highly unusual, it was found in an early to mid twelfth-century dump, and must therefore be of earlier, late Anglo-Saxon to Saxo-Norman date.

Openwork 'saucer' brooches were also produced in the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England during the tenth- and eleventh-centuries. One miscast, made of lead-alloy, is known from Coppergate in York (Bayley 1992: 780, fig. 340) (fig. 32 b). Similar objects have been found in Lindsey, including PAS NLM395 from Elsham (fig. 32 c) and PAS NLM-A6CCD1 from Whitton (fig. 32 d). Given the proximity of Whitton and Elsham to the Humber (fig. 31), it is possible that these two brooches were actually products of the York workshops. A related type of brooch, but with openwork zoomorphic decoration, was found in the parish of Aunsby with Dembleby in Kesteven (appendix 12.5.4.3.2; fig. 31; fig. 32 e). Finally, another example of lead-alloy piece of jewellery from Lincolnshire that was possibly produced in York is <676> from St Mark's Station in Wigford (appendix 11.3.4; fig. 32 f). Excavations at Coppergate in York revealed a similar object that was identified as a miscast (fig. 32 g) (Bayley 1992: 780, fig. 340).

The evidence of these lead-alloy objects reveals that Lindsey was in contact with both regions after all, which possibly suggests that only certain types of dress accessories were intended for export *outside* the settlement where they were produced. Returning to the evidence from Lincoln, the same argument may be used to explain the discrepancy between the relatively widespread distribution of the hooked tags with ratchet-type decoration (which were produced in Lincoln) and the rather more limited distribution of the flat disc-brooches (which were also produced in Lincoln) (see above). As discussed in chapter 1.3, Astill (2006: 248) concluded that the evidence for metalwork production in many of the West Saxon *burhs* "indicates a craftsman working to satisfy the demands of a patron rather than mass

production for a wider clientele". It seems that this conclusion holds true, to an extent, for some of the 'towns' in the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England too, even if there is also some evidence that at least a few categories of objects produced were produced on a more significant scale, and exported outside the limits of the settlement or even the immediate region.

Appendix 15 gives a comprehensive list of roughly contemporary disc-brooches and other dress accessories made from lead-alloys. Some of these, like the example from Aunsby with Dembleby, were clearly products of competent workmanship, decorated with intricate designs. As the perceived value of an object is not merely dependent on the relative value of the materials used, but also on the time and expertise invested in its production, it is therefore not possible to argue that the use of base-metal dress accessories was restricted to the lower classes (see section 5.2).

In addition to hooked tags, pendants and brooches, there is evidence for the production of finger and/or earrings from Lincoln, and possibly pins. As summarised in appendix 11.2.14.2, there is significant evidence for the production of copper-alloy wire from Flaxengate (White 1982). Part of this was probably related to the production of more utilitarian objects, such as chains (examples include White 1982: F2 <ae282> and F31 <ae151> (appendix 11.2.14.2)). However, it is possible as well that at least some of the wire was related to the production of copper-alloy wire rings, which may have been used as either earrings or finger-rings (examples include White 1982: F22 <ae477>; F16 <ae417>; <ae262> and <ae259> (appendices 11.2.14.1 and 11.2.14.2; fig. 32 k-l)). Some of these wire rings, including one specimen from the recent excavations at The Collection (appendix 11.2.13; fig. 32 h) as well as <ag3> and <ae221> from Flaxengate (appendix 11.2.14.1; fig. 32 i-j), have their ends twisted together, which places them firmly within the late Anglo-Saxon period (Mann *pers. comm.*), whilst others are plainer and therefore more difficult to date on art-historic grounds alone.

The copper-alloy wire produced at Flaxengate may also have been used for the production of pins (a possible example of an unfinished pin being White 1982: F13 <ae329> (appendix 11.2.14.2)). Two examples of pins produced from thin copper-alloy wire but with glass heads are <ae2> from Motherby Hill and <ae197> from Flaxengate, both in the Lower City (appendices 11.2.9 and 11.2.14.1). As glass was also produced at Flaxengate (Bayley 2008a; Foley 1981), it is possible that such pins were also local products. No wire rings and pins have been listed on the PAS database (appendix 12.9), but this is probably because they corrode easily and, even if they do survive, may not be recognised easily by metal detectorists as being of archaeological value.

Finally, there is evidence for the production of finger rings made from flat tapering strips of copper alloy. Two unfinished examples have been found at

Holmes Grainwarehouse in Wigford (fig. 28 k) and (fig. 28 l) (appendix 11.3.2). A finished example, decorated with three rows of the same ratchet-type decoration that characterised the hooked tags produced in Lincoln, was found in the Lower City, at West Parade (fig. 28 m) (published in Colyer *et al.* 1999: 226, fig. 109) (fig. 28 l). Comparison was again undertaken with finger rings listed for the rest of Lincolnshire (appendix 12.9). A number of rings were found that were produced in a similar way, made from tapering strips of copper-alloy. One of these, a finger ring from Market Stainton in East Lindsey (NLM-E71AB3), was decorated with longitudinal rows of punched dots (fig. 28 m). In addition, a small number of sheet-metal copper-alloy finger rings from Lincolnshire were decorated with ring-and-dot motifs, similar to examples found in York (appendix 12.9.1). These include a finger ring from Kirton in Lindsey (NLM-62EFB4) (appendix 12.9.1), as well as NLM4572 from Asgarby and Howell and LIN-E42F77 from Aswarby and Swarby, both in North Kesteven (appendix 12.9.2). It must be borne in mind, however, that rings of this type were common throughout late Anglo-Saxon England, as were ring-and-dot motifs and punched decoration, and it is not possible therefore to attribute them to York or Lincoln with any degree of certainty.

5.3.2.3: 'Scandinavian' brooches and 'Hiberno-Norse' pins: the spatial distribution of 'ethnic' styles across Lincolnshire

The previous section has argued that metalwork production in Lincoln took place on varying scales, depending on the type of artefact (and therefore quite possibly on the amount of consumer demand). It also drew attention to an existing bias towards Lindsey in the distribution of domed disc-brooches of possible Scandinavian manufacture, as well as artefacts decorated in *Jellinge* style. It was suggested that this was either a result of varieties in the popularity of different decorative styles in different regions of England, or of varying density of Scandinavian settlement. Cameron's (1975: 152) map of Scandinavian placenames in Lincolnshire reveals that there were more such names in Lindsey than in Kesteven, whilst there were none in Holland. This suggests that the Scandinavian settlement was denser in Lindsey than in Kesteven, and in the first instance did not occur in Holland. The metalwork from Lincolnshire can shed further light on these patterns. Analysis of finds listed on the *PAS* website reveals that, in addition to the domed disc-brooches discussed above, other artefacts of Scandinavian or Irish manufacture, as well as artefacts decorated in overt 'Scandinavian' or 'Irish' styles, occur in greater numbers in Lindsey than in Kesteven, to an extent that cannot be explained by reference to intensity of metal detecting activities alone. Instead, it seems that the inhabitants of Lindsey expressed their 'Scandinavian' identity more openly than the inhabitants of Kesteven. This compares interestingly to the evidence from the burial data, which was characterised by a complete absence of overt 'Scandinavian' rites

(chapter 3) from the entire county, and suggests that 'Scandinavian' identities existed on a variety of levels. It is possible that statements of 'Scandinavian-ness' through funerary activity were only made in extreme circumstances, as the degree of investment required for this particular medium was much more significant than that required for the wearing of, for example, a 'Scandinavian' brooch. The near-absence of dress accessories that expressed overt 'ethnic' affiliations in Holland, on the other hand, can be explained by reference to the near-absence of dress accessories of any sort, which confirms the suggestion that the low-lying marshlands of Holland were not settled on a significant scale at this stage.

One type of dress accessory that is commonly regarded as 'Scandinavian', based on their occurrence in Dublin, the Irish Sea region and York, are the so-called ring-headed pins, broadly dated to the ninth to eleventh centuries. There is no evidence that such pins were produced in Lincoln, but three examples have nevertheless been found in Lincoln. Two came from the Lower City, from Broadgate East (<ae164>) (appendix 11.4.1) and Flaxengate (<ae290>) (appendix 11.2.14.1), and one, with a double ring, was found just outside the Lower City, at Woolworth's Basement (<352>) (appendix 11.2.10) (fig. 27 h-i). Outside Lincoln, the only ringed pins that have been recognised were found in Lindsey, including the above-mentioned three from the parish of Riby, with an additional example from Torksey (Brown 2006: no. 280) (appendix 12.1.4.1; fig. 33). The fact that both Torksey and Riby are situated in the vicinity of transport routes to York – the Trent and the Humber – should not come as a surprise.

The distribution of dress accessories of probably 'Irish' manufacture, mostly consisting of penannular brooches, is also restricted to Lindsey (fig. 33). Six examples were listed in total (appendix 12.5.5.1), including <NLM4501> from Market Rasen, a copper-alloy penannular brooch with traces of gilding, which, as has been suggested in previous sections, was increasingly restricted to objects that may be related to 'viking' activity. Leahy (*pers. comm.*) has furthermore identified a D-shaped buckle <ae44> from Flaxengate as being of Irish manufacture on the basis of the fact that it had three bossed rivets, whose style was apparently 'Irish' (appendix 11.2.14.1). In addition, a disc-brooch with cruciform enamelled decoration of 'Irish' design was found in Torksey (Brown 2006: 286 = NLM7020) (appendix 12.5.3.5.1), and a copper-alloy bracelet with possible parallels from the Isle of Man was found in the parish of Saltfleetby St Peter (LIN-C33EE4) (appendix 12.12.7.1), both in Lindsey. The *PAS* database did not list any 'Irish' dress accessories for Kesteven or Holland.

In addition to the above-mentioned dress accessories and the possible 'Irish' horse-harness accessories from Lindsey that Leahy (2007: 177) mentions (section 5.2), the *PAS* lists six other objects from Lincolnshire that were of probable 'Irish' manufacture. Three of these are from Lindsey, and the remaining three from

Kesteven (fig. 33). One of the objects from Lindsey is NLM-DA7151, an Irish openwork mount or pendant, made of copper alloy, from the parish of Roxby cum Risby (appendix 12.12.1.1). An object from Kesteven is NLM4647, a lead weight from Baston with an inset of an eighth-century Irish copper-alloy blue and yellow enamelled panel (appendix 12.11.2). The other four objects are gilt, and include a gilt harness-mount from Riby <LIN-4997F4> (appendix 12.6.2.1); a gilt anthropomorphic mount <NLM258> from Holton le Moor (appendix 12.12.1.1); a cruciform mount from Sleaford in Kesteven <NLM118> (appendix 12.12.1.2); and possibly a silver-gilt drinking horn terminal from Barrowby <LIN-DA87D8>, also in Kesteven (appendix 12.12.7.2) (appendix 13). The fact that the distribution of these 'other' objects is more even across Lincolnshire suggests that the Scandinavian settlement was no less intense in Kesteven than in Lindsey, but that further south, the settlers did not explicitly express their 'Scandinavian' identities by wearing 'Irish' dress accessories.

Another type of dress-accessory that is commonly regarded as typically 'Scandinavian' is the trefoil brooch. Brooches of this type were produced both in Scandinavia and England (Leahy and Paterson 2001: 193). The *PAS* lists seven examples from Lincolnshire, three of which came from Lindsey, with an additional three from Kesteven and one from Holland. Leahy and Paterson (2001: 193-94) list an additional two from Lindsey (appendix 12.5.6). None have been found in Lincoln itself. Although their distribution seems evenly spread across Lincolnshire, further analysis reveals an important difference between the decorative styles of the objects from Lindsey and those from Kesteven and Holland. Two of the five examples from Lindsey were zoomorphic, and decorated in the *Borre* style. Examples include a gilt example from Stallingborough, with gripping beasts, which was almost certainly of Scandinavian manufacture (published in Leahy and Paterson 2001: 193, fig. 10.3), and a similar example, made from copper alloy, from Alford (<NLM5243>) (fig. 35 a) (appendix 12.6.5.1). Two further fragments were decorated in *Jellinge*-style, including NLM-6AFAC0 from Hibaldstow (fig. 35 b) (appendix 12.5.6.1). No such examples are known from Kesteven and Holland.

The final example from Lindsey, found in Keelby and published in Leahy and Paterson (2001: 194, fig. 10.4), is decorated with highly stylised acanthus-leaf decoration set within a double border. Brooches with this type of decoration occur throughout the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England and southern Scandinavia, in particular Denmark (Leahy and Paterson 2001: 194). The acanthus-motif also occurs on continental strap-ends, and strap-ends in the so-called *Winchester*-style, produced in southern England (section 5.2). In other words, unlike the trefoil brooches in *Borre*- and *Jellinge*-style, this variant of the trefoil brooch was influenced by continental fashions, and did not express 'Scandinavian-ness' to the same degree as, for example, the above-mentioned brooches from

Stallingborough and Alford. As *all* the examples of trefoil brooches from Kesteven and Holland were decorated in this style – an example is DENO-E9A0F5 from Asgarby and Howell in Kesteven (fig. 35 c) – the distribution of trefoil brooches across Lincolnshire therefore still confirms the notion that metal dress accessories from Lindsey expressed a clearer 'Scandinavian' identity than dress accessories from Kesteven and Holland (fig. 34). Although no examples are known from Lincoln itself, one example with stylised acanthus-decoration was found in Washingborough in the immediate vicinity of Lincoln (fig. 34) (<LIN-87E516>) (appendix 12.6.5.2).

Other types of dress accessories that are commonly regarded as typically 'Scandinavian' include lozenge-shaped brooches and bird brooches, whilst a number of pendants have been identified as well that are probably of Scandinavian manufacture. Lozenge-shaped brooches (sometimes also referred to as square or quadrangular brooches) are commonly made of copper alloy and decorated in *Borre* style, although varieties exist (Leahy and Paterson 2001: 194). Leahy and Paterson (2001: 194) list five examples from Lincolnshire, but the *PAS* lists only four. These were found at Binbrook (NLM7136); Elsham (NLM194) (published in Leahy and Paterson 2001: 194, fig. 10.5) (fig. 35 d); Epworth (NLM6083); and the immediate vicinity of Lincoln itself (LIN-DFAF06) (appendix 12.5.2.1). No examples have been recorded from Kesteven or Holland (fig. 34). The distribution of 'viking' bird-brooches is entirely limited to Lindsey (appendix 12.5.7; fig. 34). Only two examples have been found, from the parishes of South Ferriby (NLM4341) and Caistor (NLM5638) (fig. 34 e-f).

In addition to brooches, there are some pendants that may be of Scandinavian manufacture. Again, the majority of these have been found in Lindsey (appendix 12.8.1). One of these, decorated in *Borre*-style, was found in Tathwell, and has been published in Leahy and Paterson (2001: 195, fig. 10.6). A single lead-alloy Thor's Hammer pendant has furthermore been found in Torksey (Brown 2006: 293) (fig. 35 g). No other examples of Thor's Hammers have been found in Lincolnshire. However, *PAS* DENO-61E4C6 was an eleventh- or twelfth-century lead-alloy cross-shaped pendant from Knaith in West Lindsey, with possible parallels in Birka (Sweden) and Trondheim (Norway) (fig. 35 h). A similar lead-alloy equal-armed cross-shaped pendant has been found at Torksey (Brown 2006: 292). The only pendant of Scandinavian manufacture that has been found outside Lindsey is NARC-B3E1B5, a *Ringerike*-style comb-pendant from the Baltic, found in Leasingham in North Kesteven (appendix 12.8.2; figs 34 and 35 i).

The remaining dress accessories and other types of decorative artefacts that were identified as being of possible Scandinavian or Irish manufacture were mostly found in Lindsey as well (fig. 34). Examples include DENO-DD64A4, an eighth- or ninth-century Scandinavian brooch depicting a gripping beast from Torksey (Brown 2006: 290) (appendix 12.5.8.1; fig. 35 j). It is similar to gripping beasts published

in Graham-Campbell (1980: 136). NLM3403 was a twisted copper-alloy penannular finger ring or earring, identified as 'Scandinavian', from Horncastle (appendix 12.9.1; fig. 35 k), and finally, NLM579 was an unidentified zoomorphic object of possible Scandinavian manufacture from Mareham le Fen (appendix 12.12.7.1; fig. 35 l).

There is one final aspect of the distribution patterns of artefacts with 'ethnic' connotations that deserves further comment. With the exception of the ringed pins, the types of dress accessories with 'Scandinavian' connotations that are discussed in this section are absent from Lincoln (fig. 34). Their absence is reflected in the near-absence of *production* evidence for artefacts decorated in explicitly 'Scandinavian' styles. The only possible exception in this case is the tentative production evidence for pendants in *Jellinge* style (section 5.3.2.2), but the hooked tags and the lead-alloy brooches were characterised by a more generic style, which expressed neither 'Scandinavian-ness' nor 'Anglo-Saxon-ness'. This represents a contrast with the *Jellinge*-style brooches that were produced in York, and the *Borre*-style brooches that came out of East Anglia, suggesting that the craftsmen working in Lincoln (or the elites controlling the metalwork production in Lincoln) did not emphasise their 'Scandinavian' lineage to the same extent as their counterparts in York and East Anglia. A similar lack of overt references to the Scandinavian background of the invaders characterises the Lincoln sculpture (chapter 3.6.3), whilst the independent Lincoln coinages also avoid any references to the Scandinavian background of the settlers (chapter 4.3.5). In both cases, this contrasts starkly with the material from Northumbria, and it is possible that the absence of overt expressions of a 'Scandinavian' identity at Lincoln were the result of a conscious choice to integrate more fully into Anglo-Saxon society.

5.3.3: The spatial distribution of 'Norse' bells

There is a group of objects from Lincoln that are commonly referred to as 'Norse' bells, small hexagonal copper-alloy bells, decorated with ring-and-dot motifs, which are common finds on 'viking' sites across the British Isles, including at least one stratified example from the tenth-century layers at Coppergate (Mainman and Rogers 2000: 2599, fig. 1294.). Although no production evidence for these bells has been recognised in Lincoln to date, a total of five specimens are known from different excavations (Jones *et al.* 2003: 295-96). Two of these bells were found on the Flaxengate site (<ae72> and <a166>) (appendix 11.2.14.1) (fig. 36 a-b). A third was found at The Park, also in the Lower City (Jones *et al.* 2003: 296) (appendix 11.2.7). A fourth hexagonal bell was found at Holmes Grainwarehouse in Wigford (<ae49>) (appendix 1.3.2; fig. 36 c), whilst the final example came from St Mark's Station (published in Jones *et al.* 2003: 296), also from Wigford. In addition, a small copper-alloy conical bell (<ae1>) was found at Holmes

Grainwarehouse (appendix 1.3.2), and another ribbed conical bell <ae192> was found at Flaxengate (appendix 11.2.14.1; fig. 36 d). Jones *et al.* (2003: 295-96) interpret all these bells as late Anglo-Saxon date, but Leahy (*pers. comm.*) preferred a later eleventh- or twelfth-century date for <ae192>.

The function of these bells is unclear. It is possible that they functioned as dress accessories, or formed part of horse-harnesses, although Jones *et al.* (1981: 295) argue against this latter idea on the basis of the fact that they usually have a square attachment loop, which would not allow the bell enough freedom of movement to swing and make a sound. However, there are also examples with rounded attachment loops, including <ae166> from Flaxengate (fig. 36 b; compare to fig. 36 c). Nevertheless, Lincoln is characterised by a general absence of pre-Conquest equestrian equipment (see below). Discussing bells found during the Flixborough excavations, Ottaway (2009d) has suggested that "bells in the Anglo-Saxon or equivalent periods in Britain and Ireland ... [were] used to summon Christians to worship and in the liturgy, but they were also, presumably, hung around the necks of cattle and sheep". Jones *et al.* (2003: 295-96) interpret them as possible amulets. This suggestion is strengthened by an argument proposed by Batey (1988: 214), who has drawn attention to their function as grave goods, based on an example from St Patrick's Chapel near West Nappin, Jurby, on the Isle of Man, which came from a disturbed inhumation. More recently, McAlister (2008: 325-27) has drawn attention to a number of bells from children's graves, including one from a ninth- to tenth-century furnished child's grave at Peel Castle on the Isle of Man (also see Batey 1988: 214; Graham-Campbell 1998: 123-24). Bronze bells were also found in two children's graves in Birka in Sweden, but these were round rather than hexagonal (McAlister 2008: 325). This is in itself not a surprise, as the hexagonal shape only occurs outside Scandinavia, leading to the characterisation of the hexagonal examples by McAlister (2008: 325) as a "colonial adaptation".

The function of these small bells as grave goods fits well with Ottaway's (2009d) suggestion that bells had a liturgical function, and were used to summon people to worship. What is more, like the crosier, the bell, as a symbol, was one of the two insignia of saints, usually associated with them when they went on journeys, often in the context of missionary activity or pilgrimage (or into the otherworld) (Henken 1983: 66-67). The bell could be used by saints to heal, or even to bring the dead back to life, such as the bell of the sixth-century Welsh saint Cadog, given to him by Gildas (Henken 1983: 67).

Although the relatively high number of bells in Lincoln would fit well with the relatively high number of parishes and parish churchyards in Lincoln, none has been found in a funerary context, or even came from sites with evidence for funerary activity. It is, of course, possible that the deposition of a bell in a grave was merely the final step in the object's artefact biography, preceded by (a)

different function(s) during its 'life'. Unfortunately none of the Lincoln examples came from securely stratified contexts. However, closer analysis of their distribution pattern can still provide some insights. If bells also functioned as, for example, dress accessories that people wore about their person, or pieces of horse harness equipment, they would be prone to being lost. In this scenario, one might expect that bells had a similar distribution pattern across Lincolnshire as other finds that were equally prone to being lost, like, for example, strap-ends, objects that were used to decorate the end of leather straps or belts.

Not many strap-ends have been found in Lincoln. In addition to the above-mentioned example from St Paul-in-the-Bail (appendix 1.1.2; section 5.3.2.1), which may be part of a hoard and therefore deliberately deposited, and F75 <Ae509> from Flaxengate (appendix 11.2.14.2), which may have been a deliberate reject, Lincoln has produced only one example, a multi-headed strap-end of Thomas type 4 (*Borre*-style) from Holmes Grainwarehouse (<ae5>) (appendix 11.3.2). In contrast, the rest of Lindsey (excluding Flixborough) has produced no less than 176 strap-ends, with an additional 90+ from Kesteven, and six from Holland (appendix 12.2). This discrepancy between the number of strap-ends from Lincoln and those from the 'rural' parts of Lincolnshire does not imply that people *outside* Lincoln used more strap-ends than people *inside* Lincoln, but rather sheds light on the varying success of different retrieval methods. As discussed in chapter 2, the retrieval of casually lost artefacts is, generally speaking, more successful over a large geographical area (as opposed to in a small urban excavation trench), whilst the lack of the use of metal detectors during the majority of urban excavations also must have played a role in dictating retrieval rates.

When the number of bells from Lincoln is compared to the number of bells from Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland, a different pattern emerges. In comparison to the five hexagonal and one or two conical bells from Lincoln, only seven copper-alloy bells have been found on other sites in Lindsey (appendix 12.7.1) (again, Flixborough, which only produced iron bell fragments, has been excluded from the comparison). The district of Kesteven has produced only two copper-alloy bell fragments (appendix 12.7.2), whilst Holland produced none (appendix 12.7.3). In the light of the different retrieval methods used in Lincoln as compared to the rest of Lindsey, it can be assumed that *if* bells were worn in a similar way as strap-ends, their distribution pattern would also be similar to that of strap-ends. As this is not the case, the implication is that they were *not* as likely to be lost as strap-ends (section 5.3.4), and therefore had a different function. A plausible explanation is that they were amulets that were more carefully looked after.

Objects can have multiple functions, and the likelihood that they were amulets does not exclude the possibility that bells also fulfilled a different function. McAlister (2008: 325-27) has suggested, based on the above-mentioned evidence

for bells from children's graves, that they were children's toys. The majority of evidence for manufactured children's toys from this period comes from 'urban' contexts (McAlister forthcoming). Although this does not mean that children in 'urban' environments spent more time playing than children in 'rural' environments (sticks, pebbles and other 'natural' materials can of course also be used as toys, but these are either not archaeologically visible or tend not to be interpreted as toys), the concentration of craftsmen in Lincoln, in this case especially those involved in metalworking, may have meant that the expertise was indeed present to make objects whose primary function was to be used as toys. This suggestion sheds a slightly different light on the identities of the craftsmen who were working in Lincoln. Even if modern scholars working on aspects of late Anglo-Saxon urbanism tend to focus primarily on the socio-economic, political and sometimes ideological aspects of 'towns', the everyday lives of the people who inhabited them may have been characterised by different concerns, such as the creation of objects intended for amusement.

5.3.4: Equestrian equipment: dress accessories for horses

A type of artefact that is related in function to dress accessories is equestrian equipment, in particular decorative horse-harness fittings and stirrup mounts. During the late Anglo-Saxon period these were typically made of copper alloy, highly decorated in a variety of styles including – rather frequently – Scandinavian-derived decorative styles, sometimes with gilding (see appendix 13). Unsurprisingly, given the nature of their use, the distribution pattern of horse-harness fittings and stirrup mounts across Lincolnshire is similar to that of the strap-ends (see section 5.3.3), with only a few finds from Lincoln itself, but many more from the rest of Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland. However, in addition to differences in retrieval methods, an argument can be made that other factors also contributed to the distribution of these objects.

The only possibly pre-Conquest harness fittings from Lincoln are <ae234>, a strap-loop dated to the eleventh or twelfth century (appendix 11.12.14.1; fig. 36 e), and possibly <ae48> (White 1982: F55), some eleventh-century copper-alloy decorative strapping (White 1982: 39) (appendix 11.12.14.2), both from Flaxengate. In addition, two late Anglo-Saxon iron spurs were also found (<fe1108> from Flaxengate (appendix 11.12.14.1) and <219> from Saltergate (appendix 11.2.4)), as well as six late Anglo-Saxon horseshoes. The majority of these were found in the Lower City, at Flaxengate (<fe1574>) (appendix 11.12.14.1); Saltergate (<146> and <7>) (appendix 11.2.4); Hungate (<2009>) (appendix 11.2.2); and Granta Place (<71>) (appendix 11.2.3). One additional example was identified in Wigford, at Dickinson's Mill (<fe6>) (appendix 11.3.1).

Examples from Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland are significantly more

numerous, with 60+ late Anglo-Saxon stirrup fittings (appendix 12.6.1.1) from Lindsey, as well as 30+ stirrup fittings from Kesteven (appendix 12.6.1.2), and eleven from Holland (appendix 12.6.1.3). In addition, some 30 other harness fittings – including three harness pendants, which were purely decorative – were found in Lindsey (appendices 12.6.2.1 and 12.6.3.1). Kesteven produced more than ten other harness fittings (appendices 12.6.2.2 and 12.6.3.2), and Holland produced some ten additional pieces as well (appendices 12.6.2.3 and 12.6.3.3). No horseshoes have been recorded for the 'rural' parts of Lincolnshire, although this is probably a failure of recognition. The possibility that significant number of horseshoes *should* be added to the assemblage from Lindsey increases the discrepancy between the assemblages from Lincoln and Lindsey even further.

The excavations at Flixborough did not produce many items of equestrian equipment either. The only finds were three fragments of iron bits (appendix 12.6.2.1). Ottaway (2009d; also see Hyland 1994: 7) explains the absence of equestrian equipment from Flixborough in chronological terms:

It is very striking that items of both horse and riding equipment were very scarce at Flixborough, although one would not expect a large number of the latter in middle Anglo-Saxon contexts as stirrups were probably not introduced to this country and spurs not reintroduced (after previously being used in Roman times) until the late 8th or early 9th century.

Prior to the late Anglo-Saxon period, horse harnesses were made entirely of more perishable materials, such as wood and leather (Leahy *pers. comm.*). However, as occupation in Lincoln did not even begin on a significant scale until the second half of the ninth century, Ottaway's (2009d) argument cannot be applied to the situation there. As stated at the start of this section, it seems more likely that the difference is caused by the application of different retrieval methods. The situation is no different from York, where no decorative copper-alloy harness fittings or stirrup mounts have been found at all (Bayley 1992), even if horse equipment in general was more abundant in quantity here than in Lincoln, consisting of 33 examples, including six horseshoes, all made of iron (Ottaway 1992: 698-709).¹¹⁶ As York was also the site of a significant iron industry (Ottaway 1992), which Lincoln was not, their presence is not altogether surprising.

The nature of horse-harness fittings and stirrup mounts from the rest of Lincolnshire may shed some light on the significance of the settlement at Lincoln. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, the vast majority of late Anglo-Saxon equestrian equipment is highly decorated, often in art-styles that found their origins in Scandinavia. Examples are numerous, and include NLM-EB0C03, a tenth-

¹¹⁶ The York assemblage was further increased through the positive identification of some 50 horseshoe-nails (Ottaway 1992: 707). No definite horseshoe-nails were identified in either Lincoln or Lindsey, but this was to all probability a failure of recognition.

century strap-distributor in *Borre* style from the parish of Bonby in Lindsey (appendix 12.6.2.1; fig. 36 f); NLM-3CD626, a probably eleventh-century *Ringerike*-style harness pendant from Hibaldstow in Lindsey (appendix 12.6.3.1; fig. 36 g); and NCL-76AEA7, an extremely well-preserved tenth- to eleventh-century copper-alloy stirrup mount depicting a howling wolf or lion, found in the parish of East Kirkby in Lindsey (appendix 12.6.1.1; fig. 36 h).

As horse harness accessories, like dress accessories, are a form of fashion, their decoration can be used to express similar messages, which may include the 'ethnic' identity of the horse's owner, but also his (or her) political affiliations and/or social aspirations (Crane 2000: 1). As was suggested in section 5.3.2.3, the use of dress accessories (or equestrian equipment) with 'Scandinavian'-style decoration as a means to further one's position within society would only work if the new ruling elite were mostly of Scandinavian descent. As equestrian activity was clearly associated with elite society (a suggestion that is confirmed by the decorative nature and traces of gilding on many of the harness accessories), the use of Scandinavian styles for the manufacture of harness fittings and stirrup mounts suggests that a 'Scandinavian' identity was increasingly associated with power and status as well.

The association of equestrian activity with power and status is confirmed by a number of Old English written sources, all of which were written down in the tenth century. In *Beowulf* (Mitchell & Robinson 1998), which was set in Scandinavia, the hero is rewarded with eight horses with gold-plated bridles after he kills the monster Grendel. The elegiac poem *The Wanderer*, preserved in the tenth-century Exeter Book (Bradley 1982: 199), clearly associates horses with heroes when it poses the question "where is the horse now, where [is] the hero gone?" (verse 92). *The Husband's Message* (verses 44-46) lists horses as a hallmark of nobility, and a reward for a life lived in accordance and honour. In addition, the name of the hero Hengest from the *Finnsburgh Fragment* (included in *Beowulf*) means 'gelding'. The use of horse-related names for heroes had a longer history in Anglo-Saxon England, and Bede (*HE* I: 15) identifies the first leaders of the Anglo-Saxons, who arrived from the continent in the middle of the fifth century AD, as Hengest and Horsa, whose names carry roughly the same meaning, 'horse'. The association of horses and warriors is also apparent from imagery on helmets, most noticeably those found in Sweden (Almgren 1983; Flower 1998: 35-39), although a local, early Anglo-Saxon tradition also existed, most clearly demonstrated on the helmet from Sutton Hoo mound 1 (Bruce-Mitford 1978: 138-50).

The burial record also confirms the idea that equestrian activity was associated with Scandinavians who belonged (or aspired to belong) to the ruling elite. As discussed in chapter 3.3, during the early period of Scandinavian settlement there was a short-lived revival of furnished burials with horses, as

evidence by the relatively high amount of horse bones from the cremation cemetery at Heath Wood, Ingleby (Derbs.) (Richards 2004a; 2004b: 146-49). The status associated with equestrian activity is also apparent from by the use of warrior-on-horseback imagery from some of the Yorkshire stone sculpture, which also occurred on the example from Crowle in Lindsey (chapter 3). This particular aspect of the Yorkshire sculpture – the use of horse imagery – first occurred *after* the Scandinavian settlement, roughly contemporary with the evidence for an increased investment in equestrian activities, which found expression in the use of more durable materials and more complicated decorative styles for stirrup mounts and horse-harness fittings. What is more, as the manufacture of these stirrup mounts and horse-harness fittings was now dependent on specialist craftsmen (which meant they were more difficult to come by and harder to replace in case they got lost), the process of adorning one's horse with what was essentially jewellery would have contributed even further to an increase in associated value and status of equestrian activity.

In this context it is worth briefly drawing attention to the decorative style of the only definite late Anglo-Saxon copper-alloy horse-harness fitting that has been found in Lincoln, the above-mentioned <ae234> from Flaxengate (fig. 36 e). Unlike the majority of examples from Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland (for three rather typical examples, see figs 36 f-h), this object is relatively poorly executed, with minimal decoration. Of course horses had multiple functions. In addition to status symbols, they were also a means of transport, or could be used as work animals. It is possible, therefore, that horses in Lincoln did not fulfil the same function – the expression of elite power – as they did in the countryside. As has been argued in chapter 3.4.3, the distribution of the stone sculpture suggests that possession of land formed the basis for the power structures that existed in late Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire, and the absence of sculpture from parts of Lincoln may suggest that the landed 'rural' estates were considered a more appropriate venue for elite power display than the more crowded atmosphere of the developing 'town'. The absence of high-status horse harness-fittings from Lincoln – if absence of evidence is indeed evidence of absence – may confirm this suggestion.

An argument in favour of the suggestion that horses in 'towns' played a different role than horses outside 'towns' comes from, again, the Yorkshire stone sculpture. In contrast to the 'rural' corpus (in particular from Ryedale (Lang 1991)), which is characterised by a significant number of stones with warrior-on-horseback imagery (chapter 3), contemporary sculpture from York does *not* include any horse-riding scenes on the whole. Figurative carvings do occur, but were usually of an overtly Christian or mythological nature (Lang 1991). This may suggest that the population of York did *not* define themselves – or their ancestors – as aristocratic warriors. Although this does not contradict the notion that the craft production and

trading activities that took place in settlements like York and Lincoln were in the interest of aristocratic patrons, it seems that the real power base of the secular elite was established *outside* York and Lincoln. The next section will explore this notion in more detail.

5.3.5: 'Viking' warriors and craftsmen: evidence for the use of weapons and knives in tenth-century Lincoln and Lindsey

The argument that the settlement at Lincoln was not used as a venue for elite power display is supported by an absence of weapons, scabbards and other related artefacts from Lincoln that can be dated to the late ninth to early eleventh centuries. There is no production evidence for weapons either, nor are there any recorded weapon burials in Lincoln (appendix 5). This may be a lack of recognition, as two burials with swords that can be dated to this period have been found in Nottingham (Graham-Campbell 2001b: 106). However, rather extensive excavations have been carried out of a number of cemeteries in Lincoln, including the high-status cemetery at St Paul-in-the-Bail in the Upper City (appendix 5.1.1) and the probably mercantile cemetery at St Mark's in Wigford (appendix 5.3.3), neither of which produced any such evidence. What is more, the fact that such burials occur in Nottingham may indicate that significant differences existed between the characters of the settlements at Nottingham and Lincoln, and until each is studied on its own merits, no assumptions about supposed similarities between these two settlements can be made (see Graham-Campbell 2001b: 106).

There are some 42 late Anglo-Saxon iron knives from Lincoln, but these were all simple and undecorated, probably utilitarian (used for food preparation or industrial activities) rather than military. The majority (26 specimens) came from Flaxengate in the Lower City (appendix 11.12.14.1), with additional examples from Saltergate (2 knives) (appendix 11.2.4); Danes Terrace (2 knives (appendix 11.2.1); Granta Place (1 knife) (appendix 11.2.3); and Hungate (1 knife) (appendix 11.2.2), all in the Lower City. A late Anglo-Saxon knife was also found at Woolworth's Basement just outside the walled area of the Lower City (appendix 11.2.10), and at Broadgate East in Butwerk (appendix 11.4.1). Wigford produced some five late Anglo-Saxon knives, from Dickinson's Mill (appendix 11.3.1), St Mark's Station (appendix 11.3.4), Brayford Wharf East (appendix 11.3.7), Holmes Grainwarehouse (appendix 11.3.2) and St Benedict's Square (appendix 11.3.3). The Upper City produced only two knives that were identified as late Anglo-Saxon, found at Chapel Lane (appendix 11.1.4) and Castle Westgate (appendix 11.1.1).

In contrast, the *PAS* lists only five knives that can potentially be attributed to the Anglo-Saxon period for the rest of Lincolnshire, including three from Lindsey and one from Kesteven (appendix 12.12.1). Their paucity is almost certainly related to a failure of recognition or interest on the part of metal detectorists, as

excavations at Flixborough produced c. 250 examples (Ottaway 2009g), whilst 'Goltho' produced another twelve (Goodall 1987: 187), and knives were therefore clearly a very common type of object. One of the knife fragments listed on the *PAS* database for Lindsey requires further comment. This is the ninth- to tenth-century example from the parish of Lusby with Winceby (DENO-B9C5E6) (appendix 12.12.1.1), which is a zoomorphic knife terminal, and it is possible that its decorative nature was an indication that it was not a simple utilitarian knife.

In contrast to the complete absence of weapons from Lincoln, fragments of swords, daggers and scabbards were more numerous in Lindsey and Kesteven (although they have not been reported for Holland) (appendix 12.10.2, 12.10.3 and 12.10.4). The exclusive occurrence of pieces of weaponry outside Lincoln offers further support for the notion, brought forward in the previous section, that Lincoln was not considered the most appropriate venue for secular elite power display. At the same time, the nature of the decoration of these fragments of weapons and weapon accessories confirms the notion that 'Scandinavian-ness' was increasingly associated with elite society as well. Many of the surviving sword pommels from Lindsey and Kesteven belonged to Petersen L type VI, which combined aspects from 'Scandinavian' and 'Anglo-Saxon' fashions. Two examples are explicitly 'Scandinavian', however, including a sword pommel with *Borre*-style decoration from the parish of Calcethorpe with Kelstern (*PAS* NLM-C3B377), and a crown-shaped gilded and chip-carved 'viking' sword from Torksey (*PAS* NLM872 = Brown 2006: 315) (appendix 12.10.2.1). Interestingly, both have been found in Lindsey, with no comparable finds from Kesteven, which confirms the trend identified previously that finds of an overtly 'Scandinavian' character are more common in Lindsey than in Kesteven.

In addition to sword pommels, a late tenth- to eleventh-century *Ringerike*-style dagger guard was found in Bardney (LIN-7FE604) in Lindsey (appendix 12.10.3.1), whilst decorative fragments of scabbards for daggers and swords – again mostly decorated in Scandinavian-derived art-styles – are more common in Lindsey than in Kesteven (appendix 12.10.4.1 and 12.10.4.2). Five such fragments of scabbards are recorded for Lindsey, including a scabbard chape in *Ringerike* style from the parish of Middle Rasen (*PAS* NLM-FD16A4). The only example from Torksey is a continental solid silver scabbard mount with gilding (Brown 2006: no. 314) (appendix 12.10.4.1). Another continental scabbard (*PAS* NLM4620) was found in Honington in South Kesteven (appendix 12.10.4.2). The decorative styles of these weapons thus confirm the notion that to an extent the ruling elite had appropriated a 'Scandinavian' identity, although the continental scabbard mount from Torksey and the continental scabbard from Honington suggest that 'continental' identities were also associated with elite display. This suggestion fits well with the argument presented in chapter 4.4.2, that the Lincoln moneyers,

many of whom bore continental names, were part of the Lincoln elite or at least occupied a space high up the social ladder. The next section will briefly return to the issue of monetisation discussed in chapter 4, and analyse the spatial distribution of balances and weights.

5.3.6: 'Viking' traders: balances and weights

Late Anglo-Saxon weights can be made of copper alloy (such as polyhedral weights, significant quantities of which were found at Torksey (appendix 12.11.1)) or lead, and may have an attachment loop for suspension from a set of scales. Excavations in Lincoln produced four possible lead weights, all of which came from the Lower City. They included a simple cone-shaped lead weight from Saltergate <12> (fig. 36 i) (appendix 11.2.4), and a similarly shaped one (but without attachment loop) from Flaxengate <pb38> (appendix 11.12.14.1). A lead 'spindle whorl-shaped' lead was found at The Park <pb11> (published in Colyer *et al.* 1999: 158), but its positive identification as a weight depended on the tapering shape of the hole, which would make it unsuitable as a spindle whorl (appendix 11.2.7) (fig. 36 j).¹¹⁷ The Collection/Danesgate produced a similarly shaped example but with a straight hole and grooved decoration, which makes its identification more problematic. A similar piece from a tenth-century context at York was interpreted as a lead spindle whorl (Walton Rogers 1997: 6638, fig. 809). Excavations at Saltergate also produced one late Anglo-Saxon bun-shaped weight (<46>), made of copper-alloy (appendix 11.2.4).¹¹⁸ Finally, in addition to the above-mentioned (probably post-Conquest) zoomorphic arm of a pair of silver scales from Castle Westgate in the Upper City <1533> (fig. 27 a), the only late Anglo-Saxon balances have been found in the Lower City. The arm of a copper-alloy set of hand-held balances <128> was retrieved during excavations at The Collection/Danesgate, similar in type to a tenth- to eleventh-century example found at Coppergate in York (Mainman and Rogers 2000, fig. 1258, 10415; Mann *pers. comm.*). In addition, <367> and <384> are two fragments of late Anglo-Saxon folding scales from Saltergate/Silver Street (appendix 11.2.4), and <110> is a fragment of a set of copper-alloy folding scales of late Anglo-Saxon to medieval date from the same site (appendix 11.2.4). Finally, <847> was a set of copper-alloy scales, dated to the late Anglo-Saxon to medieval periods, and found at Hungate (appendix 11.2.2).

Outside Lincoln, fragments of balances are absent, but objects that have been identified as possible weights occur in large numbers (fig. 37). The vast majority

¹¹⁷ As appendix 12.11 reveals, it is often difficult to distinguish between weights, gaming pieces and spindle whorls, especially because no comprehensive studies into the metrology of late Anglo-Saxon weights has been carried out.

¹¹⁸ At Hungate (appendix 11.2.2), a decorated lead bi-conical spindle whorl or weight (<407>) was found in an early post-medieval layer, but Leahy (*pers. comm.*) identified this as medieval.

have been found in Lindsey. As discussed in chapter 4.2 in the context of the finds from Flixborough, the presence of weights in the late Anglo-Saxon period can be seen as indicative of a partial return to a weight-economy following the Scandinavian settlement, which would have caused a decrease in monetisation (Rogers 2009d; Wastling 2009). This is confirmed by the concentration of weights from Torksey (appendix 12.11.1). Although weights may have multiple functions, and can be associated with craft production as well, the decorative nature of many of the examples from Torksey, and the frequent occurrence of insets made of silver or gilded copper-alloy, such as a lead weight with an inset of a gilt copper-alloy boar's head (Brown 2006: 265) (fig. 36 k), or coins (appendix 12.11.1), suggests that these weights at least were used in more 'important' contexts, such as for weighing silver or other metals in non-monetary transactions.

The bias in the distribution pattern of weights towards Lindsey can be read as proof that Lindsey felt the effects of the Scandinavian settlement more acutely than Kesteven and Holland. Other concentrations occur in Flixborough (appendix 12.11.1), also situated on the River Trent, but this may be the result of the more intensive nature of the archaeological investigations that have taken place here (appendix 2.2.15). More meaningful is the concentration of weights from the parish of Stapleford (21 examples out of a total of 23 for all of Kesteven) further south along the Witham (appendix 12.11.2), which have all been retrieved by metal detectorists. Given its riverine location, it seems possible that another viking camp or settlement existed in the parish of Stapleford for a brief period of time at the very least. The majority of the remaining weights clustered around Lincoln, with some outliers further north near the Humber mouth and estuary. However, the North Sea coastal zone did not produce any weights at all (fig. 37). The district of Holland only produced one weight (appendix 12.11.3). This suggests that economic activity in Lindsey centred on Lincoln, and on the transport routes towards York.

Returning to Lincoln, the absence of weights and balances from the Upper City may not come as a surprise in the light of the general paucity of late Anglo-Saxon material, but the absence of any such material from Wigford deserves further comment. As discussed in chapters 2 and 3.2, from the tenth century onwards Wigford was supposedly the mercantile part of Lincoln (also see Stocker 2000: 187-89). One might therefore expect copious evidence for economic activity in Wigford, but no weights have been retrieved at all from this part of Lincoln. Chapter 4.3.7 revealed that coins were also mostly absent from Wigford (an exception being a single penny of Æthelred from St Mark's Station (Steane 2001: 193)). They occurred in much larger numbers in the Lower City, and, from the reign of Æthelred, also in the Upper City (appendix 8). It was suggested then that coinage was not the only type of payment that could be used in economic transactions prior to the tenth century, but if both coins *and* weights were absent from the supposedly mercantile

quarter of the settlement, another explanation is required.

A number of different suggestions can be brought forward. First, it is possible that weights were not related to economic activity after all, but were used to weigh raw materials for craft-production. However, as discussed in chapter 5.3.2.2, White (1982: 7) has argued that metalworking, one of the few types of craft-production at Lincoln that worked with materials on a scale that was limited enough for the small size of the weights, was done on a trial-and-error basis rather than according to a set recipe, and Foley (1981) has suggested the same in the context of the evidence for glass-production. Besides, the distribution of coins is also largely restricted to the Lower City, which seems to suggest that – whether or not weights were used to measure wealth – economic activity was indeed restricted to the Lower City.

It may be possible to explain the concentration of balances and weights in the Lower City by reference to the chronology of Lincoln's occupation, at least to an extent. The negative effects on the degree of monetisation in Lincolnshire that were caused by the Scandinavian settlement were short-lasting. As has been argued in chapter 4, the changing patterns of single coin losses and the hoard evidence reveal that levels of monetisation had gone up significantly again before the end of the tenth century. What is more, the discussion in chapter 2 drew attention to the fact that the Upper City was not occupied on a significant scale until the second half of the tenth century either. Occupation in Wigford began earlier, in the first half of the tenth century, but still several decades later than in the Lower City. The fact that the majority of weights – indicative of a weight-economy – occurred in the area of Lincoln that has the most significant evidence for early occupation is unsurprising. However, this does not explain the continuing absence of coins in Wigford.

Perhaps the only explanation for the absence of coins from Wigford can be found in one of the law-codes of Athelstan, previously referred to in chapter 4.3.5, which decreed that both trading and minting has to take place in *burhs* (*II Athelstan*: 12-13). The rationale behind this law was, of course, an attempt to increase control over the late Anglo-Saxon economy. The best way to exercise control over trade is by restricting it to an area that is clearly defined and surrounded by walls – such as a *burh* – so that it becomes impossible to even enter or leave the area without being noticed. In other words, even if Wigford was a mercantile settlement, it is still plausible that market activity was restricted to Lincoln's walled areas, initially the Lower City, and later, when occupation in the northern walled area had increased as well, also in the heart of the Upper City.

5.3.7: 'Other' objects

There is one site in the Lower City that has yielded a metalwork assemblage that may seem atypical for an 'urban' site. This is Saltergate (appendix 11.2.4), which produced, amongst other things, a copper-plated iron cattle bell (<52>),

measuring 134 mm in length. Another copper-plated iron bell, measuring 160 mm in length, was found at Flixborough (Ottaway 2009c). Ottaway (2009c) states that

Large bells of a similar size ... are rare in archaeological contexts, although it may be noted that a [similar] large bell ... comes from a late 9th-century context adjacent to the Anglo-Saxon church at Repton, Derby.

The proximity of the Derby-find to the church may suggest that such bells, possibly like the smaller ones discussed in section 5.3.3, had a liturgical function, and were used, for example, to summon people to mass. However, the Lincoln example has been interpreted as a cattle bell and, elsewhere, Ottaway (2009d) has suggested that bells could be "hung around the necks of cattle and sheep" (also see section 5.3.3). The possible interpretation of the large bell from Saltergate as a cattle bell fits well with another discovery made on the same site, a late Anglo-Saxon hoe (<166>). The assemblage from Saltergate furthermore compares interestingly to the discoveries at St Benedict's Square in Wigford (appendix 1.3.1.1), which included evidence for a number of possible cattle or sheep enclosures. This suggests that, in addition to industrial activities, at least some of the inhabitants of Lincoln were also involved in small-scale agricultural activities. If this was the case, it is possible to suggest that the population of Lincoln was relatively self-sufficient, a suggestion that would go well with the relative lack of evidence for widespread distribution of artefacts produced in Lincoln across the surrounding region. In other words, late Anglo-Saxon Lincoln was not a production and consumption centre that was entirely reliant on the surrounding 'hinterland' for economic surplus. Even if it was definitely part of the surrounding region, it retained a level of self-sufficiency that found expression in the agricultural activities of at least some of its inhabitants, and the relatively limited scale of craft-production (also see Astill 2006: 248).

5.3.8: The metalwork from a spatial perspective: conclusions

In conclusion, the distribution patterns of late Anglo-Saxon metal artefacts in Lincoln, Lindsey, Kesteven and Holland shed light on the changing identity of the settlement at Lincoln, as well as on existing regional identities. Lincoln was not a homogenous entity, but the different 'parts' of the settlement each had their own identities. Even if Wigford saw limited-scale metalwork production, and functioned as a 'strand' for the walled area of the settlement, market activity took place *inside* the walled areas of the settlement. What is more, Lincoln's role as a regional production centre was still up and coming. The majority of artefacts produced here were intended for a local consumer audience, although the distribution pattern of the hooked tags suggests that the first steps towards a more large-scale 'commercial' level of production had been taken.

On a regional scale, it seems that the inhabitants of Lindsey were more overt

in their expression of a 'Scandinavian' identity than those of Kesteven and Holland, although in the case of Holland this may have been the result of a general paucity of occupation of any sort. The inhabitants of Lincoln were relatively 'neutral' in their expression of ethnic affiliations as well. Although objects of an overtly 'Scandinavian' character do occur in Lincoln, there is little evidence for the production of such objects. The 'neutral' style of the Lincoln metalwork is reflected in the less overtly 'Scandinavian' style of the coinage, and the lack of figurative scenes on sculpture that may be interpreted as references to Norse mythology, especially as compared to contemporary York products.

Finally, the spatial distribution of metalwork can shed light on the function of Lincoln within the context of the region as a whole. The absence of horse-harness fittings and weapons from Lincoln suggests that, although the secular aristocracy held properties in Lincoln, the settlement was not considered an appropriate venue for conspicuous elite power display. This is not surprising given the evidence that power was largely based on landed wealth. Many of the decorative weapon- and horse harness-fittings were furthermore executed in 'Scandinavian' styles, suggesting that a 'Scandinavian' identity was associated with status and wealth. Nevertheless, the mixing of styles, such as the combination of 'Scandinavian'-style decoration on flat disc-brooches, or the production of domed openwork disc-brooches with new types of decorative patterns, shows that a certain degree of ethnic identification with the Anglo-Saxons was taking place on the part of the Scandinavian settlers, presumably in deference to the established order, which – as has been argued in chapters 3 and 4 – certainly included the Church.

5.4: The socio-economic dimensions of production and consumption

5.4.1: The socio-economic dimensions of production and consumption: introduction

This section will address the dynamics of metalwork production and consumption from a social perspective. Previous work on metalwork production has focused mainly on technological aspects (Bayley 1979; 1984; White 1982). The evidence for metalwork production in Lincoln has been discussed briefly in section 5.3.2.2 (also see appendices 11 and 16). Similar evidence from the rest of Lindsey is more limited. Hinton (2003: 276) has stated that metal-production on rural sites disappeared in the course of the tenth century. However, as stated in chapter 2.4.5 and section 5.3.1, this may partially be caused by a lack of recognition of metalworking waste from 'rural' contexts.

There is some evidence that can shed light on the way in which metalwork production was organised in Lindsey during the middle Anglo-Saxon period in the shape of the so-called smith's grave from Tattershall Thorpe, briefly discussed in chapter 3.5.3 (Hinton 2000; 2003). There is evidence for ninth-century metalwork

production from Flixborough (summarised in various chapters in Evans and Loveluck 2009), which may have occurred on a scale that was larger than the immediate needs of the settlement (Loveluck 2007: 102-04). However, even if small-scale ironworking continued into the tenth century, non-ferrous metalworking did not place there anymore in the tenth century (Loveluck 2007: 105).

Ironworking also took place in the later tenth century on the Barrow Road site in Barton-upon-Humber (Bradley 2002: 5; Gardner and Bunn 2006: 5) (appendix 2.3.3), whilst iron smelting may have taken place at Cherry Willingham (Everson *et al.* 1991: 89; Everson and Stocker 1999: 9) (appendix 2.12.26) and Cumberworth (Green 1997: 6) (appendix 2.17.33). Unstratified slag, in particular iron slag, occurs across Lincolnshire, but is difficult to date, and is not usually submitted to scientific dating methods, especially (and paradoxically) not if it does not come from securely dated contexts. The presence of slag, however, is not always an indication of ironworking, as slags had secondary uses as well, such as the metalling of road surfaces (Cowgill 1994: 25).¹¹⁹

Evidence for non-ferrous metalwork production outside Lincoln is much sparser for the ninth and tenth centuries. No unfinished objects, moulds or crucible sherds have been found in 'rural' Lincolnshire contexts.¹²⁰ However, a die used for making foils in *Jellinge* style was found at Stickford (NLM1063; Leahy 2007: 151) (appendix 12.12.3.1). An important but small piece of evidence that suggests that metalworking did take place outside Lincoln is YORYM-FA6027, a silver droplet of the period AD 850-1000, identified as metalworking waste, from Brampton in West Lindsey (appendix 12.12.3.1). Finally, a single copper-alloy ingot of ninth- to eleventh-century date from Market Rasen in West Lindsey (DENO-63EB93) may be related to metalworking, but it may also represent hack-metal. The same can be said for the single gold ingot from Springthorpe near Gainsborough (*Treasure* 2001: 50) and the silver ingot from Roxby cum Risby (NLM-683755).

Yet, even if Lincoln did not yet have a monopoly on metalwork production in the ninth and tenth centuries, crucible sherds occurred in the earliest post-Roman layers at Flaxengate, and there can be little doubt that such industrial activities increasingly took place in 'urban' contexts. What is more, the production of metalwork was essential to the development of Lincoln as a settlement, as it was for other regional centres in the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England. Settlements like York, Stamford, Northampton and Thetford have produced more significant amounts of metalworking scrap of the ninth to eleventh centuries than,

¹¹⁹ Iron slag is most common, as the industry produces most, and includes both tap slag (result of smelting) and smithing slag (waste from working the iron). Smelting should be prevalent in the East Midlands because there is lots of ore, in particular bog ore from the fen edge and valley bottoms (Cowgill 1994: 25). This might explain why Stamford, itself situated near the fen edge, became an important centre for iron production.

¹²⁰ Unfinished artefacts from rural contexts are rare throughout England. An exception was PAS SF3977, an unfinished lead disc brooch from Badingham in Suffolk.

for example, the southern *burhs* of London, Winchester and Oxford (White 1982: 7).¹²¹ The remainder of this section will look at the role that the metalworking industry at Lincoln played in the formation of individual and collective identities in late ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln and Lindsey, through the application of social theories about dress and identity. The impact of mass-production on settlement development will also be discussed. Finally, the changing role of the smith in Anglo-Saxon society will be analysed, an issue that was already briefly referred to in chapter 4.5.

5.4.2: The production of fashion

As the previous discussion of the finished metal artefacts from Lincolnshire has demonstrated, dress accessories and other decorative items were subject to 'fashion', in the sense that changes in their form and decoration were intrinsically related to social change (Wilson and de la Haye 1999: 3).¹²² As textiles have not survived in Lincoln, with the exception of the silk headdress from Saltergate (Muthesius 1982a; 1982b; Steane *et al.* forthcoming; appendix 1.2.1.18), these objects represent the only form of 'fashion' that is available for study. They were functional objects, but their form, their decoration and the materials they were made of ensured they were also *socially* significant, not only reflecting the identity of the wearer, but also, and through that, potentially affecting the wearer's position within society (Crane 2000: 1; Davis 1992: 3-4) (also see sections 5.2.3.2 and 5.3.4). What is more, despite the relatively uniform nature of tenth-century dress accessories, the significance of these decorative metal artefacts, like all items that are imbued with agency, was never straightforward, nor did it remain unchanged (Davis 1992: 6-9). Although these ideas are frequently acknowledged in the study of dress accessories, they are not commonly applied to the study of decorative metalwork in general. The remainder of this section will briefly rehearse some of the main relevant arguments from the field of dress studies, and apply them to the wider range of material presented in this chapter.

Much academic debate has focused on the question of how to interpret items of dress, although most of it focuses on the post-medieval and modern periods (Burman and Turbin 2003 (for dress and gender); Crane 2000; Davis 1992; Damhorst *et al.* (eds) 2005; Parkins 2002 (ed.) (on dress, gender and politics); Wilson and de la Haye 1999).¹²³ Nevertheless, some useful thoughts can be

¹²¹ Evidence for metalworking has also been found in Scandinavia itself, at trading centres such as Ribe, Hedeby and Birka, but in comparison Flaxengate has produced far more material (White 1982: 7).

¹²² This viewpoint represents a drastic departure from more traditional studies of dress (often referred to as 'costume'), which, promoting object-based analysis, regarded dress as an independent entity (Wilson and de la Haye 1999: 3).

¹²³ An important addition to the study of dress is the new journal entitled *Medieval Clothing and Textiles* (eds Netherton and Owen-Crocker; Boydell Press), which was launched in 2005

extracted from these studies. For example, Crane (2000: 3) has drawn attention to the way in which “changes in clothing ... indicate shifts in social relationships and tensions between different social groups that present themselves in different ways in public space”. Looking at pre-industrial societies in general, she (2000: 3-4) argues how “clothing behavior indicated very precisely a person’s position in the social structure ... [and] clothing revealed not only social class and gender but frequently occupation, religious affiliation, and regional origin, as well”. Finally, Crane (2000: 3) also argues that prior to the Industrial Revolution, “clothes were generally included among a person’s most valuable possessions ... [being] so expensive and so precious that it constituted in itself a form of currency and frequently replaced gold as a form of payment for services”. That this was indeed the case may be clear from the passage from Asser’s ninth-century *Life of Alfred* (ch. 81), in which Asser refers to a valuable silk cloak that Alfred bestowed on him as a royal gift.

The previous sections have analysed the ninth- and tenth-century metalwork from Lincolnshire primarily in order to identify ‘ethnic’ and regional identities. However, it was acknowledged, in particular in relation to the ‘Scandinavian’ styles used for the decorative horse harness- and weapon-fittings (sections 5.3.4 and 5.3.5), that a particular ‘ethnic’ identity can itself be an indicator of status, especially if such an identity is associated with the ruling elite. It is plausible, moreover, that different ‘ethnic’ styles signalled status amongst different social groups. An example of the co-existence of distinct ‘ethnic’ styles can be perceived in the occurrence of different types of decorative strap-ends (appendix 12.2). In the course of the later ninth and tenth centuries, the local *Trewhiddle*-style strap-ends, representing c. 60% of the ninth-century assemblage, are increasingly replaced by tongue-shaped strap-ends (a continental form), executed in either the southern, continental-inspired *Winchester* style (with stylised acanthus-leaf decoration or related patterns), or the Scandinavian *Borre* style, whilst a third group of multi-headed strap-ends, like the example from Holmes Grainwarehouse in Wigford (appendix 11.3.2) betrayed ‘Norse’ affections (Thomas 2001: 39-45). It is possible that these different styles were worn by, and signalled affiliation to, different elite groups.

The various aspects of identity that dress accessories can express are complex, but often difficult to reconstruct. It may be possible to consider the cross-designs on the lead-alloy disc-brooches, discussed in section 5.2.3.2, as overt references to Christianity. Like the crosses on the Lindsey-style grave markers (chapter 3) and the saintly dedication of the St Martin’s coinage (chapter 4), these

at the International Congress on Medieval Studies at Kalamazoo, and covers the period between the seventh and seventeenth centuries, although here, too, the majority of contributions focuses on the first half of the second millennium AD.

brooches, many of which were executed to high standards (see for example fig. 30 h), may have been worn to draw attention to the Christian religion of the wearer, possibly as a subtle confirmation of the consolidation of power between the ecclesiastical and new secular elites. Age-, gender- and occupation-related identities are more difficult to reconstruct from the mostly unstratified and residual metalwork assemblage from Lincolnshire. There is no evidence for occupation-specific dress accessories in late ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln. Copper-alloy bells that may have been associated mostly with children provide the only possible glimpse of a distinct age-related identity, but there is no other evidence for the specific use of dress accessories for children's dress in the tenth and eleventh centuries (Owen-Crocker 1986: 266).

Any attempts to reconstruct gender distinctions from unstratified assemblages are deeply problematic (*contra* Leahy 2007 (section 5.2)). Dress-accessories are never depicted in contemporary images (Owen-Crocker 1986: 217, 251), but funerary evidence can shed some light on the issue. Owen-Crocker (1986: 205-09) identifies disc-brooches (including cloisonné brooches), ansate brooches, pins (including ringed pins), strap-ends, hooked tags, in her opinion part of money pouches, and finger-rings in her chapter on 'women's costume in the tenth and eleventh centuries', but their inclusion here is not necessarily exclusive, as her chapter on men's costume identifies disc-brooches as part of male fashion as well (Owen-Crocker 1986: 235), and even identifies strap-ends and buckles as a *predominantly* male fashion (Owen-Crocker 1986: 217). Margesson (1997: 19, 16), in contradiction to Owen-Crocker (see above), identifies ringed pins as a predominantly male item, used to fasten a cloak, whilst she considers the 'Scandinavian' trefoil brooches as predominantly female, worn by women to fasten their shawls. A buckle was found in a male grave in Surrey (Owen-Crocker 1986: 217, 251), whilst two strap-ends were found in the aforementioned female 'viking' grave from Westness, Rousay (Orkney) (chapter 4.4.3), although the 'foreign' identity of the individual who was buried here may imply that the gendered nature of these objects had been misunderstood. In brief, although certain dress accessories were probably considered either 'male' or 'female', on the whole the distinctions were not hard and fast.

The remaining question is: why do existing fashions change? The introduction of Scandinavian styles in England is usually explained by reference to the arrival of Scandinavian settlers. However, it is not so simple to explain the transition from harness fittings in *Borre* style to harness fittings in *Ringerike* or *Urnes* style, which occurred *after* the Scandinavian settlement, or, for example, the transition from hooked tags with stamped ring-and-dot decoration to hooked tags with decorative rows of punched dots (appendix 12.4). Davis (1992: 15-16) has drawn attention to the following two opposing sides in the academic debate on the driving force behind

such change: that it is consumer-driven, caused by boredom with existing styles, or that it is producer-driven, aimed at making a profit on the basis of making existing styles obsolete. According to Davis (1992: 16-17), however, the construction of social identities is the driving force behind changes in fashion, and the binding factor between consumers and producers of fashion.¹²⁴

Davis followed a 'traditional' school of thought that did not consider early medieval 'dress' (or 'costume') as proper 'fashion'. Instead, he (1992: 29) placed the 'beginnings' of fashion in the thirteenth or fourteenth century, stating how "fashion's rise in the West had much to do with the emergence at about this time of a town bourgeoisie to rival feudal aristocracy's secular monopoly of wealth, power, and display". Since the publication of his work, a greater awareness has developed that such social processes did not 'happen' overnight, but took place over a much longer period of time, and the above discussion has demonstrated that the 'dress' of the ninth and tenth centuries AD was indeed also subject to 'fashion'. In fact, the evidence for the mass-production of hooked tags at Lincoln, and the rise of a different social class in Wigford that could be characterised as 'mercantile' (chapter 3; also see chapter 4) probably did as much to challenge the "aristocracy's secular monopoly of wealth, power, and display" (Davis 1992: 29) as did the developments of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

A look at the dress accessories from Lincolnshire adds further detail to Davis's arguments, and suggests that changes in fashion occurred as a result of a complex interaction between consumer taste, which was socially embedded, and experiments in 'new' styles by the producers of the artefacts. One of the most noticeable characteristics of ninth- and tenth-century fashion is the level of homogeneity of the dress accessories (which has traditionally excluded the dress of this period from being regarded as 'fashion', although one could argue that it was no more or less homogenous than modern mass-produced items of 'fashion'), which suggests that originality was not very highly valued. The *Borre*-style flat disc-brooches, consisting of a central lozenge-shape surrounded by knot-work, which were probably produced in Norwich, provide a good example. They were clearly popular items throughout East Anglia and Lincolnshire. Experiments in style were sometimes carried out, like the two near-identical examples from Lincoln with their stylised, geometric patterns from The Park (appendix 11.2.7) and Grantham Street (appendix 11.2.8) but, for some reason, the results of this experiment were not popular enough to warrant production on a comparable scale.

¹²⁴ Davis (1992: 16-18) draws the attention to the relationship between (collective) social identity and fashion, and highlights a number of "instabilities" that are fashion-susceptible, including "the subjective tensions between youth versus age, masculinity versus femininity, androgyny versus singularity, inclusiveness versus exclusiveness, work versus play, domesticity versus worldliness, revelation versus concealment, license versus restraint, and conformity versus rebellion".

If changes in fashion were partially consumer-driven, the homogenous nature of many dress accessories – a parallel for which can be found in the homogenous nature of contemporary funerary sculpture (chapter 3) – reveals a demand for objects that emphasised a sense of belonging to a certain social group. This may have been caused by social insecurity, caused by the Scandinavian settlement or the West Saxon expansion, or perhaps by non-political factors, such as individual insecurity, the same psychological factors, the same wish to *belong*, that cause us even now to follow fashion. This is a phenomenon of all times and all places, but may be more overt at times of increased social, religious and political instability. Focusing on industrial society, the sociologist Simmel (1904; (also see Crane 2000: 6-7) has suggested that

Fashion – *i.e.* the latest fashion - ... affects only the upper classes. Just as soon as the lower classes begin to copy their style, thereby crossing the line of demarcation the upper classes have drawn and destroying the uniformity of their coherence, the upper classes turn away from this style and adopt a new one, which in its turn differentiates them from the masses; and thus the game goes merrily on.

In other words, the more social, political, religious and financial security people enjoy, the more room there is for the exploration of individuality. In a time of significant social and political unrest, in this case caused by the Scandinavian settlement and subsequent West Saxon expansion, a need develops to be part of a larger community that can provide protection.

A final point of interest in this context is the fact that homogeneity of the decoration of dress accessories also allows for the mass-production of near-identical objects. For a successful distribution of the finished artefacts the production centres for these objects had to be situated on important junctions within existing communication networks (see Astill 2006), which was undoubtedly the case for the production centres at Lincoln, Norwich and York. The combination of those two factors was essential in assuring Lincoln's economic success. However, that success was ultimately driven by the social insecurity of the time.

5.4.3: Treasure and 'trashy dress fittings': the Anglo-Saxon smith and the use of different materials

Returning to the issues raised in section 5.2, it has sometimes been assumed that the type of metal of which dress accessories were made was an indication of the status of the wearer (Leahy 2007: 148; also see Owen-Crocker 1986: 206) (section 5.2). Consequently, the exclusive use of base metals for the production of dress accessories has been characterised as one aspect of a more general 'decline' in workmanship (Leahy 2007: 153). Other explanations for the lack of evidence for late Anglo-Saxon dress accessories made of precious metals have been offered as

well. It has been suggested that the lack of surviving gold objects was caused by the fact that the gold reserves were becoming increasingly exhausted in the middle Anglo-Saxon period (Williams *pers. comm.*), or by a lower survival rate as a result of the cessation of furnished burial (Blackburn 2007: 78). Whether these suggestions are true or not, the fact that status could be expressed through the *decoration* of an object and the intrinsic values associated with that type of decoration, rather than (exclusively) through the choice of materials implies that the equation of gold with high status and base metals with low(er) status is too simplistic. The following section will briefly return to the concept of *materiality* (chapter 3.6.3), and discuss the evidence for the social significance of gold, silver, lead- and copper-alloys in the late Anglo-Saxon period.

The perceived status of gold has been the focus of a recent article by Blackburn (2007), discussing the use of gold in the late Anglo-Saxon period as depicted in contemporary written sources, including charters. Blackburn (2007: 77) concluded that

Gold was regularly encountered in late Anglo-Saxon England, at least in the church and among the ruling elite. It was used particularly for royal gifts and bequests, both from the king and to the king, and within his household ... the wearing of gold ... would have been a status symbol, but how far down the social classes it percolated we cannot tell from the written sources alone. Quite apart from such display, gold had an economic role, recorded particularly for the purchase of land and the payment of tribute, although one has to consider how often gold – be it in bullion or coin – actually changed hands. In some cases we can be sure that it really was used, but in others it could have been merely a formal way of expressing the price.

The use of gold as royal gift features in the Old English poem *Beowulf*, in which the hero Beowulf is frequently rewarded with gold gifts of great value. What is more, the poem also uses terms such as *goldgifa* (gold-giver) meaning 'lord', and *goldwine* (gold-friend) meaning 'prince'. However, although *Beowulf* was probably written down around 1000 AD, the poem conserved aspects of a long preceding oral tradition that had its roots in the pre-Christian era. A more truly contemporary source is Asser's *Life of Alfred*. As stated previously, in ch. 81 Asser describes the gifts that King Alfred bestows upon him to persuade him not to return to Wales. In addition to the aforementioned silk cloak, Asser receives two monasteries and a large quantity of incense, but no gold. As landed wealth was becoming increasingly important as a means to create social coherence, and was gradually replacing the role of gold, the role of gold to express the value of land (Blackburn 2007: 77) can be seen as a way to 'translate' the new currency (land) to the old one (gold).

As was argued in chapter 3.2, the Church played an important role in the promotion of landownership as a means to express secular social status, and in this context it is worth noting that gold was increasingly used for religious paraphernalia

such as crosiers and chalices (Owen-Crocker 1986: 206-07; also see Ten Harkel forthcoming a), even if it was becoming increasingly rare for dress accessories and other secular purposes. The appropriation of gold by the Church may have had biblical reasons: gold was amongst the gifts offered to the baby Jesus by the three kings. If the Bible depicted the material as a gift fit for God Himself, and Christian kings could wear gold on the basis of the fact that they were God's anointed, the material may nevertheless have been considered unsuitable for the vast majority of the secular aristocracy. However, the promotion of land as a substitute also had clear practical advantages, as it allowed for a more efficient collection of taxes, tithes and other dues, from which the Church benefited as well.

It is clear, then, that gold fulfilled a different social role to other materials, and was used exclusively in transactions that went beyond the purely economic, until it was replaced by landed wealth. The fact that the majority of late eighth- to early tenth-century gold and gilt artefacts that have been found in Lincolnshire can be associated with 'viking' activity (see above) may suggest that the Scandinavian raiders had a more 'old-fashioned' understanding of gold, namely, as a means to express secular status. Yet, by the time the raiders became settlers and converted to Christianity, they too had accepted landed wealth as a suitable alternative (also see Ten Harkel forthcoming a).

The middle Anglo-Saxon smith's grave from Tattershall Thorpe (Hinton 2000) (chapter 3.5.3) confirms the notion that gold had a different social function compared to other materials. The tools that he was buried with indicated that he worked with both ferrous and non-ferrous metals (Hinton 2003: 262-63). Yet the amount of gold and silver he carried with him was extremely limited, which led Hinton (2003: 268) to suggest that for precious metals he was completely dependent on his patrons, who exercised full control over the available resources of these materials.

The previous discussion on the significance of gold sheds an interesting light on the significance of other materials as well. The use of silver(ing) for dress accessories, which had replaced the use of gilt in the course of the eighth century, was relatively short-lived, and had all but disappeared in the tenth century. By then, however, it was still widely used for coins, for which purpose it had previously replaced gold in the second half of the seventh century (Blackburn 2001a: 113, 115), roughly at the same time as solid gold dress accessories went out of fashion. By this time, England was monetised to a relatively high degree, and the use of coinage was largely restricted to economic transactions rather than social investment (Blackburn 2001a: 113). It is therefore possible that the reasons why gold was no longer used for coins were the same as why gold was no longer used for jewellery: neither object played an important part in the upkeep of established power relations. In other words, although silver clearly had an intrinsic *economic*

value (an economic value which was probably higher than that of base metals; chapter 4.5), it did not have a *social* value, like gold. By default, the decrease in the use of silver for dress accessories does therefore *not* represent a general decline in people's social status, but was related to the increased output of the mints in the course of the ninth and tenth centuries (chapter 4), which would have diminished the amount of silver that was available for non-monetary purposes.

The tenth century witnessed the almost exclusive use of base metals for dress accessories. As they did not have the potential to maintain power relations between a lord and his followers, they lent themselves better for the expression of other aspects of the wearer's identity, which may have *included* status, but also ethnic affiliation, age, gender, and religion. Presuming that the material was indeed relatively cheap and easy to come by (even if the use of copper alloys for the middle Anglo-Saxon Northumbrian stycas suggests that they were not without economic value either (chapter 4)), this meant that the possibility to express one's identity was not restricted to the highest social strata. In other words, unlike dress accessories made of gold, dress accessories made of base metals (or silver, as a more up-market alternative) represent 'proper' fashion.

The use of lead alloys has often been interpreted as a cheap alternative, to the extent that in the past scholars have suggested that lead brooches were trial pieces rather than finished objects (Leahy 2006). One example of a lead-alloy dress accessory from Lincolnshire that clearly imitated gold examples was PAS LIN-9F1715, a lead pendant from Rigsby with Ailsby. Its face was decorated with anthropomorphic or zoomorphic designs, resembling the type commonly found on gold bracteates (appendix 12.8.1). However, it has now been established beyond doubt that lead-alloy dress accessories were indeed worn, and, as stated previously, the high tin content of some lead-alloy objects, which resulted in a silvery appearance, and the high quality of many of their designs, suggests that they were certainly *not* cheap alternatives. The increasing use of lead alloys may also be explained by reference to other examples of artefacts that were made of the same material, such as lead weights. As suggested above, the decorative nature of some of the weights from Lindsey suggests that they were used for non-monetary transactions, and as such were objects of considerable socio-economic importance. The lead imitative coin from Swinhope (PAS NLM-8E52D1) (appendix 9.1.37; chapter 4.3.3; fig. 17 d) suggests that the socio-economic importance of lead was even significant enough for the material to be suitable for the production of a coinage, even if that coinage was clearly unsuccessful.

The influence of the Church on the social significance of metalwork production affected the social position of smiths, as they turned from travelling craftsmen with magical powers who existed outside 'normal' communities, such as the middle Anglo-Saxon smith from Tattershall Thorpe (appendix 3.5.3), to socially accepted

craftsmen who were often in the service of the Church (Hinton 2003: 273). The influence of the Church is apparent from the increasing evidence for ironworking sites on Church lands (Hinton 2003: 273), and by the evidence for non-ferrous metalwork production at St Mark's in Wigford and St Paul-in-the-Bail in the Upper City (appendix 16). The change in social positioning of smiths did not, however, affect their social status, which remained high. The mythological figure of Weland the smith continued to feature on the ninth- and tenth-century sculpture from Yorkshire and in contemporary written sources such as the Anglo-Saxon poem *Deor*, as did Sigurd, who was the stepson of a smith (Hinton 2003: 268-69), suggesting that smiths were prominent enough in society to be used as a motif in art and literature. Thompson (2004) has drawn attention to the use of Weland and Sigurd imagery as representations of Christ, which illustrates the high esteem in which smiths (or the sons of smiths) were still held. Bradley (1991), pursuing an unconnected line of enquiry, has looked at the lexical range for the word *smith* and the traditions and practices surrounding smiths in Old English literature, and has again highlighted the fact that Christ is often referred to as a *smith* or a *smithes sunu* (smith's son).

The main impact that the Church had on the social positioning of the smith was that it made the profession more socially acceptable. Metalworking was no longer the liminal and slightly magical activity it had once been, but took place in the centre of a nucleated settlement, and as such, became part of people's daily experiences. This contributed positively to the development of settlements like Lincoln, where metalworking took up an important role. The discipline of consumer studies has drawn attention to the importance of the production and consumption of (relatively) cheap, mass-produced clothing to maintain a monetary, capitalist economy (Wilson and de la Haye 1999: 5-6).¹²⁵ Although it would be anachronistic to suggest that such an economy was in place in tenth-century Lincolnshire, it has been argued throughout the last three chapters that the mercantile and craft-producing class was becoming increasingly important. Soon, production of certain types of dress accessories – such as the hooked tags in Lincoln – began to outgrow the needs of individual aristocratic or ecclesiastical patrons (see above), stimulating Lincoln's economic growth and attracting more craftsmen who contributed to its prosperity in the process.

¹²⁵ In the past items of clothing were often considered of high value, and "handed down from masters to servants, or, via will, from one generation to the next, or used as items of exchange or barter" (Wilson and de la Haye 1999: 6), but nowadays mass-produced clothes are often of throw-away value, and in 1999 their production and sale represented the fifth-largest industry in Britain.

5.4.4: The production and consumption of the metalwork from Lincoln and Lindsey: conclusions

The preceding discussion has argued that a direct equation of material with status is too simplistic. Status, like other aspects that make up people's identities, could also be expressed through decoration, for example through an 'ethnic' style that was associated with the ruling elite. The varying styles identified in section 5.3 were interpreted in the context of political tensions that existed between different social groups, whilst the relative lack of innovation and originality was interpreted as a result of increased social insecurity following the Scandinavian settlement. It was furthermore argued that the increased monopoly of settlements like Lincoln on metalwork production was the outcome of a process that had begun in the late seventh century, as Christianity spread across England, and smithing became increasingly socially acceptable, eventually contributing to the growth of Lincoln as a settlement.

5.5: Conclusions

In conclusion, a comparative analysis of the metalwork production and consumption in Lincoln and Lindsey, placed within the wider context of the evidence from other regions in England, and studied as a socially embedded phenomenon, can shed important light on the changes that took place in Lincoln in the course of the late ninth and tenth centuries AD. It has become clear that the increased evidence for metalwork production was not merely an economic or even political phenomenon, but was intrinsically related to social and religious changes that had been set into motion centuries before the first Scandinavian raiders set foot onto English soil. Dress, in the widest sense of the word, rather than merely reflecting the identity of the wearer, was a political, social and religious tool. As such, the production of dress accessories was situated at the core of settlements where these political, social and religious tensions were being played out. In this case that was Lincoln.

CHAPTER 6: POTTERY

6.1: Introduction

This chapter focuses on the final category of material culture that stands central to this thesis – the pottery – in order to shed light on the changing significance of late ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln. Pottery was amongst the first types of artefact to be produced in ninth-century Lincoln on a significant scale, as it was in other regional centres in the East Midlands (Stocker 2006: 66). Like coinage and metalwork, pottery is a type of portable artefact. However, unlike coinage and metalwork, which typically enters the archaeological record because it has been accidentally lost, the vast majority of ceramic material that is available for study was deliberately discarded, usually after it was broken through use (Blackburn 1989b: 17) (chapter 2.4.6).

Section 6.2 will present an overview of existing work on the pottery from Lincoln and Lindsey, which will draw significantly on the work carried out by Young and Vince (2005), who established a comprehensive typology and chronology of the material, and Symonds (1999; 2003a; 2003b), who analysed tenth-century pottery distribution patterns in Lincolnshire. The typology established by Young and Vince (2005) is summarised in appendix 17, and an alphabetic list of fabric codes mentioned in the text is provided in appendix 18. Section 6.3 will discuss changing pottery distribution patterns in Lincolnshire. The maps are based on the distribution maps in Symonds's (2003a) BAR report on pottery consumption in tenth-century Lincolnshire, which in turn were based on data collected in the context of the *EMASPP* (Vince and Young 1991a), but add, for the first time, the unpublished material from the *NLPTS* (chapter 2.4.6). The data will be presented from a qualitative rather than a quantitative perspective. Finally, as the *NLPTS* project has ensured that the density of data is much better for north Lincolnshire than anywhere else in Lincolnshire, the analysis will focus on the ceramic evidence from Lindsey, although reference to other parts of Lincolnshire will be made where relevant. Unlike in previous chapters, any discussion regarding the organisation of production will be incorporated in the analysis of the spatial distribution patterns of the pottery.

6.2: The pottery: existing research

Brown (1997: 95) has pointed out in the context of a paper on medieval pottery that most ceramic studies limit themselves to the following three questions: "What date is this?"; "Where was this made and how did this get here?"; and "How was this made?". This statement certainly holds true in the context of most of the work carried out on late Anglo-Saxon ceramics. Much of the earliest research on late Anglo-Saxon pottery was carried out on a national or at least a trans-regional scale,

and focused entirely on the establishment of ceramic typologies. A pioneering work was Dunning's (1959; reviewed and summarised in Vince 1993b) study of late Anglo-Saxon pottery, which established the basic distinction between insular and imported wares, and divided the latter into six broad groups. Two of these groups are particularly relevant in this context, namely group 2: East Anglia and the Midlands (wheel-thrown pottery, a.k.a. 'Saxo-Norman' wares, including Thetford, St Neots, and Stamford wares); and group 4: Lincolnshire and Yorkshire (interpreted as 'derivations' of group 2, founded as 'daughter-industries' by East Anglian potters) (Dunning 1959; Vince 1993b: 152).¹²⁶ Dunning (1959) furthermore believed that the potter's wheel was a continental invention, which was brought over to England at some point in the ninth century. Dunning's (1959) insular classification was later reviewed by Hurst (1976), who argued that the potter's wheel was an insular invention that occurred independently of any continental influence. Hurst's (1976) argument was based on the similarities between the shapes of wheelthrown middle Anglo-Saxon Ipswich ware (IPS) vessels and those of later ninth- and tenth-century Anglo-Saxon vessels, which, according to Hurst, indicated that the later ninth- and tenth-century wares could have been derived from Ipswich ware without the necessary migration of continental potters.

Following Dunning's basic typology, Haslam (1978) produced another synthesis of later Anglo-Saxon pottery.¹²⁷ Like Dunning, Haslam (1978: 10) identified three main wheel-turned pottery types that replaced the earlier hand-made wares at some point in the ninth century – St Neots-type ware, Thetford-type ware and Stamford-type ware – all made on a fast wheel, and all called after their type-site (Haslam 1978: 10).¹²⁸ Where Haslam's (1978) work differed from Dunning's (1959) original publication, however, was in the inclusion of important new information about the circumstances of pottery production, based on the fact that in the intervening twenty years a number of kilns had been discovered and excavated in the Midlands and the north. These included a kiln discovered in 1963 at Stamford (it was the second kiln to be found there, as a previous example had been discovered in 1874) (Simpson 1982); several kilns along Silver Street in Lincoln (Miles 1989; Miles *et al.* 1989) (excavated in 1973) (fig. 38); and kilns in

¹²⁶ Dunning (1959) furthermore identified groups 1: Southern England (handmade pottery that was derived and hard to distinguish from middle Anglo-Saxon wares); 3: London (which existed somewhere between groups 1 and 2); 5: 'other' handmade wares, which revived the techniques from group 1, but were influenced by wheel-thrown traditions; and 6: Cornwall (so-called 'bar-lip' pottery, which involved a handle that could be used to suspend vessel over fire, and apparently developed as the result of trading contacts between Cornwall and Frisia) (Vince 1993b: 152).

¹²⁷ They were labelled 'Saxo-Norman' because their production continued more or less without a break until the twelfth century (Haslam 1978: 10).

¹²⁸ There are two different types of pottery wheel, the slow wheel and the fast wheel. The slow wheel involves a turntable that has to be turned with one hand, leaving only one hand free to form the pot. The fast wheel is turned independently, for example by the potter's feet, and allows the pot to be formed with both hands (Haslam 1978: 8).

Leicester (Hebditch 1967-68), Nottingham and Derby, as well as Stafford, Northampton and Torksey (Haslam 1978: 12; Field 1990; Palmer-Brown 1995). Excavations in the same period at Flaxengate in Lincoln (Perring 1981) furthermore revealed a wealth of ceramic data, including wasters and wares that were interpreted as Frankish, Chinese and Byzantine imports (Perring 1981; Adams Gilmour 1988).

Following Dunning, Haslam (1978: 15) suggested, on the basis of the style of the new wheel-thrown pots, which he believed were clearly inspired by continental practices, that the new techniques and forms were introduced by "immigrant potters attracted both by the large populations in the east and north-east and by the growth of towns all over England in the tenth century". He (1987: 15) furthermore argued that

The general differences in form between the rounded or baggy types in the south and the taller shapes made in the east and north-east also suggest that these potters came from two different areas – from the Rhineland to East Anglia, Lincolnshire and Yorkshire in the ninth and early tenth centuries, and probably from northern France to the south of England in the later tenth and eleventh centuries.

In more recent years, Haslam's (1978) typology was refined, in particular as a result of petrological analysis undertaken by Vince (1993a; 2005). This led to a new revised pottery typology, recently published by Young and Vince (2005), which incorporated the stratified data from over 70 developer-funded sites in Lincoln (Young and Vince 2005: 4). One of the most important discoveries to emerge from such scientific work was the realisation that the vast majority of wares found in Lincoln were *locally* produced, a realisation which caused a reinterpretation of Lincoln's significance as a settlement. The notion that Lincoln was an international trading centre, which maintained many contacts with regions as far away as the Frankish and Byzantine empires and even China, had to be rejected. Petrological and chemical analysis of supposed 'glazed' Byzantine wares revealed that the potteries were without exception produced locally, and that the 'glazes' were in fact residues from glassmaking or metalwork production, whilst the 'Frankish' imports were locally produced vessels copying continental prototypes (Young *pers. comm.*; Young and Vince 2005: 42, 46, 74-75).

Vince's (2005) petrological research furthermore refined the understanding of the various transitions between different phases of pottery production in middle and late Anglo-Saxon England. He (2005: 229) argued that the transition from the middle Anglo-Saxon period was a relatively gradual process in the east of England, where the production of IPS dated the first wheel-thrown technology to the middle Anglo-Saxon period. What is more, Vince (2005: 229) also revealed that the transition from the middle Anglo-Saxon handmade northern Maxey-type ware

(MAX) to the late Anglo-Saxon wheel-thrown Lincoln Kiln Type ware (LKT) did not involve the use of different raw materials, but that both made use of the same type of local clay and shell temper, resulting in a fairly similar visual dark-coloured and gritty appearance (compare Young and Vince 2005, colour plate 13.14 (LKT) with colour plates 15.42-44 (MAX)) (appendix 17).¹²⁹

The organisation of the production of MAX was not entirely dissimilar to the production of LKT either. Like LKT vessels, the petrological composition of MAX vessels was fairly constant, and suggestive of centralised and specialist rather than domestic production. As Vince (2005: 244) has stated,

A general result [of country-wide thin-section analysis] ... has been to recognise that throughout the Anglo-Saxon and post-Conquest periods ceramics were usually produced by specialists and traded or exchanged to surrounding areas. Positive evidence for domestic production at any time has yet to be proven (and in the view of the author probably never occurred).

However, Vince's (2005: 244) distinction between 'specialist' and 'domestic' production is artificial, as the two are not mutually exclusive, and 'specialist' production can take place in a 'domestic' environment. This point can be illustrated by reference to an ethno-archaeological study of pottery production amongst the Luo tribe (Dietler and Herbich 1989). In this study, Dietler and Herbich (1989: 148) have defined the concept of 'specialisation' as a situation whereby "the body of users is significantly larger than the body of producers". Although pottery production is a specialised craft in Luo society, it is not a full-time job: the people who carry it out are usually women who also engage in a number of different activities, including agricultural work – which means that they work less during harvest times – and other tasks of a more domestic nature (Dietler and Herbich 1989: 148-49). What is more, there are no specialised workshops, which means that pottery is produced at home (Dietler and Herbich 1989: 149). Still, the women who are involved in pottery production make up less than 1% of the population, and they easily fill the requirements for pottery within their society (Dietler and Herbich 1989: 149).

The distribution of middle and late Anglo-Saxon ceramics suggests that these were the products of specialist production that took place in a domestic environment as well. The only site so far where a limited quantity of MAX wasters (fabrics U/A, restricted to North Lincolnshire and Yorkshire) has been found is the settlement at Bottesford (appendix 2.2.26). Here, the evidence is possibly indicative of small-scale production (Young 2002a: 28-29), even if the exact

¹²⁹ Maxey-type ware was named after the type-site Maxey, recognisable in Lincolnshire and the southeast Midlands. It was produced in several fabrics, which can be divided into two groups, northern MAX, with disaggregated shelly limestone, and southern MAX, with shell naturally occurring in the clays (Vince 2005: 227).

location of neither the production site nor the settlement itself were ever established (Taylor-Wilson and Telford 2002; Tibbles 2001; Young 2002a: 28). The evidence for the production of LKT in Lincoln is more significant than the production evidence from Bottesford, but it is worth noting that LKT was produced in the heart of the earliest settlement core that produced the earliest evidence for post-Roman domestic occupation in Lincoln as well, suggesting that even here the distinction between 'specialist' and 'domestic' may be arbitrary (also see section 6.3.4).

Despite the noted similarities between MAX and LKT, both in fabric and organisation of production (Vince 2005: 229, 244), the shape of the LKT vessels was different from the shape of the MAX vessels. This was probably largely a result of the use of the potter's wheel, although Vince (2005: 229) has argued that the finished vessels show enough similarities with continental wares to support the suggestion that the new technology had indeed been imported from the continent: the globular profile, hand-formed base and small everted rims on the Lincoln jars are typical of the middle Rhine area, and the use of roller stamped bands on vessel rims and shoulders seems to be taken from northern France, the Rhineland, and/or eastern Belgium. At the same time, however, the continued use of the same clays and tempers suggests that there was a degree of contact between the local middle Anglo-Saxon potters who had produced MAX, and the 'continental' potters who brought the new technology with them (Vince 1993b: 161).

In this respect Lincoln was fairly unusual: the only other types of late Anglo-Saxon wheel-thrown pottery that were produced from similar clays as preceding local handmade wares were St Neot's ware and the earlier middle Anglo-Saxon IPS (Vince 1993b: 156). Further north, the wheel-thrown York Ware (YW), had, at least on a visual level, the same petrological composition as a preceding local handmade gritty ware (type 1), leading Mainman (1990: 408) to suggest that YW was a continuation of local traditions, rather than a complete departure of traditional pottery making techniques inspired by continental methods. In nearby Stamford, however, MAX was replaced with a very different type of pottery known as Early Stamford ware (EST, often confused with the visually practically indistinguishable late tenth- and eleventh-century Stamford ware (ST)), which was made from white-firing clay with no additional temper (Kilmurry 1980; Young and Vince 2005: 71-72, 93-97) (compare appendices 17.1.1.1 and 17.2.2.1/17.2.5.2). Based on the different appearance of EST and ST as compared to MAX, Kilmurry (1980) has argued that the changes here can – again – be attributed to the arrival of immigrant potters. Other supporting evidence brought forward by Kilmurry (1980) included the early date of the start of the production of EST, which was placed roughly contemporary with the Scandinavian settlement, prior to the end of the ninth century, and the fact that there were so many new techniques introduced all at once that were competently applied, including the wheel, the use of a wire to

remove the pot from the wheel, the use of red paint, glaze, and wheel-formed strap-handles.

Vince (1993b: 152), who considered Kilmurry's arguments convincing and final, used these arguments to return to Dunning's (1959) statement that the pottery industries of the Midlands were 'daughter industries' of the Thetford, St Neot's and Stamford industries. Highlighting the fact that the Lincoln pottery industry could be shown to originate at a similarly early date as the Stamford industry, and that there are not enough similarities between Ipswich ware and the other wheel-thrown industries, Vince (1993b: 156, 161) rejected this notion, and proved that the introduction of the wheel took place at roughly the same time throughout the eastern and northern parts of England.

In addition to the pottery types discussed above, there were a number of other 'new' pottery industries in late Anglo-Saxon England that seem to have sprung up in the tenth or early eleventh centuries, including those at Nottingham, Newark and Horncastle. Again using petrological analysis, Vince (1993b: 156) identified regional groupings in order to determine the way in which these 'new' potteries spread across England. He identified a number of groups, including group 1, which utilised untempered white clays (found at Stamford and Nottingham); group 3, which used grey sandy clays (found at Torksey, Newark and Leicester, and possibly north of the Humber); group 4, which produced oxidised sandy wares (recognised in York, Derby, Nottingham and Stafford); and group 5, which produced shelly wares (found in Lincoln, St Neot's, Oxford/London, and Horncastle). In terms of the relative dating of the pottery production within each group, the production at York (group 4) took place before those in Derby, Nottingham and Stafford, whilst the production at Lincoln (group 5) certainly seems to precede that at Horncastle, suggesting the possibility that the later industries *did* represent 'daughter-industries'. Symonds (2003a: 223) has suggested that the start of the industry at Horncastle involved the movement of one of the LKT potters from Lincoln to produce Horncastle Lincoln Kiln-type (HLTK).

Regardless of the scale of the changes *in* the areas of viking settlement, they were still greater than *outside* the area of viking settlement, where the wheel-thrown potteries did not take off until several generations later (Symonds 2003a: 13; Vince 1993a: 161; 1994: 115). Brown (2003: 25) has interpreted this as evidence that people in Wessex and the south of Mercia clung to their old values in protest against the changes that were taking place: "If the Danish settlers promoted change, the Saxons resisted it" (also see Haslam 1978: 13-14). However, Brown (2003: 26) has also cautioned not to over-estimate the scale of the transition: "the cooking pots of the Danelaw may have been wheel-thrown, but they were still cooking pots", a statement that gains even more weight when the continued use of the same raw materials is taken into account, which would have

resulted in a similar visual and tactile experience when using the vessels.

Vince (1993b: 152) has analysed the reasons why the change towards wheel-turned production only took place at that particular point in time, whilst the continental prototypes had existed so much longer, and why they initially only occurred in the north. In answer to his own questions, Vince (1993b: 152, 161-62) has proposed that this was related to more significant socio-economic changes that took place at the same time, such as population growth, settlement nucleation, and the growth of the consumer market, calling for faster production techniques allowing for mass-production (Hodges 1982; 1988; Hodges and Whitehouse 1983; also see Vince 2006) (chapter 1). In this respect he moved on from the traditional idea that the introduction of new pottery types was merely the result of the changing 'ethnic' composition of the population as a result of the Scandinavian settlement, as had previously been assumed (Dunning 1959; Haslam 1978; Kilmurry 1980), and instead propagated a view that considers the transition to wheel-turned pottery as technological progress required by an increase in demand. The same line of argument permeates Mainman's (1990: 409) work on the Coppergate pottery, which regards the adoption of the slow wheel as an example of 'natural' technological progress.

In contrast to the studies discussed above, Blinkhorn (forthcoming) proposes a counter-argument to the idea that the Scandinavian settlers were responsible for the introduction of the wheel-thrown technology. Based on the radiocarbon dating of a piece of charred oak from a kiln in Leicester to AD837 +/-77, and the archeomagnetic dating of the kiln itself to AD850 +/- 50, Blinkhorn (forthcoming) argues that some of the wheel-turned industries in the midlands and East Anglia already existed *before* the arrival of the Scandinavian settlers, and were actually briefly interrupted by the Scandinavian settlement, before being brought back to life after the Anglo-Saxon conquests of the tenth century. Although Blinkhorn's (forthcoming) publication excludes material from York and Lincoln, in a paper presented at TAG in 2005 he argued that those wheel-turned industries that were instigated under Scandinavian rule, such as the industry at York, were unsuccessful because of the ethnic significance that people attributed to their products, whilst the later Torksey wares, which Blinkhorn believes were instigated after the West Saxon conquest of Lincolnshire, were again more successful because these were understood as being more 'Anglo-Saxon'.

Blinkhorn's arguments are problematic for a number of reasons. First, the dating of the Leicester material is vague enough that it can *also* be used to argue that its start date *did* coincide with the Scandinavian settlement. Second, it is more likely that social disruption would have taken place during the period of Scandinavian *raids* prior to the mid-ninth century than during the period of *settlement* after the mid-ninth century. Third, the Torksey wares are clearly based

on, and in some cases visually indistinguishable from, the York wares, rendering an argument that they were seen as appealing to a different cultural identity somewhat unlikely. Finally, although the production at Torksey did not occur on a significant scale until the later tenth century, its origins lay in the middle of the ninth century, and its later success may also be related to the decline in quality of the LKT industry in Lincoln, which occurred from the earlier tenth century onwards (appendix 17).

It is apparent from the preceding discussion that the majority of the work that looks at pottery *production* places a strong emphasis on the technological aspects of production, and does not always consider the human element. Criticising these kinds of approaches, Brown (1997: 95) has stated that "archaeology is apparently the study of evidence of human activity in the past, but unfortunately that human aspect is all too often forgotten", and "it is unlikely that many consumers [of the pottery that archaeologists study] were especially interested in those issues which archaeologists find so fascinating. Did it really matter to medieval folk at what date, where or how a pot was made?" (Brown 1997: 97). Voicing similar concerns, Blinkhorn (1997: 117) has furthermore warned against the use of microscopic analysis in identifying different fabric types, because he believes that the potters themselves, who did not have microscopes, could probably never see the differences that modern science can identify.

A different trend within ceramic research looks at pottery *consumption*, usually through the analysis of pottery distribution patterns. This category includes the majority of pottery reports in 'grey' literature and published excavation reports (Angus 2000; Boyle and Young 2007; Didsbury 1996; Young 1991; 1996; 1998a; 1998c; 1999a; 1999b; 2000c; 2005c; etc.). One study of pottery consumption patterns in Lincolnshire that is particularly relevant in the current context is the above-mentioned work by Symonds (1999; 2003a; 2003b; also see Coppack 1987; Healey 1993). Through a quantitative analysis of pottery distribution patterns, Symonds (2003a: 4) seeks to reconstruct how "people negotiated and understood their landscape". Her analysis revealed that the majority of pottery types occurred primarily in their production centres and along the transport routes emanating from these production centres, and that their distribution had a strong regional character. Thus early Stamford wares cluster mostly in Kesteven (Symonds 2003a: 209, 220), whilst Lincoln wares occur mainly in Lindsey, even if this ware was also found on a few sites in Kesteven and Holland (Symonds 2003a: 209). What is more, Nottingham ware (NOTTS) occurs mostly in Nottinghamshire, but in Lincolnshire it has only been recognised in Lincoln itself and Manton (appendix 2.2.35). Finally, in as far as its distribution in Lincolnshire is concerned, late ninth- to tenth-century York ware (YW) has only been found in Lincoln itself and near the Humber estuary, at Barton-upon-Humber (Young *pers. comm.*) and West Halton

(Boyle and Young 2005: 14), whilst the later tenth-century York gritty ware (YG) was found at West Halton (Perry 2009) and Aylesby (Didsbury and Wastling 1995: 27-28). However, the regional nature of pottery distribution patterns is not necessarily socially significant. In an article that aims to identify social boundaries based on pottery distribution patterns in the south of England, Brown (2003: 21) emphasises the fact that pottery had minimal movement throughout the Anglo-Saxon period, and argues that pottery *distribution* patterns do *not* reflect social identities. Choices made during the pottery *production* process, on the other hand, *do* reflect social identities (see section 6.3).

A drawback of Symonds's (1999; 2003a; 2003b) work is that the questions she asks – how “people negotiated and understood their landscape” (2003a: 4) – cannot be answered by reference to ceramics alone, for the simple reason that the isolated study of only *one* of the many types of material culture that people interacted with at any given point in time can only provide a partial answer. Yet, as is the case with any specialist subject, studies that seek to integrate the study of ceramics with that of other types of material culture are few and far between. Exceptions include broader works of synthesis, such as Hadley (2006) and Stocker (2006). A point that Stocker (2006) has raised is the fact that archaeological evidence suggests that all ‘urban’ settlement in the East Midlands started with the establishment of a pottery industry, which created a focal point for a growing population centre, as well as other industries and services that contributed to the ‘urbanisation’ of a particular settlement. Stocker (*pers. comm.*) furthermore believes that there are two possible rationales for the establishment of a pottery industry: one is the availability of raw materials, and the other is the presence of (or potential for the establishment of) a market, in which case the raw materials are moved to the production and market centre. Both options clearly highlight the importance of the landscape context for settlement development, in particular variations in local geology and pre-existing transport routes (also see Astill 2006) (chapters 1 and 5). At the same time, Stocker's (2006) emphasis on practical considerations – the availability of raw materials and the existence of pre-existing transport routes – confirms Brown's (2003) conclusion that the distribution of a particular type of pottery is to a greater extent determined by the distance to its production centre than by a conscious decision on the part of the consumers of the pottery to ascribe to a particular social identity.

Finally, a small number of studies address the relationship between pottery production and consumption and settlement development. For example, Perring (2002: 48) has suggested some possible directions for future research in the field of ceramic studies in the context of a publication entitled *Town and Country*. Amongst other things, Perring (2002: 47-48) encourages studies that focus on “changing patterns of relationship between a settlement, its immediate hinterland,

and more distant sites”, and calls for a move beyond the interpretation of pottery as an ethnic marker in favour of a more wide-ranging approach that utilises ceramic data to shed light on all aspects of social organisation *including* the dynamics of cultural exchange and interaction.

More unusual in its approach is Vince (2006), whose integrated analysis of Lincoln’s pottery and coinage, in the context of available stratigraphic information, bears similarities to the approach adopted in this thesis, because it takes more than one type of material culture into consideration. However, Vince uses the material in a descriptive way, to chart the chronological development of Lincoln, without engaging with broader, social questions. Although it represents a welcome departure from traditional approaches that focus on a single category of evidence, his (2006) emphasis rests on the establishment of a detailed stratigraphic sequence, and not on the question *why* certain changes occurred. The remainder of this chapter will build on Vince’s (2006) approach, and place the late ninth- and tenth-century pottery from Lincoln in a regional context, with reference to the data presented in previous chapters (in particular chapter 5).

6.3: The pottery from a spatial perspective

6.3.1: The pottery from a spatial perspective: introduction

As stated at the beginning of this chapter, this thesis combines Symonds’s (1999; 2003a; 2003b) work on late Anglo-Saxon pottery distribution patterns in Lincolnshire, which was based on data collected in the context of the *EMASPP*, with additional information from the *NLPTS*, which was collated after the *EMASPP* was completed. Figs 39-44 summarise the ceramic data from a qualitative perspective. Whilst the data gathered in the context of the *NLPTS* fills the ‘gap’ that the *EMASPP* left through its exclusion of the area of South Humberside, Symonds’s (1999; 2003a) most significant conclusions – that pottery occurred primarily in its production centres and along transport routes – are not in any way altered by the additional information.

The remainder of this chapter will discuss changes in settlement patterns as reflected in the ceramic evidence from a number of sites in Lindsey. Section 6.3.2 will begin with a brief consideration of the ceramic evidence for the transition from the middle to late Anglo-Saxon periods, placed in the context of the metalwork data discussed in chapter 5. Although the break between middle and late Anglo-Saxon wares was not complete, the production of the handmade MAX came to an end in c. 870 AD, around the same time as the start of the production of the wheel-thrown LKT, whilst the production and use of the handmade ELFS (Early Lincolnshire fine-shelled ware), which started in the first half of the ninth century, continued until the second half of the tenth century (Young 2002b) (appendix 18). However, ELFS is uncommon, and the relatively tight dating of MAX and LKT still creates the

possibility to place investigated settlement remains within a well-defined chronological framework.

Sections 6.3.3 and 6.3.4 will consider the ceramic evidence from Lincoln and Lindsey between the late ninth century and the middle of the tenth century, when the production of LKT was at its height, and Lincoln provided the majority of rural settlements in Lindsey. It will compare the pottery distribution patterns from Lindsey with evidence from neighbouring counties, where the new 'urban' pottery types were less successful at first than in Lincolnshire, and draw attention to rural settlement sites that have exclusively produced late Anglo-Saxon pottery. Finally, section 6.3.5 will briefly consider the developments that occurred in the later tenth century. Although pottery production did continue at Lincoln on a limited scale, with SNLS (Lincoln Saxo-Norman sandy ware) as its most notable product, the production of LKT was in decline, and Lincoln lost its prominent role as a pottery production centre (appendix 17). The distribution of SNLS was largely restricted to Lincoln itself (fig. 42). At the same time the products of the Stamford and Torksey kilns became increasingly widespread. This development has been explained purely in terms of the decline of one industry as a result of the success of another, or *vice versa* (Young and Vince 2005: 237), but this is a circular argument. Taking other types of material culture into consideration as well, the final part of this section will suggest some alternative explanations.

6.3.2: Pottery from Lincoln and Lindsey: c. 870 and before

The two main middle Anglo-Saxon wares that occurred in Lincolnshire were the wheel-thrown IPS, produced between c. 750 and 870 in East Anglia, and the handmade MAX (fabric B), produced in Lincolnshire between c. 670 and 870 AD (appendices 17.1.1.1, 17.2.1.1 and 18). MAX fabric B is the most common type of MAX across Lindsey, but at a number of settlements in the north of Lincolnshire, including Bottesford and Belton, two other varieties of MAX have been recognised (fabrics A and U), which are thought to be restricted to York and North Lincolnshire (Young 2001d; 2002a: 28-29). As mentioned in section 6.2, petrological analysis of assemblages from York, Flixborough, 'Goltho' and Normanby le Wold has led to the conclusion that MAX fabric B displayed clear similarities with the late Anglo-Saxon LKT, produced in Lincoln (also see Vince 2005). It has therefore been surmised that MAX fabric B was also produced in or near Lincoln, on the eastern side of the Lincoln Edge (Young and Vince 2005: 33).

The fact that IPS was also relatively common in Lindsey (fig. 39) suggests that contacts between Lindsey and East Anglia already existed prior to the period of Scandinavian settlement. The relative absence of IPS in south Lincolnshire is remarkable, although it must be kept in mind that significant parts of the southern Lincolnshire fens were excluded from Symonds's (1999; 2003a) work (chapter

2.4.6). In Lincoln itself, IPS is very uncommon, with only one definite sherd having been identified so far, found at Flaxengate, which suggests that the settlement at Lincoln did not have any economic significance prior to the middle of the ninth century (Young and Vince 2005: 39) (appendix 17.2.1.1; chapters 4 and 5).

The production of MAX came to an end with the emergence of the wheel-thrown 'urban' industries in Lincoln, Stamford and Torksey in the mid-ninth century, roughly contemporary with the Scandinavian settlement in the region (section 6.2). The question of whether or not the Scandinavian settlers were ultimately responsible for the changes in pottery production will probably never be answered definitively, but it is possible that change occurs more easily during periods of social unrest. A more pertinent line of enquiry in the current context is an analysis of the relationship between changes in pottery production and existing settlement patterns.

Analysis of the archaeological evidence from a number of different settlement sites in Lindsey that spanned the middle to late Anglo-Saxon periods reveals the varied nature of settlement development throughout the middle to late Anglo-Saxon periods. A small number of sites in north Lincolnshire produced only early to middle Anglo-Saxon pottery, but no late Anglo-Saxon wares (see appendix 2).¹³⁰ Although the evidence typically does not lend itself to explain the reasons behind the abandonment of these sites, in some cases there is copious evidence for Scandinavian activity – in the shape of unstratified metalwork – from the immediate vicinity. A good example is Riby (appendix 2.3.33) (Steedman 1994), which produced pottery of type MAX, as well as two West Saxon *Lunette* coins dated to the 870s and a Northumbrian *styca* of slightly earlier date (appendix 9.1.29), but no late ninth- to tenth-century wheel-turned pottery. The dress accessories that have been discovered in the area included three fragments of ring-headed pins (LIN-143411, LIN-134231 and LIN-145C85); artefacts of Irish manufacture, represented by two gilt copper-alloy mounts (LIN-4997F4 and LIN-4997F4); and artefacts made of precious metals, represented by a piece of gilt chip-carved copper alloy, possibly hack-metal (LIN-B8FA61). All these different types of metalwork may represent 'viking' activity (chapter 5.3.2.3). However, even if the seventh- to eighth-century settlement at Riby was deserted as a result of the Scandinavian raids and settlement, the eventual outcome was a settlement shift, and *not* total abandonment. The *-by* ending of the current placename suggests Scandinavian settlement, and *DB* records that one of the nuclei of the

¹³⁰ These were Ashby by Partney (appendix 2.19.14), Barnetby le Wold (appendix 2.3.29), Belton (appendix 6.1.4), Brigsley (appendix 2.5.7), Brumby (appendix 2.2.23), East Keal (appendix 2.18.14), Halton Hologate (appendix 2.19.10), Kettleby, Linwood, Little Conesby, Partney (appendix 2.19.7), Ravendale (appendix 2.5.9), Riby (appendix 2.3.33), and Scawby (see appendix 2.2.33). The *-by* placenames as well as Brigsley and East Keal betray Scandinavian influence, suggesting that occupation did continue after the Scandinavian settlement, if not, perhaps, on precisely the same site.

settlement at Riby, which was divided between two holdings in 1086, was associated with a church dedicated to St Edmund, the East Anglian king who had been martyred by the vikings in the 860s (Everson *et al.* 1991: 155). As discussed in chapter 4.2, the Scandinavian settlers of East Anglia had dedicated a substantial coinage to this king, and the dedication of this church may therefore be seen as a 'Scandinavian' dedication, even if it is admittedly not recorded until the 1080s, and the church itself may therefore not have been founded before the eleventh century.

There are also settlements in Lindsey that reveal evidence for a decrease in the use of ceramics – and therefore possibly of a decline in activity rather than total abandonment – during the period of raids and settlement. The sequence at Flixborough (appendix 2.2.15) continued into the early eleventh century, but revealed evidence for a decline in activity in the ninth and early tenth centuries, characterised by a decrease in the amount of ceramics, dress accessories and coins (Loveluck and Atkinson 2007: 93-95; Rogers 2009d; Wastling 2009; Young and Vince 2009: 372-73) (chapter 5.3.6), and "a major change in the use of space within the excavated area" in the shape of demolition and site clearance followed by refuse dumping (Loveluck and Atkinson 2007: 72). Rather than explaining the decline of the settlement in the light of the social disruption caused by the Scandinavian settlement, however, Loveluck (2009) has suggested that economic activity at Flixborough decreased as a result of the growing economic prosperity of new 'urban' centres, such as Lincoln and York. Yet if Lincoln's growth can be seen as a consequence of the Scandinavian settlement *as well*, it becomes apparent that the effects of the Scandinavian incursions on settlement development were highly varied. The settlement at Bottesford (appendix 2.2.26), which yielded middle Anglo-Saxon pottery (MAX and IPS), as well as some late Anglo-Saxon wares (Morris and Holmes 2002: 6-7; Young 2002a: 30), provides an interesting comparison to Flixborough. The quantity of late Anglo-Saxon wares is much lower than the quantity of middle Anglo-Saxon wares. As Bottesford was a production centre for MAX, it is possible that in this case at least the decline of the settlement was directly related to the growing success of the pottery industry at Lincoln.

In addition to the evidence for disruption of existing settlement patterns in Lindsey in the ninth century, there is evidence for disruption *before* the period of viking raids as well. The ceramic sequence from the settlement at West Halton spans the early to late Anglo-Saxon periods (Hadley and Willmott forthcoming) (appendix 2.2.5). Discoveries that were made include a square-ditched enclosure dated to the early to middle Anglo-Saxon period, tentatively interpreted as a pagan shrine; a substantial middle Anglo-Saxon enclosure ditch, which was re-cut in the later ninth or tenth centuries; and several timber buildings (Hadley and Willmott forthcoming). However, Boyle and Young (2003: 20) have drawn attention to a hiatus in the ceramic sequence in the eighth and ninth centuries, which is

confirmed by the fact that ELFS is completely absent (IPS was also believed to be totally absent, but since then one sherd has been recognised (Perry 2009)).

A recent MA dissertation focused on the pottery from the middle Anglo-Saxon enclosure ditch at West Halton (Perry 2009), and suggested that the feature may have been cut as early as the early seventh century. The primary ditch fills included a significant number of *earlier* ceramics, but very little MAX, suggesting that the ditch had filled up by the second half of the seventh century, where the start date for the production of MAX is placed (Perry 2009; Young and Vince 2009). At some point in the later ninth or tenth century the ditch was re-cut, and later fills include a mixture of late Anglo-Saxon wares as well as residual early to middle Anglo-Saxon wares including some fairly abraded MAX (Perry 2009). Perry (2009) therefore concluded that a break in activity occurred in the later seventh century, before the earliest documented references to the Scandinavian invasions, and suggested that the break in activity represents a settlement shift, as the presence of (small quantities of) MAX *does* indicate settlement activity during this period nearby.

The relatively limited occurrence of MAX at West Halton in comparison with earlier and later wares is not unique. Similar ceramic profiles have been recognised for Burgh le Marsh (appendix 2.19.18) (Snee 2000: 1), which revealed both early and late Anglo-Saxon ceramics, but no middle Anglo-Saxon wares (Cowgill *et al.* 2000; 2001; Malone 2001: 5), and Crowle (appendix 2.1.6), where only ESAX (Early Saxon, 400-700), LFS (Lincoln Fine-shelled ware, c. 970-1200), and TORKT (Torksey-type ware, 870-1100) have been found (*NLPTS*) (appendices 17 and 18). Of course an absence of ceramics does not necessarily imply an absence of activity, but may also reflect an absence of the *use* of ceramics. For example, the remains at North Thoresby (appendix 2.5.21) (Glover 2007) produced only one early and five late Anglo-Saxon sherds (Glover 2007: 5), as well as a large quantity of undated features (*i.e.* without any finds). The excavated site was located at the edge of a settlement (Glover 2007), where a significant quantity of ceramic material could be expected if ceramics were used widely within that settlement. As very few sherds were found, the possibility presents itself that ceramics were *not* used here in a widespread manner.

The preceding discussion has focused on evidence for disruption, but there are also examples of settlements in Lindsey that continued to flourish into the late Anglo-Saxon period (chapter 2.3). Examples include Barton-upon-Humber (appendix 2.3.2; chapter 2.3; 3.4.4) and Roxby (appendix 2.2.13). Investigations at Roxby revealed a full ceramic sequence spanning the early to late Anglo-Saxon periods, despite the fact that there is copious evidence for Scandinavian activity from the immediate vicinity in the shape of unstratified metalwork. Metalwork finds from the parish of Roxby cum Risby (which also included the settlements of Sawcliffe and Risby, where only late Anglo-Saxon wares have been found (section

6.3.5)) included two brooches of possible Scandinavian manufacture – a domed disc brooch in *Jellinge* style (NLM–0F69C5) and a trefoil brooch fragment (NLM6529) – as well as three possible ‘viking’ weights (NLM6264, NLM–EBA6E3 and NLM-A27134), an Irish openwork mount (NLM–DA7151), a silver ingot (NLM-683755) and a ‘Norse’ bell (NLM–0B8F36) (also see chapter 5).

In brief, the evidence for settlement disruption and continuity, when placed in the context of the established chronology for Scandinavian activity in England, and compared to metalwork finds, reveals that there is no necessary correlation between settlement disruption and Scandinavian activity. Indeed, as was discussed in chapter 1.4, Reynolds (2003; 2009b) has suggested that rural settlement *formation* was a phenomenon that occurred throughout the Anglo-Saxon period. The evidence from Lindsey supports this suggestion, and adds the fact that settlement disruption was also a phenomenon of all times.

6.3.3: Pottery from Lincoln and Lindsey before c. 870 AD: imported wares

The previous section looked only at locally produced wares, but, before moving on to the period after c. 870 AD, a few words on the evidence for continental imports are in order. Continental imports from the middle Anglo-Saxon period are extremely rare, both in Lincoln and in the rest of Lincolnshire. From Lincoln itself, a small quantity of imported pottery from the period c. 700-900 AD has been found, but no more than one vessel per fabric type has been discovered (Young and Vince 2005: 42) (appendix 17.2.1), even if this should not come as a surprise in the light of the near-absence of any evidence from the middle Anglo-Saxon period.¹³¹ In Flixborough, continental pottery dated to the eighth or ninth centuries is slightly more common, but still comprises no more than 51 sherds representing twelve to fifteen vessels, a number which exists in stark contrast to the 5,000+ local and regional sherds from contemporary contexts from the same site (Brown 2003: 22; Vince 2009). Continental imports from West Halton (Hadley and Willmott forthcoming) and the high-status church site of St Peter at Barton-upon-Humber (Young *pers. comm.*) are also rare, as they are elsewhere in Lincolnshire. Other ‘foreign’ sherds have so far only been recognised at the coastal settlement of Grimsby (which consisted of one sherd of NFSVA, or seventh- to eighth-century northern French pottery (appendix 2.4.9)).

It has been the topic of some debate whether imported wares arrived in the middle Anglo-Saxon kingdoms as a commodity in their own right, or because of the contents of the pots (Brown 2003: 23). Brown (2003: 23) has suggested that

¹³¹ In Lincoln, the continental wares all occurred at Flaxengate, with one GRBURN vessel from Monsoon Street in Wigford (Young and Vince 2005: 238), and it is tempting to view this as evidence that the nature of occupation at Flaxengate differed from that on other sites in the Lower City. However, it must also be remembered that the sequence at Flaxengate was excavated to far greater detail than elsewhere in the Lower City (see chapter 2).

imported wares had a different function and social value depending on the location where they were found:

In ports, foreign pottery may be viewed as the by-product of a trade in goods that were in greater demand and provided more attractive profits. Away from the ports where it might be regarded as a commonplace, imported pottery may be imbued with increased significance for it could well have been regarded as a rarity.

If eighth- to ninth-century imports were rare, late ninth- and tenth-century imports are even more so. By this time, the pottery assemblage consisted largely of local and regional wares.¹³² As argued in section 6.2, petrological analysis of pottery from Lincoln that had previously been mistaken for imports revealed that they were locally produced. Imported wares were equally rare in York (Mainman 1990: 477, 479, 481-84). Although the pottery assemblages from the earliest layers at the Fishergate site in York contained 33% foreign imports, this reduced to c. 20% after the middle of the eighth century, and even more subsequently (Mainman 1993: 191). The only definite tenth-century continental imports that have been recognised in Lincolnshire to date is some Blaugrau ware from Stickney on the northern fen-edge (appendix 2.18.22) (Healey 1993: 108) and from 'Goltho' (appendix 2.13.29) (Beresford 1975b: 1; Whitwell 1967: 50).¹³³

The disappearance of imported pottery after the middle Anglo-Saxon period is sometimes interpreted as evidence for the decline in international trade as a result of the Scandinavian incursions, or a decline in ostentatious display of wealth through the consumption of imported wares (as suggested by Brown 2003: 23), although this in itself may be a result of disruption caused by the Scandinavian invasions. However, it is also possible that imported wares had changed their social significance, perhaps as a result of the local production of wares that were based on continental prototypes (also suggested by Brown 2003: 24). Brown (2003: 23) interprets the general paucity of imported wares throughout the Anglo-Saxon period in terms of a lack of demand:

It seems apparent that imported pottery, although to our eyes obviously technically superior than most local products, held little value to the people of middle [or late] Anglo-Saxon England. The reason for that is likely to be cultural rather than a question of distribution. In commerce, where there is a demand there will be a

¹³² Brown's (2003: 24) study of the pottery from contemporary Hamwic has demonstrated that the majority of locally made vessels consisted of jars, whereas the imports were all pitchers, and concludes how "non-local producers were used to supply specific vessel types".

¹³³ The settlement of Stickney (appendix 2.18.22) was located on the northern fen-edge. An early to middle Anglo-Saxon settlement core was discovered to the west of the present village, producing 346 early Anglo-Saxon sherds, 40 sherds of MAX and some IPS, as well as late Anglo-Saxon wares, including some very rare tenth-century foreign imports (Healey 1993: 107-08; Lane 1993: 58). It has been suggested that Stickney was an important frontier site, situated on the border of the Kingdom of Lindsey, and controlling access in and out of the Fenland (Lane 1993: 59).

supply and in this case there was evidently little demand.

In an analysis of imported wares in Hamwic/Southampton, Brown (1997: 101-03) has furthermore demonstrated that in the late medieval period not so much the imported wares in their own right, but their consumption in large quantities was an indicator of high-status households. In the preceding high medieval period, however, imported wares occurred everywhere in Hamwic in small numbers, but rarely left the port of entry, suggesting that there was no special status attached to these items at all. The significance of imported wares in the Anglo-Saxon period is more difficult to reconstruct, but the remarkably low number of imported vessels suggests that they were too rare to play a significant part in the everyday expression or confirmation of status through material culture.

The possibility exists that the few imported wares from Lincoln arrived as personal possessions (Brown 2003: 23). After all, pottery was not easily transported, being bulky, breakable, and (arguably) too cheap to warrant the cost of massive shippings (Brown 2003: 22), and the amount of imported wares is comparable to the amount of soapstone vessel fragments, which are usually also interpreted as personal possessions.¹³⁴ The international pottery trade would not pick up again until the very late tenth or eleventh century, contemporary with the re-emergence of the production of handmade wares in England, which confirms the suggestion that there was no demand for imported wares as long as similar wares were produced locally (Vince 1985: 42).

6.3.4: Pottery from Lincoln c. 870-950

The period of Scandinavian settlement witnessed the establishment and growth of pottery production centres in settlements such as Lincoln, Torksey and Stamford. As stated previously, the production of pottery was amongst the earliest archaeologically recognisable activities in Lincoln and Stamford (Stocker 2006: 66; Symonds 2003a: 68). Two Anglo-Saxon kiln sites have been excavated in Lincoln. One of these produced LKT during the later ninth and tenth centuries, and was situated at Silver Street in the Lower City (Miles *et al.* 1989) (appendix 17.1.2.1.2). LKT enjoyed a widespread distribution across the rest of Lincolnshire (fig. 40). The other kiln site was discovered more recently at the Sessions House in Butwerk (Donel 1993; Jarvis 1997; Jones *et al.* 2003: 231; Trimble 1995; Young and Vince 2005: 239). This site produced the contemporary LSH (which initially had flat bases and was thus fairly similar to middle Anglo-Saxon vessels in terms of shape) and possibly the later tenth- and eleventh-century SNLS (Young and Vince 2005: 61-

¹³⁴ Yet the assumption that pottery is a low-prestige item and therefore cheap (also see Symonds 2003a: 112) should be taken with caution, as this argument is based on an assumption about the level of appreciation of pottery within society that is very firmly rooted in our modern understanding of the material.

62) (appendices 17.1.2.1.3 and 17.1.6.2.1). The distribution of LSH outside Lincoln is not as widespread as that of LKT, but nevertheless occurs frequently on rural sites in Lincolnshire and Leicestershire, as well as in York and Nottingham (Young and Vince 2005: 62) (appendix 17.1.2.1.3; fig. 40).

A number of other pottery types have been recognised in Lincoln that used the same clay source but a variety of different tempers (appendix 17) (Symonds 2003a: 90). The use of the same clay suggests that these were also produced at Lincoln, and Symonds (2003a: 90) suggests that there were a number of independent competing pottery industries in Lincoln in the late ninth and tenth centuries. In some cases, wasters have been found, such as the LG (Lincoln gritty ware) wasters found in the Flaxengate area, but no additional kiln sites have been discovered to date (appendix 17.1.2.2.1). The majority of production evidence comes from the southeastern half of the Lower City and Butwerk (Young and Vince 2005: 42), although some wasters of LSLOCb have been found in Wigford (Young *pers. comm.*) (appendix 17.1.2.1.4).

The pots were entirely wheel-thrown, hard-fired, and consisted mostly of rounded jars, used as cooking pots, and some pitchers. In some cases, partial glazing occurred. Dishes, bowls and pedestal lamps were more rare (Young and Vince 2005: 42). Not only the vessels were based on continental forms, but also the shape of the kilns (Symonds 2003a: 68), which may be seen as further evidence, *contra* Blinkhorn (forthcoming), for the migration of continental potters who arrived in the wake of the Scandinavian invasions (section 6.2). In the course of the tenth century the pottery declined in quality (Young and Vince 2005: 13-14) (appendices 17.1.4 and 17.1.5), which Symonds (2003a: 68) interprets as further proof that the industry was instigated by migrant potters, as she believes that only the continental potters themselves would have been skilled enough to produce these pots to the highest standards.

The changes in pottery production that occurred in Lincoln and other regional centres in c. 870 AD resulted in a change in ceramic style. Ceramic style has been the subject of many studies that focus on pottery production and use, and a number of different opinions exist with regards to the function and meaning of ceramic style. Analysing the dynamics of pottery production in Luo society in twentieth-century Kenya, Dietler and Herbich (1989: 157) have drawn attention to the inherent relationship between ceramic style and the manufacturing process, as "style results from design choices made during the forming of pots". In addition, they (1989: 160) have analysed the different levels at which meaning can be ascribed to ceramic style, and suggested that the meaning of style may change altogether when the scale of pottery production increases:

Factors such as the degree of specialisation of a given craft ... and

especially the mechanics linking the contexts of manufacture and use will obviously have a major role in determining possible information functions for aspects of style (both these factors may vary from craft to craft within the same society). Among other reasons, this is because such specialisation necessarily implies 'commodisation' of a craft, that is manufacture for the purpose of exchange ... and exchange involves a change of context which may also involve a change in meaning.

This implies that the increase in centralised pottery production that went hand in hand with the establishment of the Lincoln industries may have altered the social significance of ceramic style altogether. For example, mass-production of wheel-thrown wares that were based on continental forms would have resulted in a situation whereby such wares were no longer associated with elite society, as they arguably had been – in some cases at least – during the middle Anglo-Saxon period (section 6.3.3).

Dietler and Herbich (1989: 159) have also demonstrated that ethnicity does not necessarily play a role in the formation of pottery distribution patterns: although the different social groups of the Luo each have their own style for pottery *production*, "even at inter-ethnic markets ... stylistic differences play no part in the signalling of ethnic identity for *buyers*". This argument adds further depth to Symonds's (1999; 2003a) conclusion that pottery in tenth-century Lincolnshire typically occurred in production centres and along transport routes, and confirms Brown's (2003) assertion that pottery distribution patterns do *not* reflect differences in the ethnic composition of the population (section 6.2). If anything, the changes that are visible in the ninth century reflect a shift in the identities of the potters themselves, but the distribution patterns merely reflect the chronological development of production.

Despite the methodological issues noted in chapter 2.4.6, a chronology of pottery production in Lincoln has been established with relative precision (Young and Vince 2005). This has led to a number of conclusions about the different development of the individual parts of Lincoln. In the Lower City, the vast majority of ceramics came from terraces and levelling layers between buildings, which were characterised by high levels of residuality. It is nevertheless likely that the majority of vessels had been used on or near the site. The built-up nature of the settlement would have minimised the effect of natural processes such as weather and erosion on site formation processes, and the steep slope would have made the movement of any significant quantities of soil over large distances impractical. The Upper City, Wigford and Butwerk are located on relatively flat terrain, but Wigford in particular was very low-lying, and was frequently threatened by flooding, which created the need to artificially increase the ground level, or strengthen the waterfront, through the deposition of dumping layers. The majority of ceramics from Wigford were found in dumping layers associated with flood control, which, again, were

characterised by high levels of residuality. However, the fact that the River Witham created a natural boundary between Wigford and the rest of Lincoln renders it unlikely that soil would have been brought in from very far. The situation in the Upper City, which is characterised by a complete absence of pottery pre-dating the tenth century, is less clear. However, here, too, the built-up nature and the extant Roman remains would have severely limited the practicalities of transporting large quantities of soil across any significant distances, and it is likely therefore that the absence of pottery represents evidence of a lack of activity.

The conclusion that the majority of pottery would have been deposited (and re-deposited) relatively close to the location where it was originally discarded can shed important light on the relative chronology of occupation of the various parts of Lincoln. Young (2005a: 281-82) has compared the ceramic profiles of the Lower City (in particular Flaxengate) and Wigford, and concluded that Wigford was less varied in terms of pottery types. What is more, the ratio of LSH and LKT between Wigford and the Lower City was variable. Although LSH is sometimes interpreted as a lower-quality variant on LKT, and it is therefore possible that the occupation in Wigford was of higher status than that in the Lower City, Young (2005a: 282) interprets this as a chronological difference, a conclusion that is strengthened by the fact that at Flaxengate LSH is more common in early to mid tenth-century deposits than in earlier deposits (Young 2005a: 282). This would suggest that Wigford was not occupied on a significant scale until the earlier tenth century (also see chapter 2.2.4).

The Upper City produced far less LSH (less than 40 sherds) than Wigford (nearly 1000 sherds). The ratio of LSH as compared to LKT was also different. Again, Young (2005a: 280; also see Vince and Young 1991b: 25-26) has interpreted this as a chronological difference, stating that “the discrepancy between the earlier and later types here [*i.e.* in the Upper City] suggests that the intensity of occupation increased in the late tenth century, rather than, as at Wigford, in the early tenth”. What is more, a complete absence of TORK and SNLS on some sites in the Upper City suggests that in some cases occupation did not resume until the eleventh century (Young 2005a: 280). For example, the earliest post-Roman ceramics retrieved during excavations at The Park in 1968-72 were eleventh-century in date, and found in features directly overlying the Roman remains (Jennings and Jones 1999: 135). At West Parade, the earliest post-Roman assemblages were dated to the later eleventh to mid twelfth centuries (Young 1999a: 211), and at mws83, in the heart of the Upper City, the earliest pottery that was found was medieval (Vince and Young 1991b: 26).

On a more site-specific level, the earliest ceramic assemblage has been found in the area around St Benedict’s Square (sb85), which yielded the only closely dated ASH9 deposits (mid to late ninth century) (Young 2005a: 281). Elsewhere in

Wigford, closely dated deposits of ASH10 (early to mid tenth century) were found at Dickinson's mill (dm72), and deposits of ASH11 and ASH12 (mid to late tenth century) were found at both St Benedict's Square (sb85) and Holmes Grainwarehouse (hg72) (Young and Vince 2005: 279). However, it is not possible to use these data to reconstruct the occupation sequence of the various sites in Wigford. As stated above, the majority of ceramics enter the archaeological record because they were broken and discarded (also see chapter 2.4.6). In other words, they do not reflect pottery *use*, but waste disposal strategies. In order to understand the processes that underlie the distribution of pottery in late ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln, it is therefore vital to understand the dynamics of waste disposal.

In her discussion of the small finds from Flaxengate, Mann (1982: 42) has commented on the fact that there is no evidence for the systematic clearing, collection or deposit of domestic and manufacturing waste on this site. Only c. 15% of the finds Mann (1982) discusses came from pits, and the rest was simply scattered across the site, as was all of the manufacturing waste. There was no clear evidence for designated rubbish dumps either (Mann 1982: 42). Instead, the material seems to have been left lying around until it was incorporated in, or sealed by, the periodic levelling activities that occurred between individual building phases (Perring 1981). There is no evidence that a different system was in place anywhere else in Lincoln. On all sites, the majority of ceramic material came from levelling layers, ground raising layers, terracing or dumps that were deposited in order to consolidate the waterfront. A closer look at site formation processes based on a study of midden deposits may be able to provide answers.

One ethno-archaeological study that discusses the mechanics of waste disposal in order to understand human activities is the recent work by Beck and Hill (2007), which looks at midden ceramics from Kalinga. Beck and Hill (2007: 111) identify three different stages of refuse:

It has been argued that secondary refuse is best suited for studying discard behavior; to investigate activities ... primary refuse is more appropriate because it is less transformed from the systemic context.

By way of a definition, primary refuse, discarded where the activity actually took place, includes artefacts discarded on structure floors and yards, and secondary refuse, removed from the location where it was used, includes midden deposits and rubbish pits (Beck and Hill 2007: 111, 113). This latter type of refuse is usually increasingly formalised as population density increases, requiring the need for organised waste management strategies (Beck and Hill 2007: 113).

The 1972-76 excavations at Flaxengate provide a good case study for Lincoln. On this site, both primary and secondary waste deposits occur. As Mann (1982)

observed, the manufacturing waste at Flaxengate was typically found scattered across the site. A similar observation was made in chapter 5 in the context of the manufacturing waste from the hooked tags. These deposits count as primary waste. The majority of pottery from Flaxengate came from the dumps in between building phases (Adams Gilmour 1988: 59). During the four years of excavation at Flaxengate in the 1970s, 79,552 sherds of pottery were found. None of it could be associated with the occupation phases of the buildings (Adams Gilmour 1988: 59). These levelling layers represent secondary waste (although many of the later dumps included so much residual material that it may be necessary to devise a third category of waste – *tertiary* waste – to denote re-deposited secondary waste deposits). Altogether, the evidence suggests that no waste collection strategies were in place in Lincoln, but that waste was left lying around until the accumulated material was incorporated in the levelling layers between individual building phases, which are believed to have taken place every 20 to 30 years (Perring 1981). This would have resulted in fairly unpleasant and odorous living conditions, a suggestion that is confirmed by the high number of human coprolites found during the excavations in the 1970s (Perring *pers. comm.*).

There is some tentative evidence that attempts at waste removal were sometimes made as well. Refuse dumps were found against the Roman rampart at the Central Library site (Jarvis 1996: 8) (appendix 1.2.1.23). At Flaxengate, refuse pits were situated at some distance from contemporary structures, along the western end of the site and along Grantham Street, at some distance from the buildings (Perring 1981: 41). The use of boundary features for the location of rubbish pits (streets also being boundaries as well as communication routes) was well attested throughout the medieval period, and was frequently encountered by the present author during the 2005-2006 'Grand Arcade' excavations in central Cambridge, which revealed a row of properties along the Roman road leading into the settlement that dated back to at least the eleventh or twelfth centuries (Cessford and Dickens forthcoming). This sheds interesting light on the significance of boundaries during the Anglo-Saxon and medieval periods, and draws attention to the multi-functionality of individual features, which may act at the same time as boundaries, defences, and rubbish pits.

6.3.5: Pottery in Lindsey, c. 870-950

Outside Lincoln, new 'rural' settlements were also established during the later ninth or tenth centuries. These are recognisable by the exclusive occurrence of wheel-turned ceramics.¹³⁵ Again, the evidence suggests that there was no single 'moment' for village formation (Reynolds 2003; 2009b). New settlements were continuously

¹³⁵ Other examples are listed in chapter 2.3. Also see appendix 2.

established into the tenth century. The settlements of Risby (appendix 2.2.18) and Sawcliffe (appendix 2.2.17), both situated in the parish of Roxby cum Risby (section 6.3.2), both found their origins in the second half of the ninth century. Examples of probable tenth-century foundations include Horkstow (appendix 2.3.5); Scotter (appendix 2.6.2); Scotton (appendix 2.6.7); the deserted medieval village of Southorpe (appendix 2.6.9); and Walcot (appendix 2.2.4), all of which produced only *TORK*, *TORKT* or *ST*. Although *TORK* and *TORKT* were produced from the later ninth century onwards, they were uncommon outside Torksey and York until the tenth century (Young *pers. comm.*). *ST* was not produced until the later tenth century (Young and Vince 2005).

Symonds (2003a: 228-29) has stated that differences between urban and rural assemblages did not exist until the eleventh century. However, the near-exclusive occurrence of certain pottery types in Lincoln itself, such as *LG* and *LSLS* (appendix 18), suggests that this is incorrect (which Symonds (2003a: 223) herself admits when she states that, in terms of the number of fabric types, pottery from the rest of Lindsey is less varied during this period than contemporary pottery from Lincoln itself). Outside Lincoln, the type of wheel-thrown pottery that occurred most frequently (but still in much smaller quantities than in Lincoln itself) was *LKT* (fig. 40) (appendix 18). The only other late ninth- to tenth-century pottery type produced at Lincoln that enjoyed a regional distribution was *LSH* (appendix 18), like *LKT* shell-tempered, and sometimes regarded as a lower-quality variant of *LKT* (Symonds 2003a: 186) (appendix 17.1.2.1.3). The Lincoln-produced sand-tempered late ninth- to tenth-century wares *LG* (appendix 17.1.2.2.1) and *LSLS* (Lincoln late Anglo-Saxon sandy ware) (appendix 17.1.2.2.2), on the other hand, occurred mostly in Lincoln itself (fig. 41). A similar difference in distribution between shell- and sand-tempered wares can be seen in the late tenth century, when the shell-tempered *LFS* (appendix 17.1.6.1.4) enjoyed a relatively widespread distribution across the region, whilst the sand-tempered contemporary *SNLS* (appendix 17.1.6.2.1) was less common outside Lincoln (fig. 42).

In brief, a common characteristic of the late ninth-century pottery types produced in Lincoln that found widespread distribution across the rest of Lindsey is their shell-temper. In this respect, they are similar to the preceding middle Anglo-Saxon wares *MAX* and *ELFS*. The types of late ninth-century pottery produced in Lincoln that did *not* find widespread distribution across the rest of Lindsey all used sand-temper. It may be possible to explain the difference through application of the theoretical concept of phenomenology. Cumberpatch (1997: 125-26) has advocated a phenomenological approach to pottery, and argues there are three elements central to pottery perception: colour, shape and texture. The transition from handmade to wheel-turned wares in the second half of the ninth century definitely affected the shape of the vessels. However, the clays used for the

seventh- to ninth-century MAX, the earlier ninth- to tenth-century ELFS, the later ninth- to tenth-century LKT, and the later ninth to twelfth-century LSH (appendix 18) were from a similarly local source, and all were shell-tempered. This suggests that the colour and texture of the vessels would have remained fairly comparable despite the differences in production technology (compare Young and Vince 2005, colour plate 13.14 (LKT) with colour plates 15.42-44 (MAX)) (see section 6.2).

If one accepts the possibility that human beings prefer familiarity to novelty, it becomes possible that the transition from handmade middle Anglo-Saxon to wheel-thrown late Anglo-Saxon pottery is *not* a matter of simple technological progress that requires no further explanation. Choices that are made during the pottery production process may be culturally defined (see above). However, the *success* of the industries depended not on production but on demand, and if the consumers preferred something that looked and felt familiar, they would prefer shell-tempered wares to sand-tempered wares.

Some aspects of intra-regional differences between pottery distribution patterns can be explained in these terms as well. The widespread rural distribution of LKT was unusual compared to contemporary wheel-thrown pottery types from neighbouring regions, which occurred mostly in the production centres themselves, or in other regional centres (Young *pers. comm.*). Leicester-ware (LEICS) has been found in Leicester (Blinkhorn forthcoming; Courtney 1998; Hebditch 1967-68), and in small quantities in Lincoln (appendix 17.2.2.4) (Symonds 2003a: 186). Wheel-thrown wares from Nottingham, Derby and York were initially also found exclusively at their production centres and, in small numbers, in other regional centres (appendix 17.2) (Symonds 2003a: 186; Young *pers. comm.*). Early Stamford ware (EST) occurred across Lincolnshire, but in terms of quantity was still much more frequent in Stamford and Lincoln than on rural sites (fig. 43 is a *qualitative* representation of the distribution of this ware). In Lincoln, it took up a similar percentage of the pottery assemblage as the locally produced LG (Symonds 2003a: 186). Stamford crucibles were particularly popular, but these were exchanged almost exclusively between towns (Symonds 2003a: 229). In York, other Stamford wares did not appear until the eleventh century (Symonds 2003a: 186). Torksey ware initially occurred primarily in Torksey and York, but, as stated above, it became increasingly common elsewhere in Lindsey and in Lincoln itself in the course of the tenth century, when it usually occurred side by side with Lincoln wares (Symonds 2003a: 221, 223; Young *pers. comm.*).

If the success of LKT over other pottery types was the result of a greater demand for this type of pottery, the different distribution patterns can be explained. For example, rural Yorkshire was largely aceramic during the middle Anglo-Saxon period (with the exception of the above-mentioned gritty handmade wares (section 6.2), but these did not have a widespread distribution) and as a

result, there was no existing demand for pottery at the start of the late Anglo-Saxon period either. As appendix 19 reveals, most of the other wheel-thrown pottery types were sand-tempered, which made the colour and texture of the vessels noticeably different from the colour and texture of middle Anglo-Saxon fabrics, such as MAX and ELFS, which were shell-tempered. The different fabrics made them too unfamiliar to be desirable as well.¹³⁶ Even if changes in the *production* process may be explained by reference to the changing identities of the potters, the fact that pottery was now produced under different circumstances in different locations, and possibly by different individuals, did not mean that the people who *used* pottery had changed. The emphasis on familiarity compares interestingly with the homogenous nature of dress accessories discussed in chapter 5, which was interpreted as evidence of a degree of social upheaval that led to a lack of appreciation of originality and presumably also change. Sand-tempered wares finally became more widespread in the tenth century, when Torksey and Stamford wares began to enjoy a widespread distribution across Lindsey (figs 43 and 44). This suggests that it took several decades before the occupants of Lindsey regarded the 'new' fabrics familiar enough to engage with them.

6.3.6: Pottery from Lincoln and Lindsey: c. 950-1000

The final section of this thesis will address the developments in pottery production and use that took place in the later tenth century, roughly after 950 AD. Although the pottery types that were produced in Lincoln from c. 870 onwards remained the same for more than a century, the quality and quantity of the main pottery type LKT declined in the course of the tenth century (appendix 17.1.4 and 17.1.5). Not long before its production in the Lower City came to an end around c. 1000 AD, in c. 970 two new types of pottery began to be produced in Lincolnshire. One of these, Lincolnshire fine-shelled ware (LFS), was still shell-tempered, but entirely handmade, and production took place *outside* Lincoln (appendix 17.1.6.1.4). It is believed to have developed from the middle to late Anglo-Saxon ELFS, which was produced from the early ninth century until the later tenth century (appendix 17.1.1.2) (Symonds 2003a: 99). In the eleventh century, LFS would replace LKT as the most common pottery in Lincoln itself, and was widely distributed across Lincolnshire (fig. 42), although its distribution would never become as widespread as that of LKT (fig. 40). The other ware, LSLS, was wheel-thrown but sand-tempered, and although it was used throughout Lincoln, with the exception of the western half of the Upper City, which may have remained largely unoccupied, it was rare elsewhere in Lincolnshire (Young and Vince 2005: 81; Symonds 2003a:

¹³⁶ Appendix 19 also highlights the greater variety of different wares that were produced in Lincoln as compared to elsewhere. If each different ware is regarded as the product of a different potter, the conclusion can be drawn that Lincoln housed more individual potters (and therefore probably had a larger population) than any other settlement in Lincolnshire.

186), confirming the notion that there was no widespread demand for sand-tempered wares produced in Lincoln.

There are a limited number of settlements in Lindsey that only produced late tenth-century wares, but no earlier wheel-turned wares, again confirming the notion that nucleated settlement formation occurred throughout the Anglo-Saxon period. For example, Waterton (appendix 2.1.2) mostly produced the tenth- to twelfth-century Torksey-ware, and it was suggested that settlement here did not start until a few decades before the Norman Conquest (Foreman 1996: 23). The earliest phase at Somerby (appendix 2.6.22), whose placename is of Scandinavian origin, incorporating the personal name *Sumarled*, only produced TORK and ST, and was assigned to the eleventh century (Mynard 1969: 69). The earliest sherd from Hagworthingham (appendix 2.15.18) was Saxo-Norman, of fabric type SNLOC, and was assigned an eleventh-century date (Rylatt 2000b: 6).¹³⁷ However, even if settlement formation occurred throughout the Anglo-Saxon period, there is no evidence for the abandonment of individual sites in Lincolnshire during the later tenth century on a scale that is comparable to the evidence for the abandonment of sites during the eighth and ninth centuries (section 6.3.2). The lack of evidence for settlement abandonment from the later tenth century onwards may be related to a gradual population increase that had occurred – partially as a result of the Scandinavian settlement of the later ninth and tenth centuries – in the course of previous decades.

The later tenth-century decline of the wheel-turned LKT and subsequent transition back towards hand-made pottery produced in a 'rural' context (*i.e.* outside Lincoln) is often regarded as problematic. It is perceived as a step 'backwards' in terms of technology, as the 'natural' order of events is supposedly from handmade wares to pottery finished on a slow wheel, and eventually a fast wheel (see for example Mainman 1990: 409). Lincoln's 'decline' is sometimes seen as the cause for or the result of the success of the neighbouring pottery industries at Torksey and Stamford, which became more widespread across Lincolnshire in the course of the tenth century (Young and Vince 2005: 237), even if this is essentially a circular argument (also see section 6.3.1).

In order to find an alternative explanation for the decline of the wheel-turned wares at the expense of handmade wares in the later tenth century, it is useful to address the entire production process as a socially meaningful event. This approach, also known as *chaîne opératoire*, involves the theoretical analysis of the

¹³⁷ Other settlements produced LFS and early Anglo-Saxon wares, but the gap in the sequence during the middle and early late Anglo-Saxon periods is probably indicative of abandonment followed by re-occupation in the later tenth century. These included Bolingbroke (appendix 2.18.8), Cadney (appendix 2.3.18), Clee (appendix 2.4.10), Gainsborough (appendix 2.6.21), Glentham (appendix 2.7.7), Hemswell (appendix 2.7.5), Immingham (appendix 2.3.18) and Willoughton (appendix 2.7.3).

production sequence and the decision-making process in the transformation of raw materials, allowing for the study of the social dynamics of artefact production (Dobres 1999: 124). Dobres (1999: 124) accepts that technology is a “total social act”. Technical acts are part of everyday life (Dobres 1999: 126-27). As such, technology is an act of material *and* social transformation (Dobres 1999: 128):

Technologies are, at one and the same time, arenas in which agents construct social identities and forge power relations while also producing and using utilitarian objects for practical ends ... While undertaking productive activities, individuals create and localize personal and group identities, making statements about themselves that are “read” by others with whom they are interacting. Technical acts can thus be treated as a medium for defining, negotiating and expressing personhood (Dobres 1999: 129).

In order to understand the significance of the renewed production of handmade pottery, it is worth briefly considering the identity of the late Anglo-Saxon potter. Much less is known about the Anglo-Saxon potter than about the Anglo-Saxon smith. Potters, like masons, do not feature in any surviving pre-conquest historical or literary sources (Symonds 2003a: 67), nor are there special ‘potter’s’ graves known, comparable to the smith’s grave at Tattershall Thorpe in Lindsey (chapter 5.4.3). There is no mention of any potters in inscriptions either, and there is no equivalent for Weland the smith in the form of a mythical figure producing pottery.

A few inferences about the social position of the Anglo-Saxon potter can nevertheless be made. As discussed above, during the middle Anglo-Saxon period, pottery production was already relatively specialised. Although no kilns have been identified for the main middle Anglo-Saxon pottery types of MAX and ELFS, petrological analysis has suggested that their production took place in the area near Lincoln. In the middle of the ninth century, a number of competing wheel-turned industries were established in the heart of the new settlement core at Lincoln. One of these, LKT, used the same clays but a different technology, whilst others, like LG, used *different* clays and a different technology. However, production remained specialised. It is therefore not possible to view the changes as a change in the mode of production, but only as change in manufacturing techniques, location of production, and, in the case of LKT, also scale of production. The establishment of the pottery industries stimulated Lincoln’s growth. As stated in sections 6.1 and 6.4.1, pottery manufacturing waste was amongst the first evidence for activity in Lincoln and other regional centres in the Scandinavian controlled regions of England (Stocker 2006), and the presence of such an industry would have attracted other industries (such as metal- and glass-working industries). In other words, the activities of the potters were an essential driving force behind Lincoln’s economic growth.

Sillar (1997: 7) has demonstrated, in the context of twentieth-century pottery

production in the Andes, that the level of excess pottery production (*i.e.* beyond the requirements for personal use) and time investment in travel to markets is entirely related to the amount of free time that people have, and the amount of goods that people cannot provide for themselves. In the Andes, most pottery production is community bound, but there are itinerant potters who travel with their raw materials and produce pots outside their community. These are usually from highland settlements, not only because they own the llamas needed to transport the clay and any wares they get in return, but also because they are the ones who are wanting of some of the products that are readily available in the lowlands, and because they have more time on their hands because there are more parts of the year that are unsuitable for agriculture. When Sillar's (1997) arguments are applied to late ninth-century England, they provide an explanation why the most successful pottery industries were those established within 'towns' such as Lincoln. Despite the agricultural character of some parts of the settlement (chapter 5.3.7), its inhabitants were further removed from the landscape, creating the need to obtain certain foods or raw materials through trade or exchange.

The prominent position of potters in Lincoln came to an end in the course of the tenth century. The transition from the production of shell-tempered (LKT) to sand-tempered vessels (SNLS) in Lincoln may have been inspired by the sand-tempered products from Torksey and Stamford, whose output was steadily increasing as people were getting used to the look and feel of these new pots. The replacement of Lincoln-produced wares by Torksey-type wares in the second half of the tenth century is paralleled in York, whose local pottery tradition was then also replaced by Torksey wares (Mainman 1990: 512). The suggestion that the production of SNLS was inspired by TORK is strengthened by the fact that the form of the SNLS bowls was based on the form of TORK bowls (Young and Vince 2005: 77) (appendix 17). Like earlier sand-tempered potteries produced at Lincoln, SNLS was mostly restricted to consumption within Lincoln itself. However, this type of pottery was no longer produced in the Lower City. Despite the presence of some SNLS wasters at Flaxengate, some production evidence has also been recognised in Wigford, and the majority of production evidence from this period has been found in Butwerk (Young and Vince 2005: 77) (appendix 17.1.6.2.1), both outside the walled area. In other words, the pottery industry was no longer 'central' to Lincoln.

Whilst Lincoln's pottery industry was in decline, a 'rural' industry producing 'traditional' handmade wares (LFS) *outside* Lincoln began to produce pottery on a regional scale (appendix 17.1.6.1.4) (Symonds 2003a: 186; Young and Vince 2005: 76). LFS bore similarities to the earlier wheel-thrown LSH (appendix 17.1.2.1.3), which Symonds (2003a: 186) regards as a lower-quality variation on LKT, even if LFS was finer in composition with smaller inclusions (Young and Vince 2005: colour plate 13.11). Although no production centre for LFS has been

identified to date, its distribution stretched all the way from Nottingham to Beverley, but has a slight northern bias in terms of quantity, leading Young and Vince (2005: 88) to suggest its production centre must have been situated north of Lincoln. As LFS probably developed out of the earlier ELFS, also produced *outside* Lincoln, the start of the production of LFS sheds more light on the degree of continuity of handmade pottery traditions in a rural context, than on the reasons for the demise of the Lincoln-based wheel-thrown industries. The significant increase in pottery production *outside* Lincoln may be related to the above-mentioned process of settlement intensification that seems to have taken place in the tenth and eleventh centuries, which would have resulted in a much higher pressure on the available land. As a result, not everyone may have been able to gain access to arable land, resulting in a situation whereby 'rural' society was also becoming increasingly diversified.

The establishment of the 'daughter' industries at Horncastle (Symonds 2003a: 223) and Newark (Phillips and Young 1994: 1-2; Wilkinson and Young 1995b: 6) (section 6.2) is a further expression of the increased diversification of society in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The location of these 'daughter-industries' corresponds to the location of the late tenth-century 'minor' mints (Torksey, another 'minor' mint, already had a pottery industry). The correlation between the location of a new (or existing) industry and that of a new mint should not come as a surprise, as the success of a mint is not only dependent on political factors but also on the degree of economic success of the settlement where they are issued. Such economic and political strategies would have had a far-reaching effect on the process of settlement differentiation in the tenth century. As Horncastle, Newark and Torksey were granted some of the functions on which Lincoln had previously held a monopoly, it became increasingly apparent that different settlements began to fulfil different roles. In addition to Torksey and Horncastle, Stamford also increasingly specialised in the production of pottery, whilst York focused on the production of ferrous and non-ferrous metals (Bayley 1992; Ottaway 1992). Lincoln specialised in the production of non-ferrous metals (chapter 5) and, eventually, textiles, whilst Norwich (Margeson 1997; Oakley forthcoming) also invested in the production of non-ferrous metals on a scale that transcended the immediate needs of the settlement.

The differentiation between individual settlements in terms of the industries they housed may have had an effect on their status. If different craftspeople have a different social standing within society, then the presence of a significant number of craftspeople within a particular settlement would have worn off on the status of that settlement. Lincoln, like York, was associated with the manufacture of goods that were intended for personal adornment, or 'fashion': in addition to metalworking and textile production, glass-working was also carried out in the

Lower City (Bayley 2008a; Foley 1981). In this context it is interesting to note that in *DB* it was only Lincoln that was given the suffix of *civitas*; Torksey and Stamford were a *villa* and a *burgus regis* respectively (chapters 1.2 and 4.4.3). Although Reynolds (1987: 299) (chapter 4.4.5) has argued that the use of town terminology in *DB* was inconsistent on the whole, the fact that the three main 'towns' in Lincolnshire were each granted a different label within the context of *one* regional survey with relative constancy is nevertheless significant, as it suggests that a degree of difference was indeed understood by the compilers of *this part* of the *Domesday* survey. In this case, the implication may have been that Lincoln was more 'civilised', and increasingly specialised in more 'civilised' artisan activities, than other settlements in the region.

6.3.7: The pottery from a spatial perspective: conclusions

Analysis of the various ceramic assemblages from Lincoln and Lindsey confirms the notion that rural settlement patterns were fluid, and changed continuously throughout the Anglo-Saxon period. It also reveals that the dynamics that underlie the economic success of a single settlement are subject to constant renegotiation, as the production of a type of artefact may lose significance for the developing identity of a settlement, and consequently become sidelined. An important contribution of the Scandinavian settlement was that it led to a process of population increase, disturbing established production and supply mechanisms and creating room for socio-economic movement.

6.4: Conclusions

The final data chapter in this thesis has focused on the ceramic evidence for Lincoln and Lindsey. Analysis of distribution patterns can shed light on the highly variable nature of settlement development across the middle and late Anglo-Saxon periods. Analysis of pottery distribution patterns in Lincoln itself suggests that, on the whole, pottery consumption patterns were fairly uniform across the settlement, and that most differences can be explained by reference to chronology. As is confirmed by other evidence, settlement started in the southeastern corner of the Lower City, and spread to Wigford, Butwerk and the Upper City in the tenth century. The tenth century witnessed a gradual process of settlement differentiation expressed in the production of different 'types' of artefacts in different settlements.

CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSION

The question posed at the beginning of this thesis was how and why late ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln developed into a 'town', and how 'urban', or how different from the 'rural', the settlement was during this period. The previous four chapters have addressed the differences and similarities between Lincoln and the rest of Lindsey, placed within the context of Lincolnshire and other regions within the Scandinavian-controlled territories of England. This was done through an analysis of four categories of material culture – funerary deposits, coinage, metalwork and pottery – each of which was understood as being imbued with *agency* (chapter 1.5) (Gardner 2004; 2008: 95; Gell 1998: 16; Knappett 2002: 100, 115; Shanks 2008: 13). As all of these chapters incorporated significant discussion, it would be superfluous to repeat any of this in detail. However, a brief reminder of the most important points is necessary.

Chapter 3, which focused on funerary deposits, emphasised the role of ideology and the importance of perceived antiquity for the growth of Lincoln, emphasising the importance of prolonged use of a particular location for funerary activity to add status to a settlement, legitimising the presence of the landholding elite. It also revealed that Lincoln was not a homogenous entity, but that political allegiances existed between individual parts of the settlement (or even individual parishes) and with different areas *outside* Lincoln. Nevertheless, funerary rites, and funerary sculpture in particular, were used to create a sense of social and political unity, which was initially orchestrated from the settlement at Lincoln under the patronage of the bishop. This elite investment in monumental display led to the rise of a new artisan class, whose skills were indispensable for the maintenance of power relations amongst the ruling elite.

The arguments developed in chapter 3 were reinforced by the discussion in chapter 4, which focused on the coinage. Through analysis of the iconography and distribution of Lincoln's earliest coins, it was argued that they were first and foremost expressions of the political ideology of the secular elite, who took great care to promote the role of Lincoln as an important political, economic and religious settlement. In addition, and despite a temporary and partial reversal to a non-monetary economy following the Scandinavian raids and settlement, in the course of the tenth century the production of coinage also played an increasingly important economic role as a stimulus for the economy. The location of a mint at Lincoln, as well as legal restrictions that limited certain transactions to 'towns', therefore stimulated Lincoln's political *and* economic significance. As Lincoln's mint grew in importance, so did the socio-economic and political role of its moneyers and die-cutters, whose expertise created a medium for the continued expression of opposition to the expansionist policies of the West Saxon rulers, even after Lincoln

had nominally become part of the united Anglo-Saxon realm. Although opposition to the south was expressed, to an extent, through allegiance to York, it is doubtful that this ever took the form of direct political control. It was only after Lincoln broke free from the south for the last time in the middle of the tenth century that West Saxon control over its mint was established to the degree that Lincoln mint-signed coins were struck in the name of the West Saxon king.

Finally, chapters 5 and 6 moved away from a focus on elite society, and focused more directly on Lincoln's economic growth through an analysis of the metalworking and pottery industries respectively. It was argued that dress played a vital role in the negotiation of social, political and 'ethnic' identities, and that the production of dress accessories *in* Lincoln therefore had a far-reaching effect on the identity of the settlement as well. The continued location of the production process in the heart of the walled Lower City emphasises the consistent importance of the negotiation of communal and individual identities for the development of the *civitas* of Lincoln. Although the production of pottery had been essential to Lincoln's initial, ninth-century growth, its production was less central to Lincoln's tenth-century development, and was increasingly taken over by other production centres. This process of settlement differentiation ensured that Lincoln became increasingly embedded within the surrounding region, as evidenced by the distribution of ninth- and earlier tenth-century pottery and hooked tags, although a pre-requisite for this process of integration was, of course, the existence of suitable transport and communication routes.

Although this thesis has focused on a single case study, the methodology developed here can be applied to other datasets from different regions and time periods. It is clear that the integrated study of different categories of material culture on a regional level leads to a more nuanced understanding of the changing significance of a single 'urban' settlement than the study of a single category of material culture – or, indeed, the prescriptive study of 'towns' that takes a list of 'urban' characteristics as its starting point – could ever achieve. It has become clear that modern perceptions of 'urbanism' are irrelevant, and that the terminology itself is merely confusing. Nevertheless, it is clear, not only from the eleventh-century *DB*, which treats Lincoln (as well as Stamford and Torksey) separately from the rest of Lincolnshire, but also from the mint signatures on the tenth-century St Martin's coins, that Lincoln was perceived to be a *civitas*, a term that has a complex and multi-layered meaning, as discussed in chapter 3.

Analysis of the exact significance of the *civitas* terminology sheds light on the processes that underlay the *urbanisation* of Lincoln, but do not necessarily give an accurate insight into the nature of late Anglo-Saxon *urbanism*, or history *in* towns (Gottdiener 1994: 102) (chapter 1.5). Nevertheless, both processes are inherently related: Lincoln's *urbanisation* process – which involved a gradual population

growth and intensification of industrial activity as well as an increased level of integration into the surrounding region – affected Lincoln’s *urbanism*, or the way in which Lincoln’s ninth- and tenth-century inhabitants experienced their daily existence. But to what extent did the daily lives of Lincoln’s inhabitants differ from those of the rural population? Did, as Durkheim (1964) has suggested (see chapter 1.5), the urbanisation processes result in a situation of *organic* solidarity, whereby increased levels of specialisation made people dependent on each other as if they were different parts of a single organism (chapter 1.5)? It must be acknowledged that the concentration of craftsmen and traders in *one* location (for example the Lower City) may have contributed to increased levels of specialisation and inter-dependence – an example of which might be the mutual inter-dependence of potters, who produced crucibles for glass-workers, and glass-workers, who created high-lead glazing for ceramic vessels – that could possibly be considered as a form of ‘organic solidarity’. But was this so different from other forms of nucleated settlements, such as, for example, middle Anglo-Saxon Flixborough, especially given the fact that different ‘towns’ also specialised in different crafts, and the majority of crucibles found in Lincoln were imported from Stamford?

It was also suggested in chapter 1.5 that the difference between Lincoln and other ‘rural’ nucleated settlements was the fact that Lincoln was *multinucleated* (Gottdiener 1994: 5). As argued in chapter 2, the extra-mural settlement cores of Butwerk and Wigford were separate settlement cores rather than overspill areas. However, Barton-upon-Humber, which *DB* did *not* list amongst the ‘towns’ of Lincolnshire, was also a multinucleated settlement which has produced evidence for a wide range of activities and performed a variety of functions, none of which were essentially different from the functions that Lincoln performed. This may suggest that the difference between ‘urban’ and ‘rural’ is one of scale (Lincoln was, undoubtedly, the largest settlement in tenth-century Lincolnshire), but then again, this flatly ignores the evidence that ‘towns’ varied in size as well (chapter 4.4.5) (Astill 2009: 257-58).

In many ways, as Astill (2009: 265) has stated, too great a focus on identifying differences between urban and rural obscures existing similarities. Lincoln’s secular elite held estates both inside and outside Lincoln, and its population engaged in the same agricultural and craft-making activities as the populations of ‘rural’ settlements like middle Anglo-Saxon Flixborough and Bottesford, or late Anglo-Saxon Barton-upon-Humber and Cumberworth, both of which revealed evidence for ironworking. If Lincoln stood out in one respect, it was in the evidence for the emergence of a mercantile and artisan class, whose expertise was essential to the ruling secular elite, and who had social aspirations that they expressed through the erection of, for example, stone sculpture (chapter 3.2; also see chapters 4 and 5). However, even if one could truly speak of a rise of

the mercantile and artisan classes in the later ninth and tenth centuries, and even if this can be considered as an 'urban' phenomenon, these developments are still deeply embedded in and dependent upon developments that took place *outside* towns. As has been argued in chapters 3 and 5, landed wealth continued to be essential for the maintenance of power structures in tenth-century society, and although the artisans who produced the sculpture and horse harness fittings that were used *by* the ruling elite to express and maintain power relations may have worked *in* an urban context, their industries would never have existed if there was no wider 'rural' context.

Nevertheless, it can be argued that changing patterns of lordship and the fragmentation of the landscape – itself a result of the consolidation of power between the secular and ecclesiastical elites – instigated the urbanisation process that took place in England during the later ninth and tenth centuries. The Scandinavian invasions and subsequent settlement had resulted in frequent changes in landownership, creating a degree of social insecurity that required overt statements of power. The Church could legitimise the power of the newly established secular elite, at least in part, which resulted in a 'Christianisation' of secular power that ultimately led to a renewed appreciation of the concept of *civitas*. This happened not only because the ruined Roman towns were the physical locations where the power centres of the Church were based, nor exclusively because the antiquity of these places – particularly their cemeteries – created a tangible link between the new landholding elite and the land to which they had laid claim, but also because the concept of *civitas* was deeply meaningful on a symbolic level. After all, although one might debate its immediate success, the West Saxon King Alfred allegedly also invested in "cities and towns to be rebuilt and others to be constructed where previously there were none" (Asser, *Life of Alfred*: ch. 90), a statement that can be interpreted more as a literary theme, a traditional attribute of an exemplary Christian king, than as a statement of fact. Finally, 'towns' constituted controlled spaces, typically situated at nodal points in transport and communication networks, where available resources and economic activity could be regulated (Astill 2006; Gottdiener 1994) (chapter 1.5).

Yet a focus on elite society cannot explain the entire process. Elite investment in conspicuous display of wealth and power – which found expression in, for example, the erection of monumental sculpture and the production of coinage – also gave rise to an artisan class whose expertise was essential to ongoing power negotiations amongst the ruling elite. And as long as the internal hierarchy of the ruling elite remained open to negotiation, there was room for the expression of social aspiration on the part of the artisan and mercantile classes, perpetuating the need for the expression of social, political and 'ethnic' identities, and, by default, the production of objects that functioned as the medium through which such

messages were expressed. In the end, it was this mutually reinforcing process of elite investment and social aspiration that perpetuated Lincoln's economic success, and allowed the settlement to develop an 'urban' identity.

The urbanisation process was not restricted to the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England, although the evidence suggests that the evidence for economic activity from the 'towns' in the areas that had been subject to Scandinavian settlement predates that from the 'towns' in Wessex, thus confirming the notion that the urbanisation process was inherently related to changes in landownership. The fact that the Scandinavian settlers came from a non-urban background is irrelevant, as cultural change cannot be explained through an equation of 'peoples' and expressions of 'material culture' (in the widest sense of the word). It was highlighted in chapter 1 that settlement nucleation is related to group formation (and therefore the formation of communal identities), and that communal identities are affected by issues of territoriality, or the manipulation of space in the context of social or political conflict (Acuto 2005: 212-14; Davies 2006: 5-6; Kleniewski 2002: 11; Konvitz 1985: 4-5; Perring 2002: 1; Tilley 2006: 14). However, identities are multi-faceted and complex (Wilkie 2001: 108), and subject to constant negotiation (Acuto 2005: 212; Konvitz 1985: 1; Trafford 2000: 26).

It was suggested in chapter 1 that identities are either adopted through a process of *identification*, which involves the active adoption of certain characteristics *by* a socially inferior group, or through a process of *attribution*, which involves the imposition of certain characteristics *onto* a socially inferior group (Stovel 2005: 145-46). As the Scandinavian settlers are usually regarded as the dominant group in the Scandinavian-controlled regions of England, it seems that Stovel's (2005) model is too rigid, although it can, of course, be questioned to what extent the Scandinavian settlers were *socially* (rather than politically and militarily) dominant. Besides, as was also stated in chapter 1, cultural change cannot be regarded entirely as an adaptive strategy (Woolf 1998: 13-14). Identities exist on many different levels, both the individual and the communal. Both are interrelated, as the individual exists "in the world" (Tilley 1994: 12; Ingold 1993: 152-53), and "human experience is immersed in relationships with other people, with things, and place, through tasks and activities" (Fowler 2004: 18) (chapter 1). Metal dress accessories express a person's individual identity, but also make him or her part of a social group. Likewise, funerary sculpture expresses the individual identity of the deceased, but does so by emphasising his or her allegiance to a particular social or political group. At the same time, a monument affects the communal identities of the people who inhabit the same space, whilst the meaning invested in such an object also has an unavoidable impact on the perceived identity of the settlement where it was produced. In this case, that was Lincoln.

In conclusion, it may be worth stressing that a 'town' cannot be regarded as a

static entity, and that both *urbanisation* and *urbanism* should be regarded as *processes* rather than states of being. This is not to advocate a return to chronological and linear approaches towards towns; on the contrary, the term 'process' here is meant to imply that both the *urbanisation* and the *urbanism* of Lincoln were socially meaningful. The processes that took place in late ninth- and tenth-century Lincoln possessed *agency*, in the sense that they 'caused things to happen' (Gell 1998: 16), and people to think differently. A combination of Christian ideology and the social insecurity of the new secular landowners may have stimulated Lincoln's initial growth, whilst the presence of significant numbers of specialist craftsmen and merchants with social aspirations may have ensured its subsequent success. However, the process was self-perpetuating. Lincoln's developing urbanism affected the way people thought about towns, and continued to stimulate the urbanisation process until the old *colonia* – as well as many similar settlements – had become an essential and integrated part of the social, political, economic and religious landscape of Anglo-Saxon England.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

- Abbo of St Germain-des-Prés, *Bella Parisiacae Urbis*. In: *Le Siège de Paris par les Normands: Poème du IXe Siècle*. Ed. and trans. H. Waquet, 1942. Paris.
- Ælfric, *Depositio Sancti Martini Episcopi Excusatio Dictantes*. In: *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: The Second Series: Text*, 288-96. Ed. M. Godden, 1979. London: Oxford University Press.
- III Æthelred. In: *The Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I*, 64-70. Ed. and trans. A. J. Robertson, 1925. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- IV Æthelred. In: *The Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I*, 70-79. Ed. and trans. A. J. Robertson, 1925. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Æthelweard, *The Chronicle of Æthelweard*. In: *The Chronicle of Æthelweard*. Ed. and trans. A. Campbell, 1962. London: Nelson.
- Alfred, *Prose Preface to Gregory's Pastoral Care*. In: *Alfred the Great: Asser's Life of Alfred and other Contemporary Sources*, 124-26. Trans. S. Keynes and M. Lapidge, 1983. London: Penguin.
- Alfred, *Preface to Augustine's Soliloquies*. In: *Alfred the Great: Asser's Life of Alfred and other Contemporary Sources*, 138-39. Trans. S. Keynes and M. Lapidge, 1983. London: Penguin.
- The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. In: *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*. Ed. and trans. by M. Swanton, 2000. London: Phoenix Press.
- The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. In: *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*. Eds D. Dumville and S. Keynes, 1983-. 17 vols. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- Ari the Wise, *Íslendingabók*. In: *The Book of the Icelanders (Íslendingabók)*. Ed. H. Hermannsson, 1930. Ithaca: Cornell University Library Press.
- Asser, *Life of Alfred*. In: *Alfred the Great; Asser's Life of Alfred and other Contemporary Sources*, 66-110. Trans. S. Keynes and M. Lapidge, 1983. London: Penguin.
- II Athelstan. In: *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings*, 126-43. Ed. and trans. F. L. Attenborough, 1922. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Augustine, *De Civitate Dei contra Paganos*. In: *Concerning the City of God against the Pagans*. Trans. H. Bettenson, 1984. London: Penguin.
- The Battle of Maldon*. In: *A Choice of Anglo-Saxon Verse*, 50-69. Ed. and trans. R. Hamer, 1970. London: Faber and Faber.
- Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*. In: *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. Eds and trans. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, 1969. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bede, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*. In: *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. Trans. J. McClure and R. Collins, 1999. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beowulf*. In: *Beowulf: An Edition*. Eds B. Mitchell and F. C. Robinson, 1998. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Deor*. In: *A Choice of Anglo-Saxon Verse*, 90-93. Ed. and trans. R. Hamer, 1970. London: Faber and Faber.
- Domesday Book*. In: *Domesday Book: A Survey of the Counties of England*. Ed. J. Morris. 35 vols. Chichester: Phillimore.
- Dudo of St Quentin, *De Moribus et Actis primorum Normanniae Ducum*. In: *History of the Normans*. Trans. E. Christiansen, 1998. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
- Durham*. In: *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, 27. Ed. E.V.K. Dobbie, 1958. New York: Columbia University Press.
- The Gifts of Men*. In: *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, 325-28. Trans. S. A. J. Bradley, S. A. J. 1982. *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*. London: Everyman.
- Gregory, *Dialogi*. In: *Dialogues*. Trans. O. J. Zimmerman, 1977. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press in association with Consortium Books.
- The Husband's Message*. In: *A Choice of Anglo-Saxon Verse*, 78-81. Ed. and trans. R. Hamer, 1970. London: Faber and Faber.
- Óttar Svarti, *Knútsdrápa*. In: *English and Norse Documents Relating to the Reign of Ethelred the Unready*, 136-39. Ed. and trans. M. Ashdown, 1930. Cambridge.
- Roger of Wendover, *Flores Historiarum*. In: *Roger of Wendover's Flowers of History: Comprising the history of England from the Descent of the Saxons to A.D. 1235*. Trans. J.A. Giles, 1849. 2 vols. London: Henry G. Bohn.
- The Ruin*. In: *The Exeter Book*, 227-29. Eds G.P. Krapp and E.V.K. Dobbie, 1961. New York: Columbia University Press.
- St Martin of Tours: The Chronicles of Sulpicius Severus done into English from the French of Paul Monceaux and with an Introduction by him*. Ed. and trans. M. C. Watt, 1928. London: Sands and Co.
- Waldere*. In: *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, 510-12. Trans. S. A. J. Bradley, S. A. J. 1982. *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*. London: Everyman.

The Wanderer. In: *A Choice of Anglo-Saxon Verse*, 174-95. Ed. and trans. R. Hamer. London: Faber and Faber.

Secondary Sources

- Abrams, L., and Parsons, D. N. 2004. Place-Names and the History of Scandinavian Settlement in England. In J. Hines, A. Lane and M. Redknap (eds), *Land, Sea and Home; Proceedings of a Conference on Viking-Period Settlement at Cardiff, July 2001*, 379-431. Leeds: Maney Publishing.
- Abrams, P. 1978a. Introduction. In P. Abrams and E. A. Wrigley (eds), *Towns and Societies: Essays in Economic History and Historical Sociology*, 1-7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Abrams, P. 1978b. Towns and Economic Growth: Some Theories and Problems. In P. Abrams and E. A. Wrigley (eds), *Towns and Societies: Essays in Economic History and Historical Sociology*, 9-33. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Abrams, P. and E. A. Wrigley (eds). 1978. *Towns and Societies: Essays in Economic History and Historical Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Acuto, F. A. 2005. The Materiality of Inka Domination: Landscape, Spectacle, Memory, and Ancestors. In P. P. Funari, A. Zarankin and E. Stovel (eds), *Global Archaeological Theory: Contextual Voices and Contemporary Thoughts*, 211-35. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Adams, L. 1977. *Medieval Pottery from Broadgate East, Lincoln 1973*. The Archaeology of Lincoln 17.1. London: The Council for British Archaeology for the Lincoln Archaeological Trust.
- Adams Gilmour, L. 1988. *Early Medieval Pottery from Flaxengate, Lincoln*. The Archaeology of Lincoln 17.2. London: The Council for British Archaeology for the Trust for Lincolnshire Archaeology.
- Addyman, P. V. and J. B. Whitwell. 1970. Some Middle Saxon Pottery Types in Lincolnshire. *Antiquaries Journal* 50: 96-102.
- Albone, J. 1999. *Archaeological Field Evaluation Report: Land off St Peter's Close, Holton-le-Clay, Lincolnshire*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report 99/20.
- Albone, J. 2002. *Archaeological Evaluation on Land off Spa Hill, Kirton in Lindsey, North Lincolnshire*. Archaeological Project Services Report 126/02.
- Allen, D. 1938. Northumbrian Pennies of the Tenth Century. *The British Numismatic Journal* 22: 175-86.
- Allen, M. 2007. *Archaeological Evaluation Report: Trial Trenching on Land off 1-8 Mill Lane, Lincoln*. Allen Archaeological Associates report.
- Allen, M. and G. Tann. 2000. *Saltfleetby Pipeline; Howdales, South Cockerington-Theddlethorpe Gas Terminal; NGR: TF 415 909 – 487 872; Archaeological Watching Brief and Excavation*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 398.
- Allott, S. 1974. *Alcuin of York: His Life and Letters*. York: William Sessions Limited.
- Almgren, B. 1983. Helmets, Crowns and Warrior's Dress: From the Roman Emperors to the Chieftains of Uppland. In J. P. Lamm and A. Nordstrom (eds), *Vendel Period Studies: Transactions of the Boat-Grave Symposium in Stockholm, February 2-3, 1981*. Stockholm: Statens Historiska Museum.
- Alston, R. 2001. *The City in Roman Egypt*. London: Routledge.
- Angus, C. D. 2000. Post-Roman Pottery. In: *Development on Land at St Michael's Terrace, Michaelgate, Lincoln: Archaeological Watching Brief*, M. Jarvis, 30-32. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 415.
- Archaeological Excavations, Great Coates, Grimsby, 1989*. Humberside Archaeology report (1989).
- Archaeological Evaluation Report: Trial Trenching at 116b High Street, Lincoln*. Allen Archaeological Associates report (2008).
- Archaeological Field Evaluation Report, St Martin's School, Hungate, Lincoln (HUN00); NGR SK 97485 71544*. John Samuels Archaeological Consultants report 737/00/02 (2001).
- Archaeological Field Evaluation, St Mary's Works, Barton Upon Humber*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report (2007).
- An Archaeological Trial Trench Evaluation: The Proposed Redevelopment of Wm Wrights Premises, Park Street, Lincoln, NGR SK 9733 7135*. John Samuels Archaeological Consultants report 672/01/05 (2001).
- Archibald, M. M. 2007. The Evidence of Pecking on Coins from the Cuerdale Hoard: Summary Version. In J. Graham-Campbell and G. Williams (eds), *Silver Economy in the Viking Age*, 49-53. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Archibald, M. M. 2009. The Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Coins from Flixborough. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 402-20. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.

- Arthur, C. J. 1992. *Marx's Capital: A Student Edition*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Astill, G. G. 1991. Towns and Town Hierarchies in Saxon England. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 10: 95-117.
- Astill, G. 2000. General Survey 600-1300. In M. Palliser (ed.), *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain*, 27-49. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Astill, G. 2006. Community, Identity and the Later Anglo-Saxon Town: The Case of Southern England. In W. Davies, G. Halsall and A. Reynolds (eds), *People and Space in the Middle Ages 300 – 1300*, 233-54. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Astill, G. G. 2009. Medieval Towns and Urbanization. In R. Gilchrist and A. Reynolds (eds), *Reflections: 50 Years of Medieval Archaeology, 1957-2007*, 255-70. Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 30. Leeds: Maney Publishing.
- Astill, G. G. in press. Exchange, Coinage and the Economy of Early Medieval England. In J. Escalona and A. Reynolds (eds), *Scale and Scale Change in Early Medieval Western Europe*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Aston, M. and J. Bond. 2000. *The Landscape of Towns*. Revised edition. Stroud: Sutton Publishing Limited.
- Atkins, R. 2005. *Partney By-Pass, Lincolnshire: Post-Excavation Assessment and Updated Project Design*. 2 vols. Cambridgeshire County Council Archaeological Field Unit report 788.
- Attenborough, F. L. 1963. *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings*. New York: Russell & Russell.
- Attreed, L. C. 2001. *The King's Towns: Identity and Survival in Late Medieval English Boroughs*. New York: P. Lang.
- Auger Survey at 9-17 Bridge Street, Horncastle*. Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire Ltd (1990).
- Bailey, R. N. 1980. *Viking Age Sculpture in Northern England*. London: Collins.
- Bailey, R. N. 1996. *England's Earliest Sculptors*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies.
- Barley, M. 1964. The Medieval Borough of Torksey: Excavations 1960-2. *Antiquaries Journal* 44: 165-87.
- Barley, M. 1981. The Medieval Borough of Torksey: Excavations 1963-8. *Antiquaries Journal* 61: 264-91.
- Barford, P. 2006. Artefact Hunting and the Archaeological Resource. *Rescue News* 98, 1-2.
- Barker, P. 1993. *Techniques of Archaeological Excavation*. 3rd ed. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd.
- Bassett, S. 2006. Boundaries of Knowledge: Mapping the Land Units of Late Anglo-Saxon and Norman England. In W. Davies, G. Halsall and A. Reynolds (eds), *People and Space in the Middle Ages 300 – 1300*, 115-42. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Batey, C. 1988. A Viking-Age Bell from Freswick Links, Caithness. *Medieval Archaeology* 32: 214.
- Bayley, J. 1979. *The Technological Finds from Anglo-Scandinavian Levels at Flaxengate: Interim Report*. Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report 2998.
- Bayley, J. 1984. *Ingot Moulds from Flaxengate and Holmes Grain, Lincoln*. Ancient Monuments Laboratory Report 4163.
- Bayley, J. 1992. *Anglo-Scandinavian Non-Ferrous Metalworking from 16-22 Coppergate*. The Archaeology of York 17/7: The Small Finds. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Bayley, J. 2008a. *Lincoln: Evidence for Glass-working on Flaxengate and other Sites in the City: Technology Report*. English Heritage Research Department Report 68-2008.
- Bayley, J. 2008b. *Lincoln: Evidence for Metalworking on Flaxengate and other Sites in the City: Technology Report*. English Heritage Research Department Report 67-2008.
- Beck, M. E. and M. E. Hill. 2007. Midden Ceramics and their Sources in Kalinga. In J. M. Skibo, M. W. Graves and M. T. Stark (eds), *Archaeological Anthropology: Perspectives on Method and Theory*, 111-37. Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press.
- Bell, J. A. 1994. *Guidelines and Conditions for the Preparation and Deposition of Archaeological Archives*. Salisbury and South Wiltshire Museum unpublished document. Available on <http://www.salisburymuseum.org.uk/download-document/guidelines-and-conditions-for-the-preparation-and-deposition-of-archaeological-archives.html>.
- Bennet, M. and N. Field. 1999. Archaeology in Lincolnshire 1999. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 34: 24-37.
- Bentley, R. A. and H. D. G. Maschner. 2008. Introduction: On Archaeological Theories. In R. A. Bentley, H. D. G. Maschner and C. Chippindale (eds), *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*, 1-8. Lanham: Alta Mira Press.
- Beresford, G. 1975a. Excavations at Goltho 1974. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 10: 61.
- Beresford, G. 1975b. *The Medieval Clay-land Village: Excavations at Goltho and Barton Blount*. The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph Series 6.
- Beresford, G. 1981. Goltho Manor, Lincolnshire: The Buildings and their Surrounding

- Defences c. 850-1150. *Proceedings of the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies* 4: 13-36, 171-4.
- Beresford, G. 1987. *Goltho: The Development of an Early Medieval Manor; c. 850-1150*. London: Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England/English Heritage.
- Besteman, J. 2004. Two Viking Hoards from the Former Island of Wieringen (The Netherlands): Viking Relations with Frisia in an Archaeological Perspective. In J. Hines, A. Lane and M. Redknap (eds), *Land, Sea and Home; Proceedings of a Conference on Viking-Period Settlement at Cardiff, July 2001*, 93-108. Leeds: Maney Publishing.
- Biddle, M. 1974. The Development of the Anglo-Saxon Town. *Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo* 21: 203-42.
- Biddle, M. 1976a. The Evolution of Towns: Planned Towns Before 1066. In M. Barley (ed.), *Plans and Topography of Medieval Towns in England and Wales*, 19-42. London: CBA Research Report 14.
- Biddle, M. 1976b. Towns. In D. M. Wilson (ed.), *The Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England*, 99-150. London: Methuen and Co Ltd.
- Biddle, M. 1990. *Object and Economy in Medieval Winchester: Artefacts from Medieval Winchester*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Biddle, M., and J. P. Kjølbye-Biddle. 1992. Repton and the Vikings. *Antiquity* 66: 36-51.
- Biddle, M., and J. P. Kjølbye-Biddle. 2001. Repton and the 'Great Heathen Army', 873-4. In J. Graham-Campbell, R. Hall, J. Jesch and D. N. Parsons (eds), *Vikings and the Danelaw: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress*, 45-96. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Bill, J. 1997. Ships and Seamanship. In P. Sawyer (ed.), *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Vikings*, 182-201. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. (ed.). 1986a. *Anglo-Saxon Monetary History*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. 1986b. The Welbourn (Lincs.) Hoard 1980-82 of Æthelred II Coins. *The British Numismatic Journal* 55: 79-83.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. 1989a. The Ashdon (Essex) Hoard and the Currency of the Southern Danelaw in the Late Ninth Century. *The British Numismatic Journal* 59: 13-38.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. 1989b. What Factors Govern the Number of Coins Found on an Archaeological Site? In H. Clarke and E. Schia (eds), *Coins and Archaeology*, 15-24. BAR International Series 556.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. 1993. Coin Finds and Coin Circulation in Lindsey, c. 600-900. In A. Vince (ed.), *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, 80-90. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 1. Lincoln: Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. 1998. The London Mint in the Reign of Alfred. In M. A. S. Blackburn and D. N. Dumville (eds), *Kings, Currency and Alliances*, 105-23. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. 2001a. Coinage. In M. Lapidge, J. Blair, S. Keynes and D. Scragg (eds), *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, 113-16. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. 2001b. Expansion and Control: Aspects of Anglo-Scandinavian Minting South of the Humber. In J. Graham-Campbell, R. Hall, J. Jesch and D. N. Parsons (eds), *Vikings and the Danelaw: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress, Nottingham and York, 21-30 August 1997*, 125-42. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. 2001c. Mints and Minting. In M. Lapidge, J. Blair, S. Keynes and D. Scragg (eds), *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, 317-18. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. 2002. Finds from the Anglo-Scandinavian Site of Torksey. In Ryszard Kiersnowski et al. (eds), *Moneta Mediaevalis: Studia numizmatyczne i historyczne ofiarowane Profesorowi Stanisławowi Suchodolskiemu w 64. rocznicę urodzin*, 89-101 and 526-27. Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Warsaw: DiG.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. 2004. The Coinage of Scandinavian York. In R. A. Hall (ed.), *Aspects of Anglo-Scandinavian York*, 325-49. The Archaeology of York 8/4: Anglo-Scandinavian York. York: Council for British Archaeology.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. 2005. Presidential Address 2004: Currency under the Vikings. Part 1: Guthrum and the Earliest Danelaw Coinages. *The British Numismatic Journal* 75: 18-43.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. 2006. Presidential Address 2005: Currency under the Vikings. Part 2: The Two Scandinavian Kingdoms of the Danelaw, c. 895-954. *The British Numismatic Journal* 76: 204-26.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. 2007. Gold in England During the 'Age of Silver' (Eighth- to Eleventh Centuries). In J. Graham-Campbell and G. Williams (eds), *Silver Economy in the Viking Age*, 55-98. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. and R. Atherton. 2007. *Torksey: Finds from a Viking Winter Camp*. Available on www.finds.org.uk/documents/conf07/blackburn.pdf

- Blackburn, M. A. S., C. Colyer and M. Dolley. 1983. *Early Medieval Coins from Lincoln and its Shire, c. 770 – 1100*. The Archaeology of Lincoln VI 1. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. and K. Leahy. 1996. A Lincoln Mint-Signed Coin from the Reign of Edgar. *The Numismatic Chronicle* 156: 239-41.
- Blackburn, M. A. S. and J. Mann. 1995. A Late Anglo-Saxon Coin Die From Flaxengate, Lincoln. *The Numismatic Chronicle* 155: 201-08.
- Blair, J. 1988. Minster Churches in the Landscape. In D. Hooke (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Settlements*, 35-58. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Blair, J. 1996. Churches in the Early English Landscape: Social and Cultural Contexts. In J. Blair and C. Pyrah (eds), *Church Archaeology: Research Directions for the Future*, 6-18. York: CBA research report 104.
- Blair, J. 2005. *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blinkhorn, P. 1997. Habitus, Social Identity and Anglo-Saxon Pottery. In C. G. Cumberpatch and P. W. Blinkhorn, *Not So Much a Pot, More a Way of Life*, 113-24. Oxford: Oxbow Monograph 83.
- Blinkhorn, P. forthcoming. No Pots Please, We're Vikings: Pottery in the Southern Danelaw, AD 850-1000. In D. M. Hadley and L. Ten Harkel (eds), *Everyday Life in Viking 'Towns': Social Approaches to Viking Age Towns in Ireland and England, c. 850-1100 AD*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Blunt, C. E. 1979. The Coinage of Athelstan, 924-939: A Survey. *The British Numismatic Journal* 42: 35-158.
- Blunt, C. E., B. H. I. H. Stewart and C. S. S. Lyon. 1989. *Coinage in Tenth-Century England From Edward the Elder to Edgar's Reform*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boddington, A. 1990. Models of Burial, Settlement and Worship: The Final Phase Reviewed. In E. Southworth (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries: A Reappraisal*, 177-99. Stroud: Alan Sutton Publishing.
- Boden, J. M. and J. B. Whitwell. 1979. Barrow-upon-Humber. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 14: 66-67.
- Boyd, R. forthcoming. From Country to Town: Social Transitions in Viking Age Housing. In D. M. Hadley and L. Ten Harkel (eds), *Everyday Life in Viking 'Towns': Social Approaches to Viking Age Towns in Ireland and England, c. 850-1100 AD*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Boyd, R. in prep. *Norse Houses in Ireland and Western Britain, AD 800-1100: A Social Archaeology of Dwellings, Ethnicity and Cultural Identity*. PhD thesis, University College Dublin.
- Boyle, A. and J. Young. 2003. The Pottery. In D. M. Hadley, H. B. Willmott and A. T. Chamberlain (eds), *Fieldwork in West Halton, Lincolnshire 2003*. University of Sheffield report.
- Boyle, A. and J. Young. 2005. The Pottery. In D. M. Hadley, H. B. Willmott and A. T. Chamberlain (eds), *Fieldwork in West Halton, Lincolnshire 2005*, University of Sheffield report.
- Boyle, A. and J. Young. 2007. Post-Roman Pottery and CBM Assessment Report. In M. Allen, *Archaeological Evaluation Report: Trial trenching on Land off 1-8 Mill Lane, Lincoln*, 9. Allen Archaeological Associates report.
- Boyle, A., J. Young and A. Vince. 2008. *A Fabric Type Series for Post-Roman Pottery in North Lincolnshire*. Unpublished document, held by the North Lincolnshire SMR.
- Bradley, J. 1991. St Joseph's Trade and Old English *Smith*. *Leeds studies in English* (new series) 22: 21-42.
- Bradley, J. 2000. *An Archaeological Evaluation at Barrow Road, Barton Upon Humber, North Lincolnshire*. Humber Archaeology Report 48.
- Bradley, J. 2002. *An Archaeological Evaluation on Land at Barrow Road, Barton-on-Humber, North Lincolnshire*. Humber Archaeology Report 97.
- Bradley, J., J. Fraser and K. Steedman. 2004. *An Archaeological Evaluation at Countess Close, Alkborough, North Lincolnshire*. Humber Archaeology Report 153.
- Bradley, S. A. J. 1982. *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*. London: Everyman.
- Bradley-Lovekin, T. 2003. *Archaeological Watching Brief at Back Lane, Wood Enderby, Lincolnshire*. Archaeological Project Services Report 11/03.
- Brooks, N. P. and J. A. Graham-Campbell. 1986. The Viking-Age Silver Hoard from Croydon. In M. A. S. Blackburn (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Monetary History*, 91-110. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Brown, D. 1997. The Social Significance of Imported Medieval Pottery. In C. G. Cumberpatch and P. W. Blinkhorn (eds), *Not So Much a Pot, More a Way of Life*, 95-112. Oxford: Oxbow Monograph 83.
- Brown, D. 2003. Bound by Tradition: A Study of Pottery in Anglo-Saxon England. In D. Griffiths, A. Reynolds and S. Semple (eds), *Boundaries in Early Medieval Britain*, 21-27. Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History 12. Oxford: Oxford University

School of Archaeology.

- Brown, H. 2006. *Torksey, Lincolnshire, in the Anglo-Scandinavian Period*. Unpublished MA dissertation, Centre for Medieval Studies, York.
- Brown, M. P. and E. Okasha. 2009. The Inscribed Objects. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 138-41. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Brønsted, J. 1936. Danish Inhumation Graves of the Viking Age: A Survey. *Acta Archaeologica* 7: 81-228.
- Bruce-Mitford, R. 1978: *The Sutton-Hoo Ship Burial vol. 2: Arms, Armour and Regalia*. London: The British Museum.
- Bruce-Mitford, R. 1993. Late Celtic Hanging Bowls in Lincolnshire and South Humberside. In A. Vince (ed.), *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, 45-70. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 1. Lincoln: City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Bryant, G. F. 1994. *The Early History of Barton upon Humber*. Barton-on-Humber: Workers' Educational Association.
- Buckberry, J. 2004. *A Social and Anthropological Analysis of Conversion Period and Later Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire* (4 vols.). University of Sheffield: Unpublished PhD thesis.
- Buckberry, J. 2007. On Sacred Ground: Social Identity and Churchyard Burial in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, c. 700-1100 AD. *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 14: 117-27.
- Buckton, D. 1986. Late 10th- and 11th-century Cloisonné Enamel Brooches. *Medieval Archaeology* 30: 8-18.
- Budd, P., A. Millard, C. Chenery, S. Lucy and C. Roberts. 2004. Investigations of Population Movement by Stable Isotope Analysis: A Report from Britain. *Antiquity* 78: 127-41.
- Bunn, D. and A. Hardwick. 2000. *Fluxgate Gradiometer Survey, Land at the Green, Orby, Lincolnshire*. Pre-Conquest Geophysics report 00/29.
- Burchard, A. 1982. A Saxo-Norman Iron-Smelting Site at 'Co-op' in High Street. In C. Mahany, A. Burchard and G. Simpson (eds), *Excavations in Stamford, Lincolnshire, 1963-1969*, 105-44. London: The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 9.
- Burman, B. and C. Turbin. 2003. Introduction: Material Strategies Engendered. In B. Burman and C. Turbin (eds), *Material Strategies: Dress and Gender in Historical Perspective*, 1-11. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Byock, J. 2002. The Icelandic Althing: Dawn of Parliamentary Democracy. In J. M. Fladmark (ed.), *Heritage and Identity: Shaping the Nations of the North*, 1-18. Donhead: The Heyerdahl Institute and Robert Gordon University.
- Cambridge, E. and D. Rollason. 1995. Debate: The Pastoral Organization of the Anglo-Saxon Church: a Review of the Minster Hypothesis. *Early Medieval Europe* 4: 87-104.
- Cameron, K. 1975. Scandinavian Settlement in the Territory of the Five Boroughs: The Place-name Evidence. *Place-name Evidence for Anglo-Saxon Invasion and Scandinavian Settlements*, 139-71. Nottingham: English Place-name Society.
- Cameron, K. 1985. *The Place-names of Lincolnshire*. Part 1. Nottingham: English Place-name Society.
- Cameron, K. 2001. *The Place-names of Lincolnshire*. Part 6. Nottingham: English Place-name Society.
- Campbell, J. 1989. The Sale of Land and the Economics of Power in Early England: Problems and Possibilities. *Haskins Society Journal* 1: 23-37.
- Carlyle, S. M. Holmes and S. Morris. 2003. *Archaeological Recording Action on Land off Baldwin Avenue, Bottesford, Scunthorpe, 2002*. Northamptonshire Archaeology Report.
- Carroll, J. and D. N. Parsons (forthcoming), *Anglo-Saxon Mint-names*. Vols 2 and 3. Nottingham: English Place-name Society.
- Carver, M. O. H. 1987. *Underneath English Towns; Interpreting Urban Archaeology*. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd.
- Carver, M. O. H. 1992. *The Age of Sutton Hoo*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
- Carver, M. 1993. *Arguments in Stone: Archaeological Research and the European Town in the First Millennium*. Oxford: Oxbow Monograph 29.
- Carver, M. 1996. Transitions to Islam: Urban Rôles in the East and South Mediterranean, Fifth to Tenth Centuries AD. In N. Christie and S. T. Loseby (eds), *Towns in Transition: Urban Evolution in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, 184-212. Aldershot: Scholar Press.
- Carver, M. 1998. *Sutton Hoo: Burial Ground of Kings?* London: British Museum Press.
- Carver, M. 2000. Town and Anti-Town in the First Millennium Europe. In A. Buko and P. Urbańczyk (eds), *Archeologia w Teorii i w Praktyce*, 373-96. Warsaw.
- Carver, M. O. H., S. Donaghey and A.B. Sumpter. 1978. *Riverside Structures and a Well in Skeldergate and Buildings in Bishophill*. The Archaeology of York 4/1. London: Council for British Archaeology.

- Casella, E. C. and C. Fowler. 2005. Beyond Identification: An Introduction. In E. C. Casella and C. Fowler (eds), *The Archaeology of Plural and Changing Identities: Beyond Identification*, 1-8. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Cemeteries and Settlements in North Lincolnshire, c.700-1100*, <http://www.shef.ac.uk/archaeology/research/lincolnshire/index.html>. Last studied in January 2010.
- Cessford, C. and A. Dickens. forthcoming. Publication of the 2005-2006 excavations at the Grand Arcade shopping centre, Cambridge.
- Chamberlain, A., D. Hadley and J. Williams. 1999. *Isle of Axholme Project 1: Archaeological Excavations at Belton*. Department of Archaeology and Prehistory, University of Sheffield report.
- Chapman, H, R. Head, H. Fenwick, H. Neumann and R. Van de Noort. 1998. The Archaeological Survey of the Ancholme Valley. In R. Van de Noort and S. Ellis (eds), *Wetland Heritage of the Ancholme and Lower Trent Valleys*, 199-246. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- Checklist of Coin Hoards from the British Isles, c. 450-1180*, <http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/dept/coins/projects/hoards/index.list.html>. Last studied in January 2010.
- Childe, V. G. 1950. The Urban Revolution. *The Town Planning Review* 21: 3-17.
- Clark Hall, J. R. 2000. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. 4th ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, in association with the Medieval Academy of America.
- Clarke, H. and B. Ambrosiani. 1991. *Towns in the Viking Age*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Cloke, P. J. 1980. New Emphases for Applied Rural Geography. *Progress in Human Geography* 4: 181-217.
- Coatsworth, E. 2008. *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture Volume VIII: Western Yorkshire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Colyer, C., B. J. J. Gilmour and M. J. Jones. 1999. *The Defences of the Lower City: Excavations at the Park and West Parade 1970-2 and a Discussion of Other Sites Excavated up to 1994*. The Archaeology of Lincoln VII/2. York: Council of British Archaeology for the City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Cope-Faulkner, P. 2000. *Archaeological Watching Brief of Development adjacent to Xanadu, Back Lane, Little Cawthorpe, Lincolnshire*. Archaeological Project Services report 21/00.
- Cope-Faulkner, P. 2005. *Archaeological Watching Brief at 7-13 Bridge Street, Horncastle, Lincolnshire*. Archaeological Project Services report 169/05.
- Coppack, G. 1970. Two Finds of Ipswich ware from Lincolnshire. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 5: 16-17.
- Coppack, G. 1987. Saxon and Early Medieval Pottery. In G. Beresford, *Goltho: The Development of an Early Medieval Manor; c. 850-1150*, 134-69. London: Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England/English Heritage.
- Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture*. <http://www.dur.ac.uk/corpus/index.php3>.
- Courtney, P. 1998. Saxon and Medieval Leicester: The Making of an Urban Landscape. *Transactions of the Leicestershire Archaeology and History Society* 73: 110-45.
- Cowgill, J. 1994. Desperately Seeking Slags. *Lincoln Archaeology 1993-1994*: 25.
- Cowgill, J., H. Healey and G. Taylor. 2000. The Other Finds. In J. Snee, *Archaeological Watching Brief of Development at Hall Lane, Burgh-le-Marsh, Lincolnshire*. Archaeological Project Services report 106/00.
- Cowgill, J., H. Healey and G. Taylor. 2001. *The Medieval Pottery, Iron Slag and Other Finds*. In S. Malone, *Evaluation at Hall Lane, Burgh-le-Marsh, Lincolnshire*. Archaeological Project Services report 16/01.
- Craig, E. 2009. *A Bio-Cultural Study of Middle Saxon Cemeteries in Northern England*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sheffield.
- Cramp, R. 1969. Excavations at the Saxon Monastic Sites of Wearmouth and Jarrow, co. Durham: An Interim Report. *Medieval Archaeology* 13: 21-66.
- Crane, D. 2000. *Fashion and its Social Agendas: Class, Gender and Identity in Clothing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Creighton, J. 2000. *Coins and Power in Late Iron Age Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cubitt, C. 2006. Folklore and Historiography: Oral Stories and the Writing of Anglo-Saxon History. In E. M. Tyler and R. Balzaretto (eds), *Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West*, 189-223. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Cumberpatch, C. G. 1997. Towards a Phenomenological Approach to the Study of Medieval Pottery. In C. G. Cumberpatch and P. W. Blinkhorn (eds), *Not So Much a Pot, More a Way of Life*, 125-51. Oxford: Oxbow Monograph 83.
- Daley, M. P. 2005. *The Horse Close, Chapel Lane, Minting: Archaeological Watching Brief Report*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report.
- Damhorst, M. L., K. A. Miller-Spillman and S. O. Michelman (eds). 2005. *The Meanings of*

- Dress. Second edition. New York: Fairchild Publications.
- Danesgate Multi-Storey Car Park, Danesgate, Lincoln: *Archaeological Recording*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 448 (2001).
- Darby, H. C. 1987. Domesday Book and the Geographer. In J. C. Holt (ed.), *Domesday Studies*, 101-19. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
- Davies, W. 2006. Introduction: Community Definition and Community Formation in the Early Middle Ages – Some Questions. In W. Davies, G. Halsall and A. Reynolds (eds), *People and Space in the Middle Ages 300 – 1300*, 1-12. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Davis, F. 1992. *Fashion, Culture and Identity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Davis, R. H. C. 1982. Alfred and Guthrum's Frontier. *The English Historical Review* 97: 803-10.
- Denning, K. E. L. 1999. Apocalypse Past/Future: Archaeology and Folklore, Writ Large. In A. Gazin-Schwartz and C. Holtorf (eds), *Archaeology and Folklore*, 90-105. London: Routledge.
- Didsbury, P. 1996. The Pottery. In M. Foreman, *Excavations at Waterton, North Lincolnshire: A Preliminary Report*, 11-13. Humber Archaeology Report 8.
- Didsbury, P. 2000. The Finds. In J. Bradley, *An Archaeological Evaluation at Barrow Road, Barton Upon Humber, North Lincolnshire*, 13-16. Humber Archaeology Report 48.
- Didsbury, P. and L. Wastling. 1995. The Pottery. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 30: 27-30.
- Dietler, M. and I. Herbich. 1989. *Tich Matek*: The Technology of Luo Pottery Production and the Definition of Ceramic Style. *World Archaeology* 21: 1, 148-64.
- Dobinson, C. and S. Denison. 1995. *Metal Detecting and Archaeology in England*. York/London: English Heritage and Council for British Archaeology.
- Dobney, K. M., S. D. Jacques and B. G. Irving. 1996. *Of Butchers and Breeds; Report on Vertebrate Remains from Various Sites in the City of Lincoln*. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 5. Lincoln: City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Dobney, K., D. Jacques, J. Barrett and C. Johnstone. 2007. *Farmers, Monks and Aristocrats: The Environmental Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon Flixborough*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Dobres, M.-A. 1999. Technology's Links and *Chaînes*: The Processual Unfolding of Technique and Technician. In M.-A. Dobres and C. R. Hoffman (eds), *The Social Dynamics of Technology: Practice, Politics and World Views*, 124-46. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Dolley, R. H. M. and D. M. Metcalf. 1961. The Reform of the English Coinage under Eadgar. In R. H. M. Dolley (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Coins; Studies Presented to F. M. Stenton on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday, 17 May 1960*, 136-68. London: Methuen & Co Ltd.
- Dolley, R. H. M. and Strudwick, J. S. 1956. A Note on the Mint of Torksey and on Some Early Finds of English Coins from Nottinghamshire. *Numismatic Chronicle* 16: 293:302
- Donel, L. 1991. *Lincoln Central Library: Archaeological Evaluation*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 11.
- Donel, L. 1993. *North Lincolnshire College (Proposed Student Accommodation)*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 55.
- Donel, L. 1996. *Sessions House, Lincoln: Archaeological and Historical Study*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 284.
- Drewett, P. L. 1999. *Field Archaeology: An Introduction*. London: UCL Press.
- Drinkall, G. and M. Foreman. 1998. *The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Castledyke South, Barton-on-Humber*. Sheffield Excavation Reports 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Driscoll, S. T. 1984. The New Medieval Archaeology: Theory versus History. *Scottish Archaeological Review* 3.2: 104-09.
- Duczko, W. 2002. Test or Magic? Pecks on the Viking-Age Silver. In Ryszard Kiersnowski et al. (eds), *Moneta Mediaevalis: Studia numizmatyczne i historyczne ofiarowane Profesorowi Stanisławowi Suchodolskiemu w 64. rocznicę urodzin*, 193-208 and 542-47. Instytut Archeologii i Etnologii Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Warsaw: DiG.
- Dunning, G. C. 1959. Pottery of the Late Anglo-Saxon Period in England. *Medieval Archaeology* 3: 31-78.
- Durkheim, E. 1964. *The Division of Labour in Society*. London: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Early Medieval Corpus*, <http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/dept/coins/emc/>. Last studied in December 2009.
- Ekwall, E. 1960. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Placenames*. Fourth Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ellis, S., H. Fenwick, M. Lillie and R. Van de Noort. 2001. *Wetland Heritage of the Lincolnshire Marsh: An Archaeological Survey*. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- The Encyclopedia of Catholic Saints*. (12 vols.) 1966. Philadelphia: Chilton Books.
- Ensor, S. 1997. Environmental and Biological Data; Human Bone. In F. J. Green, *St Helen's, Cumberworth; Assessment Report*, 33-35. Hampshire Archaeology TVAT report 04/97.

- Evans, D. H. 1991. *Excavations at the Moated Manor of Habrough, South Humberside (Site RDX 33)*. Humberside Archaeology Unit report.
- Evans, D. H. and C. Loveluck (eds). 2009. *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Everson, P. 1972. Some Anglo-Saxon Potters in North Lincolnshire. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 7: 16-19.
- Everson, P. 1973. An Excavated Anglo-Saxon Sunken-featured Building and Settlement Site at Salmonby, Lincs. 1972. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 8: 61-72.
- Everson, P. 1984. The Pre-Conquest Estate at Æt Bearuwe in Lindsey. In M. Faulk (ed.), *Studies in Late Anglo-Saxon Settlement*, 123-27. Oxford: Oxford University Department for External Studies.
- Everson, P. 1988. What's in a name? "Goltho", Goltho and Bullington. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 23: 93-99.
- Everson, P. 1990. The Problem of Goltho. *Medieval Settlement Research Group Report* 5: 9-14.
- Everson, P. 1993. Pre-Viking Settlement in Lindsey. In A. Vince (ed.), *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, 91-100. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 1. Lincoln: Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Everson, P., and Knowles, G. C. 1993. The Anglo-Saxon Bounds of Æt Bearuwe. *Journal of the English Place-Name Society* 25: 19-37.
- Everson, P. and D. Stocker. 1999. *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture Volume V: Lincolnshire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy.
- Everson, P. and D. Stocker. 2006. The Common Steeple? Church, Liturgy, and Settlement in Early Medieval Lincolnshire. In C. P. Lewis (ed.), *Anglo-Norman Studies XXVIII. Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2005*, 103-24. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
- Everson, P. and D. Stocker. in prep. Addendum to the *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture Volume V: Lincolnshire*.
- Everson, P., C. C. Taylor and C. J. Dunn. 1991. *Change and Continuity: Rural Settlement in North-West Lincolnshire*. London: HSMO.
- Fahlander, F. and T. Oestigaard. 2008. The Materiality of Death: Bodies, Burials, Beliefs. In F. Fahlander and T. Oestigaard (eds), *The Materiality of Death: Bodies, Burials, Beliefs*, 1-16. BAR International Series 1786.
- Fanning, T. 1994. *Viking Age Ringed Pins from Dublin*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.
- Farr, S. 2000. The Evaluation Trenches. In: *Land to the North of Conging Street, Horncastle, Lincs; NGR: TF 2599 6977; Archaeological Evaluation*, 8-13. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 481.
- Faulk, M. L. 1976. The Location and Relationship of the Sancton Anglo-Saxon Cemetery. *Antiquaries Journal* 56: 227-33.
- FCFT01: *Proposed Residential Development, Castle Farm, Torksey*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report (2001).
- Fellows-Jensen, G. 1978. *Scandinavian Settlement Names in the East Midlands*. Copenhagen: Navnestudier 16.
- Fenwick, H., H. Chapman, W. Fletcher, G. Thomas and M. Lillie. 2001. The Archaeological Survey of the Lincolnshire Marsh. In S. Ellis, H. Fenwick, M. Lillie and R. Van de Noort (eds), *Wetland Heritage of the Lincolnshire Marsh: An Archaeological Survey*, 63-97. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- Fenwick, H., H. Chapman, R. Head and M. Lillie. 1998. The Archaeological Survey of the Lower Trent Valley and Winterton Beck. In R. Van de Noort and S. Ellis (eds), *Wetland Heritage of the Ancholme and Lower Trent Valleys*, 143-97. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- Field, F. N. 1981. Cherry Willingham. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 16: 70.
- Field, N. 1990. *Castle Farm Torksey, Exploratory Excavations*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report.
- Field, N. and I. George. 1998. Archaeology in Lincolnshire 1998. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 33: 35-46.
- Field, N. and M. McDaid. 1995. *Alford Road Huttoft; Archaeological Evaluation*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report.
- Field, N. and M. McDaid. 2000. *Land at Tumby, Lincolnshire: Archaeological Evaluation*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 242.
- Field, N. and H. Hurst. 1983. Roman Horncastle. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 18: 47-90.
- Fieldwork in Fillingham, Lincolnshire*. Vol. 2. Department of Archaeology and Prehistory, University of Sheffield unpublished report (2000).
- Fillingham Project Overview - A Late Anglo-Saxon Cemetery in Lincolnshire*, <http://www.shef.ac.uk/archaeology/research/lincolnshire/fillingham01.html>. Last studied in January 2010.

- Flixborough Middle Saxon Settlement. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 26 (1991): 35-36.
- Flower, S. L. 1998. *Heroes and Horses: A Contextual Analysis of Horse Sacrifice in Anglo-Saxon England*. Unpublished MPhil dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Foley, K. 1981. Glass- and Metalworking: Industrial Material from Anglo-Scandinavian Lincoln. Unpublished MSc thesis, Institute of Archaeology, University of London.
- Foot, S. 1993. The Kingdom of Lindsey. In A. Vince (ed.), *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, 128-40. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 1. Lincoln: The City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Foot, S. 1996. The Making of *Anglecynn*: English Identity before the Norman Conquest. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (sixth series) 6: 25-49.
- Foot, S. 1999. Remembering, Forgetting and Inventing: Attitudes to the Past in England at the End of the First Viking Age. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* (sixth series) 9: 185-200.
- Foreman, M. 1990. *Excavations at Castledyke 1990*. Humberside Archaeology report.
- Foreman, M. 1996. *Excavations at Waterton, North Lincolnshire: A Preliminary Report*. Humber Archaeology report 8.
- Fowler, C. 2004. *The Archaeology of Personhood: An Anthropological Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Frick, H. J. 1992. Karolingische-Ottonische Scheibenfibeln des nordlichen Formenkreises. *Offa* 49/50: 243-463.
- Frye, R. 2005. *Ibn Fadlan's Journey to Russia: A Tenth-Century Traveler from Baghdad to the Volga River*. Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers.
- Gannon, A. 2003. *The Iconography of Early Anglo-Saxon Coinage: Sixth to Eighth Centuries*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gannon, A. 2006. Imitation is the Sincerest Form of Flattery. In B. Cook and G. Williams (eds), *Coinage and History in the North Sea World, c. AD 500 – 1250: Essays in Honour of Marion Archibald*, 193-208. Leiden: Brill.
- Gardiner, M. 2004. Timber Buildings Without Earth-Fast Footings in Viking-Age Britain. In J. Hines, A. Lane and M. Rødtnap (eds), *Land, Sea and Home; Proceedings of a Conference on Viking-Period Settlement at Cardiff, July 2001*, 345-58. Leeds: Maney Publishing.
- Gardner, A. (ed.). 2004. *Agency Uncovered: Archaeological Perspectives on Social Agency, Power and Being Human*. London: UCL Press.
- Gardner, A. 2008. Agency. In: *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*, eds R. A. Bentley, H. D. G. Maschner and C. Chippindale, 95-108. Lanham: Alta Mira Press.
- Gardner, R. D. and D. Bunn. 2006. *Proposed New Hotel Site, Barrow Road, Barton-on-Humber, Lincolnshire: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Geophysical Survey*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report.
- Geake, H. M. 1997. *The Use of Grave-Goods in Conversion-Period England, c. 600 – c. 850*. BAR British Series 261.
- Geake, H. 2007. The Human Burials. In C. Loveluck and D. Atkinson (eds), *The Early Medieval Settlement Remains From Flixborough, Lincolnshire: The Occupation Sequence, c AD 600-1000*, 113-19. Excavations at Flixborough 1. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Gell, A. 1998. *Art and Agency; An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gilg, A. 1985. *An Introduction to Rural Geography*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Gilmour, B. 2007. Sub-Roman or Saxon, Pagan or Christian: Who Was Buried in the Early Cemetery at St Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln? In L. Gilmour (ed.), *Pagans and Christians – From Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Papers in Honour of Martin Henig, Presented on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, 229-56. BAR International Series 1610.
- Gilmour, B. J. J. and D. A. Stocker. 1986. *St Mark's Church and Cemetery*. The Archaeology of Lincoln XIII-1. The Council for British Archaeology for the Trust for Lincolnshire Archaeology.
- Glover, G. 2007. *Land at the Thatch/Rosegarth, North Thoresby, Lincs.: Archaeological Evaluation*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 978.
- Gondek, M. 2006. Investing in Sculpture: Power in Early Historic Scotland. *Medieval Archaeology* 50: 105-42.
- Goodall, A. R. 1987. Objects of Copper Alloy and Lead. In G. Beresford, *Goltho: The Development of an Early Medieval Manor; c. 850-1150*, 171-76. London: Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England/English Heritage.
- Goodall, I. H. 1987. Objects of Iron. In G. Beresford, *Goltho: The Development of an Early Medieval Manor; c. 850-1150*, 177-88. London: Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England/English Heritage.
- Gosden, C. and Y. Marshall. 1999. The Cultural Biography of Objects. *World Archaeology* 31 (2), 169-78.
- Gottdiener, M. 1994. *The New Urban Sociology*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Gottdiener, M. and R. Hutchinson. 2006. *The New Urban Sociology*. Boulder: Westview Press.

- Graham-Campbell, J. 1972. Two Groups of Ninth-Century Irish Brooches. *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland* 120: 113-128.
- Graham-Campbell, J. 1980. *The Viking World*. London: Book Club Associates.
- Graham-Campbell, J. 1982. Viking Silver Hoards: An Introduction. In T. Farrell (ed.), *The Vikings*, 32-41. London: Phillimore and Co. Ltd.
- Graham-Campbell, J. (ed.). 1992. *Viking Treasure from the North West: The Cuerdale Hoard in Context*. Liverpool: National Museums and Galleries in Merseyside.
- Graham-Campbell, J. 1993. The Northern Hoards of Viking Age Scotland. In C. E. Batey, J. Jesch and C. D. Morris (eds), *The Viking Age in Caithness, Orkney and the North Atlantic; Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Eleventh Viking Congress, Thurso and Kirkwall, 22 August – 1 September 1989*, 173-86. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Graham-Campbell, J. 1998. The Early Viking Age in the Irish Sea Area. In H. Clarke, M. Ní Mhaonaigh and R. Ó Floinn (eds), *Ireland and Scandinavia in the Early Viking Age*, 123-24. Dublin: Four Courts Press Ltd.
- Graham-Campbell, J. 2001a. The Dual Economy of the Danelaw. *The British Numismatic Journal* 71: 49-59.
- Graham-Campbell, J. 2001b. Pagan Scandinavian Burial in the Central and Southern Danelaw. In J. Graham-Campbell, R. Hall, J. Jesch and D. N. Parsons (eds), *Vikings and the Danelaw; Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress*, 105-23. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Graham-Campbell, J. forthcoming. Definitive publication on the Cuerdale hoard.
- Graham-Campbell, J., R. Hall, J. Jesch and D. N. Parsons (eds). 2001. *Vikings and the Danelaw: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Graham-Campbell, J. and G. Williams (eds). 2007. *Silver Economy in the Viking Age*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Grantham Street, Lincoln, Proposed Student Accommodation; Archaeological Evaluation*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 416 (2000).
- Gräslund, A. S. 1980. *Birka IV: The Burial Customs; A Study of the Graves of Björkö*. Stockholm: Royal Academy for History, Antiquity and Letters.
- Green, F. J. 1997. *St Helen's, Cumberworth; Assessment Report*. Hampshire Archaeology TVAT report 04/97.
- Green, M. 1996. *Celtic Art, Symbols & Imagery*. New York: Sterling Publishing Co.
- Greenhalf, D. 1981a. *Barton Vicarage Site: Draft Report of Excavations March-April 1981*. Unpublished report held by North Lincolnshire SMR.
- Greenhalf, D. 1981b. *The Barton Vicarage Excavation*, Humberside Archaeological Unit report.
- Grenville, J. and M. Parker Pearson. 1983. *Excavations at West Halton, Lincolnshire. An Interim Report*. Unpublished document, available at North Lincolnshire SMR.
- Grierson, P. 1957. Halfpennies and Third-Pennies of King Alfred. *The British Numismatic Journal* 28: 477-93.
- Grierson, P. and M. Blackburn. 1986. *Medieval European Coinage I: The Early Middle Ages (5th-10th centuries)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guarinello, N. L. 2005. Archaeology and the Meanings of Material Culture. In P. P. Funari, A. Zarankin and E. Stovel (eds), *Global Archaeological Theory: Contextual Voices and Contemporary Thoughts*, 19-27. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Gunstone, A. 1981. Tetney, Lincs., Hoard 1945. *Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles* 27: *Lincolnshire Collections*, pls. 57-60. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hadley, D. M. 2000a. Burial Practices in the Northern Danelaw, c.650-1100. *Northern History* 36: 199-216.
- Hadley, D. M. 2000b. Discussion and Conclusions. In: *Fieldwork in Fillingham, Lincolnshire*. Vol. 2, 42-49. University of Sheffield report.
- Hadley, D. M. 2001. Whitton: SE 9035 2450. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 36: 59.
- Hadley, D. M. 2002a. *Fieldwork in Whitton, Lincolnshire; Volume 2*. University of Sheffield report.
- Hadley, D. M. 2002b. Viking and Native: Re-thinking Identity in the Danelaw. *Early Medieval Europe* 11 (1): 45-70.
- Hadley, D. M. 2004a. Fieldwork at West Halton (Lincs.). *Medieval Settlement Research Group Annual Report* 19.
- Hadley, D. M. 2004b. Negotiating Gender, Family and Status in Anglo-Saxon Burial Practices, c. 600-950. In L. Brubaker and J. M. H. Smith (eds), *Gender in the Early Medieval World; East and West, 300-900*, 301-23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hadley, D. M. 2006. *The Vikings in England; Settlement, Society and Culture*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hadley, D. M. 2007. The Garden Gives up its Secret: The Developing Relationship between

- Rural Settlements and Cemeteries c. 800-1100. *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 14: 194-203.
- Hadley, D. M. 2008a. Ethnicity and Identity in Context: The Material Culture of Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries. In V. Gazeau, P. Bauduin and Y. Mohéran (eds), *Identité et Ethnicité: Concept, Débats Historiographiques, Exemples (IIIe – XIIe siècle)*, 163-83. Publications du CRAHM.
- Hadley, D. M. 2008b. Warriors, Heroes and Companions: Negotiating Masculinity in Viking-Age England. *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 15: 276-84.
- Hadley, D. M. 2009. Burial, Belief and Identity in Later Anglo-Saxon England. In R. Gilchrist and A. Reynolds (eds), *Reflections: 50 Years of Medieval Archaeology*, 465-88. Leeds: Maney Publishing.
- Hadley, D. M. and G. Davies. 2001. *Fieldwork in Whitton, Lincolnshire; Volume 1*. Unpublished report, University of Sheffield.
- Hadley, D. M. and J. D. Richards (eds). 2000. *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Hadley, D. M. and L. Ten Harkel (eds) forthcoming. *Everyday Life in Viking 'Towns': Social Approaches to Viking-Age Towns in Ireland and England, c. 850-1100*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Hadley, D. M. and H. B. Willmott forthcoming. Anglo-Saxon Settlement and the Appropriation of a Bronze Age Landscape at West Halton (Lincolnshire).
- Hadley, D. M., H. B. Willmott and A. T. Chamberlain. 2003. *Fieldwork in West Halton, Lincolnshire 2003*. Unpublished report.
- Hadley, D. M., H. B. Willmott and A. T. Chamberlain. 2004. *Fieldwork in West Halton, Lincolnshire 2004, vol. 2*. Unpublished report.
- Hadley, D. M., H. B. Willmott and A. T. Chamberlain. 2005. *Fieldwork in West Halton, Lincolnshire 2005, vol. 3*. Unpublished report.
- Hadley, D. M., H. B. Willmott and A. T. Chamberlain. 2006. *Fieldwork in West Halton, Lincolnshire 2006, vol. 4*. Unpublished report.
- Hale, D. 1998. *Archaeological Evaluation of Land off Baldwin Avenue, Bottesford, Scunthorpe, North Lincolnshire; A Programme of Research carried out on behalf of JS Bloor (Measham) Ltd*. GeoQuest Associates report.
- Hall, D. 2002. *Burgess, Merchant, and Priest: Burgh Life in the Scottish Medieval Town*. Edinburgh: Birlinn with Historic Scotland.
- Hall, R. A. 1984. *The Viking Dig: The Excavations at York*. London: Bodley Head.
- Hall, R. A. 1997. *Excavations in the Praetentura: 9 Blake Street*. The Archaeology of York 3/4. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Hall, R. A. (ed.). 2004. *Aspects of Anglo-Scandinavian York*. The Archaeology of York 8/4. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Hall, R. V. 2005. *Archaeological Evaluation for the Proposed Melton Ross Quarry Extension, Croxton, North Lincolnshire (CMR 05)*. Archaeological Project Services report 40/05.
- Halsall, G. 2000. The Viking Presence in England? The Burial Evidence Reconsidered. In D. M. Hadley and J. D. Richards (eds), *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, 259-76. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Hambly, J. 2000. *Archaeological Evaluation of Land at Melton Ross Quarries, North Lincolnshire (MRW 00)*. Archaeological Project Services report 39/00.
- Hamer, R. 1970. *A Choice of Anglo-Saxon Verse*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Haselgrove, C. 1985. Inference from Ploughsoil Artefact Samples. In C. Haselgrove, M. Millett and I. Smith (eds), *Archaeology from the Ploughsoil: Studies in the Collection and Interpretation of Field Survey Data*, 7-29. Sheffield: Department of Archaeology and Prehistory, University of Sheffield.
- Haselgrove, C., M. Millett and I. Smith (eds). 1985. *Archaeology from the Ploughsoil: Studies in the Collection and Interpretation of Field Survey Data*. Sheffield: Department of Archaeology and Prehistory, University of Sheffield.
- Haslam, J. 1978. *Medieval Pottery*. Aylesbury: Shire Publications Ltd.
- Haslam, J. 1987. Market and Fortress in England in the Reign of Offa. *World Archaeology* 19.1: 76-93.
- Hatt, A. 1982. *Pasture Road/Beck Hill Relief Sewer January/February 1982: A Report on the Trench Section*. Unpublished report held by North Lincolnshire SMR.
- Hatt, A. undated. *Preliminary Fieldwalking Survey at Middle Manton*. Unpublished report.
- Hattatt, R. 1989. *Ancient Brooches and Other Artefacts*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Hawkes, J. 1968. The Proper Study of Mankind. *Antiquity* 42: 255-62.
- Hawkins, P. S. 1986. *Civitas: Religious Ideas of the City: Introduction*. In P. S. Hawkins (ed.), *Civitas: Religious Ideas of the City*, xi-xix. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Head, R., H. Fenwick and H. Chapman. 1998. Sites and Finds from the Isle of Axholme. In R. Van de Noort and S. Ellis (eds), *Wetland Heritage of the Ancholme and Lower Trent Valleys*, 265-88. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.

- Healey, H. 1993. Appendix V: Saxon and Medieval Pottery. In T. W. Lane, *The Fenland Project Number 8: Lincolnshire Survey, the Northern Fen-Edge*, 107-08. East Anglian Archaeology Report 66.
- Healey, H. 1994. *An Archaeological Watching Brief at South Cockerington, Lincolnshire*. Unpublished report.
- Hebditch, M. 1967-68. A Saxo-Norman Pottery Kiln Discovered in Southgate Street, Leicester, 1964. *The Leicestershire Archaeological and Historical Society* 43: 4-9.
- Henken, E. R. 1983. The Saint as Folk Hero: Biographical Patterning in Welsh Hagiography. In P. K. Ford (ed.), *Celtic Folklore and Christianity: Studies in Memory of William W. Heist*, 58-74. Santa Barbara: McNally and Loftin.
- Heritage Protection Bill*. For a discussion of the reasons why the Heritage Protection Bill has been put on hold, see <http://www.englishheritage.org.uk/server/show/nav.20038>. A draft version (2008) can be downloaded from www.culture.gov.uk/images/publications/DraftHeritageProtectionBill.pdf.
- Hey, G. and M. Lacey. 2001. *Evaluation of Archaeological Decision-making Processes and Sampling Strategies*. Oxford: Oxford Archaeological Unit, with Kent County Council.
- Higgitt, J. 1991. Regional Geology. In J. Lang, *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture Volume III: York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 44-47. Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy.
- Hill, F. 1965. *Medieval Lincoln*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinton, D. A. 1974. *A Catalogue of the Anglo-Saxon Ornamental Metalwork 700-1100 in the Department of Antiquities, Ashmolean Museum*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hinton, D. A. 2000. *A Smith in Lindsey: The Anglo-Saxon Grave at Tattershall Thorpe, Lincolnshire*. London: The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph Series 16.
- Hinton, D. A. 2003. Anglo-Saxon Smiths and Myths. In D. Scragg (ed.), *Textual and Material Culture in Anglo-Saxon England; Thomas Northcote Toller and the Toller Memorial Lectures*, 261-82. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- Hodges, R. 1982. *Dark-Age Economics: The Origins of Towns and Trade AD 600-1000*. London: Duckworth.
- Hodges, R. 1988. The Rebirth of Towns in the Early Middle Ages. In R. Hodges and B. Hobley (eds), *The Rebirth of Towns in the West AD 700 – 1050*. Council for British Archaeology: Research Report 68.
- Hodges, R. 1996. Dream Cities: Emporia and the End of the Dark Ages. In N. Christie and S. T. Loseby (eds), *Towns in Transition: Urban Evolution in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, 288-305. Aldershot: Scolar Press.
- Hodges, R. and D. Whitehouse. 1983. *Mohammed, Charlemagne and the Origins of Europe; Archaeology and the Pirenne Thesis*. London: Duckworth.
- Horde, P. 2000. The Abrams Test: Ancient and Medieval Cities in Recent Historiography. *Journal of Urban History* 26: 479-92.
- Hunter-Mann, K. 2006. *The Old Vicarage, 48 Church Lane, Stallingborough, North-East Lincolnshire: An Interim report on an Archaeological Excavation and Watching Brief*. York Archaeological Trust report.
- Hurst, J. 1984. The Development of Medieval Pottery Research in Lincolnshire. In F. N. Field and A. J. White (eds), *A Prospect of Lincolnshire*, 64-68. Lincoln: private publication.
- Hyland, A. 1994. *The Medieval Warhorse from Byzantium to the Crusades*. Stroud: Allan Sutton.
- Hyslop, M. M. 1963. The Two Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries at Chamberlains Barn Pit, Leighton Buzzard. *Archaeological Journal* 120: 181 ff.
- Ingold, T. 1993. The Temporality of the Landscape. *World Archaeology* 25: 152-74.
- Irving, A. 1995. HT95: Assessment Report on the Post-Roman Pottery. In N. Field and M. McDaid, *Alford Road Huttoft; Archaeological Evaluation*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report.
- Jarvis, M. 1996. *Central Library, Lincoln. Archaeological Excavation and Assessment*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 173.
- Jarvis, M. 1997. *Sessions House, Archaeological Evaluation*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 302.
- Jarvis, M. 2000. *Development on Land at St Michael's Terrace, Michaelgate, Lincoln: Archaeological Watching Brief*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 415.
- Jennings, S. and C. Jones. 1999. Post-Roman Pottery. In C. Colyer, B. J. J. Gilmour and M. J. Jones, *The Defences of the Lower City: Excavations at the Park and West Parade 1970-2 and a Discussion of Other Sites Excavated up to 1994*, 135-38. The Archaeology of Lincoln VII/2. Council of British Archaeology for the City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Johnson, M. 1999. *Archaeological Theory: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Johnson, S. 1997a. *Archaeological Field Evaluation Report (Part 2): Land North of Church Lane, Manby, Lincolnshire*. PCA 97/11.

- Johnson, S. 1997b. *The Willows, Barton Street, Barrow Upon Humber: Report on an Archaeological Evaluation*. York Archaeological Trust Report 1997/27.
- Johnson, S. and C. Palmer-Brown. 1995. *Abbey Far, Alvingham: An Archaeological Watching Brief Report*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report.
- Jones, G. 2000. Site Phasing. *Fieldwork in Fillingham, Lincolnshire*. Vol. 2, 3-10. Department of Archaeology and Prehistory, University of Sheffield report.
- Jones, M. J. and R. H. Jones. 1977. The Broadgate East Site. In L. Adams (ed.), *Medieval Pottery from Broadgate East, Lincoln 1973*, 5-6. The Archaeology of Lincoln 17.1. London: The Council for British Archaeology for the Lincoln Archaeological Trust.
- Jones, M. J., D. Stocker and A. Vince. 2003. *The City by the Pool: Assessing the Archaeology of the City of Lincoln*. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 10. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Jones, R. and M. Page. 2006. *Medieval Villages in an English Landscape*. Macclesfield: Windgather.
- Jones, S. R., K. Major and J. Varley. 1990. *Survey of Ancient Houses III: Houses in Eastgate, Priorygate, and James Street*. Lincoln: Lincoln Civic Trust.
- Jones, S. R., K. Major and J. Varley. 1996. *Survey of Ancient Houses IV: Houses in the Bail: Steep Hill, Castle Hill and Bailgate*. Lincoln: Lincoln Civic Trust.
- Jonsson, K. 2006. The Pre-reform Coinage of Edgar – the Legacy of the Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms. In B. Cook and G. Williams (eds), *Coinage and History in the North Sea World, c. AD 500 – 1250: Essays in Honour of Marion Archibald*, 325-46. Leiden: Brill.
- Jonsson, K. and G. van der Meer. 1990. Mints and Moneyers c. 973-1066. In K. Jonsson (ed.), *Studies in Late Anglo-Saxon Coinage in Memory of Bror Emil Hildebrand*, 47-136. Numismatiska Meddelanden XXXV. Stockholm: Svenska Numismatiska Föreningen.
- Karkov, C. E., S. Larratt Keefer and K. L. Jolly (eds). 2006. *The Place of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
- Kemp, R. L. 1996. *Anglian Settlement at 46-54 Fishergate*. The Archaeology of York 7/1. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Kermode, P. M. C. 1892. *Catalogue of the Manks Crosses with the Runic Inscriptions and Various Readings and Renderings Compared*. 2nd ed. Isle of Man: C. B. Heyes, Ramsey Courier Office.
- Kershaw, A. 1998. The Lincolnshire National Mapping Programme. In R. H. Bewley (ed.), *Lincolnshire's Archaeology from the Air*, 18-22.
- Kershaw, J. in prep. *Gender and Culture in the Danelaw: Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian brooches, 850-1050*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Oxford.
- Keynes, S. and M. Lapidge. 1983. *Alfred the Great: Asser's Life of Alfred and other Contemporary Sources*. London: Penguin.
- Kilmurry, K. 1980. *The Pottery Industry of Stamford, Lincs.; c. A.D. 850-1250: Its Manufacture, Trade and Relationship with Continental Wares, with a Classification and Chronology*. Oxford: BAR British Series 84.
- Kilger, C. 2006. Silver Handling Traditions During the Viking Age – Some Observations and Thoughts on the Phenomenon of Pecking and Bending. In B. Cook and G. Williams (eds), *Coinage and History in the North Sea World, c. AD 500 – 1250: Essays in Honour of Marion Archibald*, 449-65. Leiden: Brill.
- Kitch, J. 2006. *Archaeological Watching Brief on Groundworks at Willow Cottage, Church Lane, Brigsley, North East Lincolnshire (BCW05)*. Archaeological Project Services report 95/06.
- Kleniewski, N. 2002. *Cities, Change and Conflict: A Political Economy of Urban Life*. 2nd ed. Belmont: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Knappett, C. 2002. Photographs, Skeudomorphs and Marionettes; Some Thoughts on Mind, Agency and Object. *Journal of Material Culture* 7 (1), 97-117.
- Knowles, C. 1974. An Eighth-Century Gilded Bronze Disc from Flixborough. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 9: 29.
- Konvitz, J. W. 1985. *The Urban Millennium: The City Building Process from the Early Middle Ages to the Present*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Kopytoff, I. 1986. The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process. In A. Appadurai (ed.), *The Social Life of Things; Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, 64-91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kruse, S. E. 1993. Silver Storage and Circulation in Viking Age Scotland. In C. E. Batey, J. Jesch and C. D. Morris (eds), *The Viking Age in Caithness, Orkney and the North Atlantic: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Eleventh Viking Congress, Thurso and Kirkwall, 22 August – 1 September 1989*, 187-203. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- La Rocca, C. 2001. Perceptions of an Early Medieval Urban Landscape. In P. Lineham and J. L. Nelson (eds), *The Medieval World*, 416-31. London: Routledge.
- Land to the North of Conging Street, Horncastle, Lincs; NGR: TF 2599 6977; Archaeological*

- Evaluation*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 481 (2000).
- Lane, T. W. 1993. *The Fenland Project Number 8: Lincolnshire Survey, the Northern Fen-Edge*. East Anglian Archaeology report 66.
- Lane, T. and P. Hayes. 1993. The South-Eastern Witham Fens. In T. W. Lane, *The Fenland Project Number 8: Lincolnshire Survey, the Northern Fen-Edge*, 13-23. East Anglian Archaeology report 66.
- Lang, J. 1976. Sigurd and Weland in Pre-Conquest Carving from Northern England. *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 48: 83-94.
- Lang, J. 1991. *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture Volume III: York and Eastern Yorkshire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy.
- Lang, J. 2001. *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture Volume VI: Northern Yorkshire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy.
- Lapidge, M. 2001. Paulinus. In M. Lapidge, J. Blair, S. Keynes and D. Scragg (eds), *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, 359. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Laughlin, N. and K. Miller. 1979. *A Survey of Archaeological Sites in Humberside; Carried out for the Humberside Joint Archaeological Committee*. Kingston upon Hull: Humberside Libraries and Amenities.
- Leahy, K. 1993. The Anglo-Saxon Settlement of Lindsey. In A. Vince (ed.), *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, 29-44. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 1. Lincoln: Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Leahy, K. 1998. The Early Saxon Context. In G. Drinkall and M. Foreman (eds), *The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Castledyke South, Barton-on-Humber*, 6-17. Sheffield Excavation Reports 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Leahy, K. 2004. Detecting the Vikings in Lincolnshire. *Current Archaeology* 190: 462-68.
- Leahy, K. 2007. *The Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey*. Stroud: Tempus.
- Leahy, K. and C. Coutts. 1987 *The Lost Kingdom: The Search for Anglo-Saxon Lindsey*. Scunthorpe: Scunthorpe Museum.
- Leahy, K. and C. Paterson. 2001. New Light on the Viking Presence in Lincolnshire: the Artefactual Evidence. In J. Graham-Campbell, R. Hall, J. Jesch and D. N. Parsons (eds), *Vikings and the Danelaw: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress*, 181-202. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Leeds, E. T. 1936. *Early Anglo-Saxon Art and Archaeology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leone, M. P. 2007. Middle Range Theory in Historical Archaeology. In J. M. Skibo, M. W. Graves and M. T. Stark (eds), *Archaeological Anthropology: Perspectives on Method and Theory*, 21-39. Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press.
- Lewarch, D. E. and M. J. O'Brien. 1981. The Expanding Role of Surface Assemblages in Archaeological Research. *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 4, 297-342.
- Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. 2001. *The Decline and Fall of the Roman City*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lillie, M. 1998. Landuse in the Ancholme and Lower Trent Valleys. In R. Van de Noort and S. Ellis (eds), *Wetland Heritage of the Ancholme and Lower Trent Valleys*, 15-20. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- Lillie, M. and B. Gearey. 2001. Introduction to the Palaeoenvironmental Survey. In S. Ellis, H. Fenwick, M. Lillie and R. Van de Noort (eds), *Wetland Heritage of the Lincolnshire Marsh: An Archaeological Survey*, 21-29. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- Lillie, M. and H. Neumann. 1998. The Palaeoenvironmental Survey of the Lower Trent Valley and Winterton Beck. In R. Van de Noort and S. Ellis (eds), *Wetland Heritage of the Ancholme and Lower Trent Valleys*, 33-72. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- Longden, G. 2003. Iconoclasm, Belief and Memory in Early Medieval Wales. In H. Williams (ed.), *Archaeologies of Remembrance: Death and Memory in Past Societies*, 171-92. New York: Kluwer Academic Press/Plenum Publishers.
- Loveluck, C. 1997. Uncovering an Anglo-Saxon 'Royal' Manor. *British Archaeology* 28: 8-9.
- Loveluck, C. 1998. A High-Status Anglo-Saxon Settlement at Flixborough, Lincolnshire. *Antiquity* 72: 146-61.
- Loveluck, C. 2001. Wealth, Waste and Conspicuous Consumption: Flixborough and its Importance for Middle and Late Saxon Rural Settlement Studies. In H. Hamerow and A. MacGregor (eds), *Image and Power: Essays in Honour of Rosemary Cramp*, 78-130. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Loveluck, C. 2007. *Rural Settlement, Lifestyles and Social Change in the Later First Millennium AD: Anglo-Saxon Flixborough and its Wider Context*. Excavations at Flixborough 4. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Loveluck, C. 2009. A Note on the Lava Querns from Flixborough. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 248. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.

- Loveluck, C. and D. Atkinson (eds). 2007. *The Early Medieval Settlement Remains From Flixborough, Lincolnshire: The Occupation Sequence, c. AD 600-1000*. Excavations at Flixborough 1. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Loyn, H. R. 1987. The Beyond of Domesday Book. In J. C. Holt (ed.), *Domesday Studies*, 1-13. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
- Lucy, S. 2005. Ethnic and Cultural Identities. In M. Díaz-Andreu, S. Lucy, S. Babic, and D. N. Edwards (eds), *The Archaeology of Identity: Approaches to Gender, Age, Status, Ethnicity and Religion*, 86-109. London: Routledge.
- MacDonald, S. 2006. Words in Stone? Agency and Identity in a Nazi Landscape. *Journal of Material Culture* 11, 105-26.
- MacGregor, A. 1987. Objects of Bone and Antler. In G. Beresford, *Goltho: The Development of an Early Medieval Manor, c. 850-1150*, 188-93. London: Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England/English Heritage.
- MacGregor, A., A. J. Mainman and N. S. H. Rogers. 1999. *Craft, Industry and Everyday Life: Bone, Antler, Ivory and Horn from Anglo-Scandinavian and Medieval York*. The Archaeology of York 17/12: The Small Finds. York: Council for British Archaeology.
- MacMahon, A. and J. Price (eds). 2005. *Roman Working Lives and Urban Living*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- MacPherson, P. 2006. *Tracing Change: An Isotopic Investigation of Anglo-Saxon Childhood Diet*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Sheffield.
- Mahany, C. 1982. Two Urban Sites and a Saxo-Norman Pottery Kiln. In C. Mahany, A. Burchard and G. Simpson (eds), *Excavations in Stamford, Lincolnshire, 1963-1969*, 13-104. London: The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 9.
- Mahany, C., A. Burchard and G. Simpson. 1982. *Excavations in Stamford, Lincolnshire, 1963-1969*. London: The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 9.
- Mainman, A. J. 1990. *Anglo-Scandinavian Pottery from Coppergate*. The Archaeology of York 16/5. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Mainman, A. 1993. Imported Wares in York. In D. Piton (ed.), *Travaux du Groupe de Recherches et D'Etudes sur la Céramique dans le Nord – Pas-de-Calais; Actes du Collque D'Outreau (10 -12 Avril 1992)*, 189-93. Numéro hors-série de Nord-Ouest Archéologie.
- Mainman, A. J. and N.S.H. Rogers. 2000. *Craft, Industry and Everyday Life: Finds from Anglo-Scandinavian York*. The Archaeology of York 17/14. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Main Street, New Medical Centre and Housing, Torksey*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report (2002).
- Maitland, F. W. 1987. *Domesday Book and Beyond: Three Essays in the Early History of England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malone, S. 2001. *Archaeological Evaluation at Hall Lane, Burgh-le-Marsh, Lincolnshire*. Archaeological Project Services report 16/01.
- Malone, S. 2009. *Excavations at the Site of The Collection, Danes Terrace, Lincoln*. Archaeological Project Services report 20/09.
- Mann, J. 1982. *Early Medieval Finds from Flaxengate I: Objects of Antler, Bone, Stone, Horn, Ivory, Amber, and Jet*. The Archaeology of Lincoln XIV/1. The Council for British Archaeology for the Lincoln Archaeological Trust.
- Mann, J. 1986. Small Finds. In B. J. J. Gilmour and D. A. Stocker (eds), *St Mark's Church and Cemetery*, 41-43. The Archaeology of Lincoln XIII/1. The Council for British Archaeology for the Trust for Lincolnshire Archaeology.
- Mann, J. 1996. Registered Finds and Bulk Materials Assessment. In M. Jarvis, *Central Library, Lincoln. Archaeological Excavation and Assessment*, 53 ff. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 173.
- Mann, J. 1998. Registered Finds and Bulk Materials. In R. Trimble, *St Mark's Station, High Street, Lincoln: Archaeological Investigation (vol. 2)*, 9-15. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 338.
- Mann, J. 1999a. The Finds. In: *The Sessions House, Monks Road, Lincoln: Archaeological Watching Brief*, 29-49. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 312.
- Mann, J. 1999b. Other Artefacts. In C. Colyer, B. J. J. Gilmour and M. J. Jones (eds), *The Defences of the Lower City: Excavations at the Park and West Parade 1970-2 and a Discussion of Other Sites Excavated up to 1994*, 146-69 and 224-36. The Archaeology of Lincoln VII/2. Council of British Archaeology for the City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Mann, J. 2001. Appendix E: Registered and Bulk Finds. In R. Trimble, *Site of the Proposed City & County Museum, Danesgate, Lincoln: Archaeological Evaluation*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 458.
- Mann, J. 2009. Some Finds from the Site of the New City and County Museum, Flaxengate, Lincoln (LDG03). In S. Malone, *Excavations at the Site of The Collection, Danes Terrace, Lincoln*. Archaeological Project Services report 20/09.

- Margeson, S. 1993. *Norwich Households: The Medieval and Post-Medieval Finds from Norwich Survey Excavations 1971-78*. East Anglian Archaeology report 58.
- Margeson, S. 1997. *The Vikings in Norfolk*. Norfolk: Norfolk Museums Service.
- Marjoram, J. 1973. Archaeological Notes, 1972. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 8: 35-49.
- Marjoram, J. 1974. Archaeological Notes, 1973. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 9: 17-34.
- Marshall, C. 1986. *Buckles Through the Ages*. Unknown publisher.
- Maxwell, R. A. 2007. *The Art of Medieval Urbanism: Parthenay in Romanesque Aquitaine*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Mays, S. 2004. After the Bone Report: The Long-Term Fate of Skeletal Collections. In M. Brickley and J. I. McKinley (eds), *Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains*, 46-47. IFA Paper 7.
- Mays, S. 2005. *Guidance for Best Practice for Treatment of Human Remains Excavated from Christian Burial Grounds in England*. English Heritage Document. Available on www.english-heritage.org.uk/upload/pdf/16602_HumanRemains1.pdf.
- McAlister, D. 2008. *Gender, Age and Visibility: The Archaeology of Women and Children in Ireland, 700-1200 AD*. Unpublished PhD thesis, National University of Ireland, Maynooth.
- McAlister, D. forthcoming. Childhood in Viking and Medieval Dublin 800 – 1100. In D. M. Hadley and L. Ten Harkel (eds), *Everyday Life in Viking 'Towns': Social Approaches to Viking Age Towns in Ireland and England, c. 850-1100 AD*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- McKinley, J. I. and C. Roberts. 1993. *Excavation and Post-Excavation Treatment of Cremated and Inhumed Human Remains*. IFA Technical Paper 13.
- Meaney, A. L. 1964. *A Gazetteer of Early Anglo-Saxon Burial Sites*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Meaney, A. L. and S. C. Hawkes. 1970. *Two Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries at Winnall, Winchester, Hampshire*. Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 4, London: Society for Medieval Archaeology.
- Metcalf, D. M. 2007. Regions around the North Sea with a Monetised Economy in the Pre-Viking and Viking Ages. In J. Graham-Campbell and G. Williams (eds), *Silver Economy in the Viking Age*, 1-11. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Meulengracht Sørensen, P. 1997. Religions Old and New. In P. Sawyer (ed.), *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Vikings*, 202-24. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Middleton, N. 2005. Early Medieval Port Customs, Tolls and Controls on Foreign Trade. *Early Medieval Europe* 13 (4): 313-58.
- Middleton, R. 1998. Landuse in the Ancholme and Lower Trent Valleys. In R. Van de Noort and S. Ellis (eds), *Wetland Heritage of the Ancholme and Lower Trent Valleys*, 15-20. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- Miles, P. 1989. The Kilns. In P. Miles, J. Young and J. Wachter (eds), *A Late Saxon Kiln Site at Silver Street, Lincoln*, 185-94. The Archaeology of Lincoln XVII/3. The Council for British Archaeology for the Lincoln Archaeological Trust.
- Miles, P. J. Young and J. Wachter. 1989. *A Late Saxon Kiln Site at Silver Street, Lincoln*. The Archaeology of Lincoln XVII/3. The Council for British Archaeology for the Lincoln Archaeological Trust.
- Mills, N. 1985. Regional Analysis and Fieldwalking in British Archaeology. In C. Haselgrove, M. Millett and I. Smith (eds), *Archaeology from the Ploughsoil: Studies in the Collection and Interpretation of Field Survey Data*, 39-47. Sheffield: Department of Archaeology and Prehistory, University of Sheffield.
- Mills, N. 2001. *Saxon and Viking Artefacts*. Witham: Greenlight.
- Mitchell, B. and F. C. Robinson. 1998. *Beowulf: An Edition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mitson, A. 1995. Select Documentary Evidence for the Parish of Aylesby. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 30: 13-16.
- Morgan, P. and C. Thorne. 1986. *Domesday Book; A Survey of the Counties of England*. Vol. 31: Lincolnshire. 2 vols. Chichester: Phillimore.
- Morris, S. and M. Holmes. 2002. *Land off Baldwin Avenue, Bottesford, Scunthorpe: Archaeological Evaluation*. Northamptonshire Archaeology report.
- Mossop, H. R. (ed.). 1970. *The Lincoln Mint c. 890 – 1279*. Newcastle: Corbitt & Hunter Limited.
- Moulden, J. and D. Tweddle. 1986. *Anglo-Scandinavian Settlement South-west of the Ouse*. The Archaeology of York 8/1. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Mudd, A. and B. Lewis. 2004. *Archaeological Evaluation at Brayford Wharf North, Lincoln, Sept. 2003*. Northamptonshire Archaeology report.
- Müller-Wille, M. and A. Tummuscheit. 2004. Viking-Age Proto-Urban Centres and their Hinterlands: Some Examples from the Baltic Area. In J. Hines, A. Lane and M. Redknapp

- (eds), *Land, Sea and Home; Proceedings of a Conference on Viking-Period Settlement at Cardiff, July 2001*, 27-39. Leeds: Maney Publishing.
- Musty, J. 1982. The Pottery Industry: A Commentary. In C. Mahany, A. Burchard and G. Simpson, *Excavations in Stamford, Lincolnshire, 1963-1969*, 10-11. London: The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 9.
- Muthesius, A. 1982a. *Eastern Silks in Western Shrines and Treasuries before 1200*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of London (Courtauld Institute).
- Muthesius, A. 1982b. The Silk Fragment from 5 Coppergate. In A. MacGregor, *Anglo-Scandinavian Finds from Lloyds Bank, Pavement and Other Sites*, 132-36. The Archaeology of York 17/3. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Mynard, D. C. 1969. Excavations at Somerby, Lincs., 1957. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 4: 63-91.
- Myres, J. N. L. 1969. *Anglo-Saxon Pottery and the Settlement of England*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myres, J. N. L. 1977. *A Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Pottery of the Pagan Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nailor, V. 2005. Nottingham-type Ware. In J. Young and A. Vince, *A Corpus of Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Pottery from Lincoln*, 73-74. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 7. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Nelson, J. 1993. The Political Ideas of Alfred of Wessex. In A. J. Duggan (ed.), *Kings and Kingship in Medieval Britain*, 125-58. London: King's College London Centre for Late Antique and Medieval Studies.
- Neumann, H. 1998. The Palaeoenvironmental Survey of the Ancholme Valley. In R. Van de Noort and S. Ellis (eds), *Wetland Heritage of the Ancholme and Lower Trent Valleys*, 75-102. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- Nighthawks and Nighthawking: Damage to Archaeological Sites in the UK & Crown Dependencies Caused by Illegal Searching & Removal of Antiquities*. 2009. Oxford Archaeology Report. Available from <http://www.helm.org.uk/server/show/nav.20434>.
- Nighthawking Survey Summary Report*. 2009. Available from <http://www.helm.org.uk/server/show/nav.20434>.
- Nightingale, P. 1982. Some London Moneyers, and Reflections on the Organisation of English Mints in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. *The Numismatic Chronicle* 142: 34-50.
- North, J. J. 1980. *English Hammered Coinage Vol. 1: Early Anglo-Saxon to Henry III, c. 600-1272*. London: Spink & Son.
- North Lincolnshire Pottery Type Series; Database of Roman, Saxon and Medieval Pottery*. Digital database of pottery held by the North Lincolnshire Museum and The Collection, Lincoln (in progress). Available at North Lincolnshire SMR. Used on 3 April 2008.
- Oakley, E. in prep. *Towns as Arenas of Social Interaction in Medieval Europe: Flanders and Eastern England Compared 900-1550*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Nottingham.
- O'Connor, T. 1982. *Animal Bones from Flaxengate, Lincoln, c. 870-1500*. The Archaeology of Lincoln XVIII-1. London: The Council for British Archaeology for the Lincoln Archaeological Trust.
- O'Donnabháin, B. 2001. *Immigrants and Indigenes: Morphological Variability and Irish-Viking Interactions in the Early Historic Period*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Chicago.
- O'Keefe, T. 2005. Medieval Towns, Modern Signs, Identity Inter-Spaces: Some Reflections in Historical Archaeology. In E. C. Casella and C. Fowler (eds), *The Archaeology of Plural and Changing Identities: Beyond Identification*, 11-32. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- O'Neill, J. 1997. Material Assessment; Artefactual Data; Pottery. In F. J. Green, *St Helen's, Cumberworth; Assessment Report*, 9-15. Hampshire Archaeology TVAT report 04/97.
- Orton, F. 2003. Rethinking the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Monuments: Some Strictures on Similarity; Some Questions of History. In C. E. Karkov and F. Orton, *Theorizing Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture*, 65-92. Morgantown: West Virginia University Press.
- Ottaway, P. 1992. *Anglo-Scandinavian Ironwork from 16-22 Coppergate*. The Archaeology of York 17/6: The Small Finds. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Ottaway, P. 1996. *Excavations and Observations on the Defences and Adjacent Sites, 1971-90*. The Archaeology of York 3/3. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Ottaway, P. 2007. The Coffin Fittings. In C. Loveluck and D. Atkinson (eds), *The Early Medieval Settlement Remains From Flixborough, Lincolnshire: The Occupation Sequence, c AD 600-1000*, 122-24. Excavations at Flixborough 1. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Ottaway, P. 2009a. Agricultural Tools. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 245. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Ottaway, P. 2009b. Five Iron Strap-ends. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and*

- Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 16. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Ottaway, P. 2009c. The Flixborough Tool Hoard. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 256-67. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Ottaway, P. 2009d. Horse Equipment. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 122-23. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Ottaway, P. 2009e. Iron Brooches. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 6-7. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Ottaway, P. 2009f. Iron Locks and Keys. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 187-95. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Ottaway, P. 2009g. Miscellaneous Iron Fixtures and Fittings. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 203-31. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Ottaway, P. 2009h. Possible Liturgical Objects: Iron Bells and Bell Clappers. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 141-42. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Ottaway, P. 2009i. Weapons and Armour. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 123. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Ottaway, P., D. Starley and C. Loveluck. 2009. Ironworking. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 317-28. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Ottaway, P., L. M. Wastling, N. Rogers, M. Foreman and D. Starley. 2009b. Domestic Fittings and Implements. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 165-243. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Owen, O. 2001. The Strange Beast that is the English Urnes Style. In J. Graham-Campbell, R. Hall, J. Jesch and D. N. Parsons (eds), *Vikings and the Danelaw: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress*, 203-22. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Owen-Crocker, G. R. 1986. *Dress in Anglo-Saxon England*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Pagan, H. E. 1987. *Presidential Address 1986*. *The British Numismatic Journal* 56: 207-209.
- Palat, R. A. 1991. Symbiotic Sisters: Bay of Bengal Ports in the Indian Ocean World Economy. In R. Kasaba (ed.), *Cities in the World-System*, 17-40. New York; Greenwood Press.
- Palmer-Brown, R. 1995. *Castle Farm, Torksey: An Archaeological Excavation*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report.
- Parkins, H. M. 1997. *Roman Urbanism: Beyond the Consumer City*. London: Routledge.
- Parkins, W. (ed.). 2002. *Fashioning the Body Politic: Dress, Gender, Citizenship*. Oxford: Berg.
- Patterson, J. R. 2006. *Landscapes and Cities: Rural Settlement and Civic Transformation in Early Imperial Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paxton, F. S. 1990. *Christianizing Death: The Creation of a Ritual Process in Early Medieval Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Perring, D. 1981. *Early Medieval Occupation at Flaxengate, Lincoln*. The Archaeology of Lincoln 9. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Perring, D. 2002. *Town and Country in England: Frameworks for Archaeological Research*. CBA Research Report 134. York: Council for British Archaeology.
- Perry, G. 2009. *An Analysis of the Pottery from Ditch Systems at the Multi-Period Site of West Halton, North Lincolnshire*. Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Sheffield.
- Pestell, T. 2009. The Styli. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 123-37. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Petersen, J. G. T. 1919. *De Norske Vikingesverd: En Typologisk-Kronologisk Studie over Vikingetidens Vaaben*. Kristiana.
- Petts, D. 2002. Memories in Stone. In H. Williams (ed.), *Archaeologies of Remembrance: Death and Memory in Past Societies*, 193-214. New York: Kluwer Academic Press/Plenum Publishers.
- Phillips, D., and B. Heywood. 1995. *Excavations at York Minster Vol. 1: From Roman Fortress to Norman Cathedral*. London: Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, HMSO.
- Philips, P. 1985. Excavation and Survey at Swinhope. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology*

- 20: 72-73.
- Philips, P. 1989. *Archaeology and Landscape Studies in North Lincolnshire Part 1: Excavations at North Lincolnshire Long Barrows*. BAR British series 208 (i).
- Phillips, S. and J. Young. 1994. *Assessment Report on the Post-Roman Pottery from Kirkgate, Newark (NKC94)*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 126.
- Piling and Archaeology; An English Heritage Guidance Note*. 2007. Available on http://www.english-heritage.org.uk/upload/pdf/Piling_for_Web_tagged.pdf.
- Pirenne, H. 1925. *Medieval Cities: Their Origins and the Revival of Trade*. Trans. D. Halsey. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pirie, E. J. E. 2009. The Northumbrian Coins. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 413-18. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Pitts, M. 2004. Cumbrian Heritage. *British Archaeology* 79: 28-31.
- Plot 3, St Michael's Terrace, Michaelgate, Lincoln: Archaeological Watching Brief*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 452 (2001).
- Poole, K. forthcoming. More Than Just Meat: Animals in Viking Age Towns. In D. M. Hadley and L. Ten Harkel (eds), *Everyday Life in Viking 'Townships': Social Approaches to Viking Age Towns in Ireland and England, c. 850-1100 AD*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Poole, K. in prep. *Identity in England, AD 410-1066: A Zooarchaeological Perspective*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Nottingham.
- Portable Antiquities*. Annual Report 1997-98. Department for Culture, Media and Sport.
- Portable Antiquities Scheme* (www.findsdatabase.org.uk/hms/home.php?publiclogin=1&expand=90).
- Postan, M. M. 1972. *The Medieval Economy and Society*. The Penguin Economic History of Britain 1. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- PPG16. Planning Policy Guidance 16: Archaeology and Planning*. Available on <http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/ppg16>.
- Precious, B., A. Vince and J. Young. 2004. Assessment of the Pottery from the Trial Excavation. In J. Bradley, J. Fraser and K. Steedman, *An Archaeological Evaluation at Countess Close, Alkborough, North Lincolnshire*, 29-32. Humber Archaeology report 153.
- Price, N. forthcoming. *The Viking Way: Religion and War in Late Iron Age Scandinavia*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Pullen, R. 2005. *Old Bolingbroke, Lincolnshire: Archaeological Watching Brief, Anglian Water Sewerage Pipeline across Land in and to the South of Old Bolingbroke*. Lindsey Archaeology Services report 718.
- Pushkina, T. 2004. Viking Period Pre-Urban Settlements in Russia and Finds of Artefacts of Scandinavian Character. In J. Hines, A. Lane and M. Redknap (eds), *Land, Sea and Home: Proceedings of a Conference on Viking-Period Settlement at Cardiff, July 2001*, 41-53. Leeds: Maney Publishing.
- Ragon, M. 1983. *The Space of Death: A Study of Funerary Architecture, Decoration, and Urbanism*. Trans. A. Sheridan. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Rahtz, P. 1981. *The New Medieval Archaeology: Inaugural Lecture Delivered at the University of York, November 12 1980*. York: University of York Printing Unit.
- Rahtz, P. 1984. The New Medieval Archaeology: Theory vs. History - Comment on Driscoll. *Scottish Archaeological Review* 3.2, 109-12.
- Rainbird Clarke, R. and R. H. M. Dolley. 1958. The Morley St Peter Hoard. *Antiquity* 32: 100-103.
- Ramsey, E. 2001. *An Archaeological Evaluation at High Farm, Halton Hologate, Lincolnshire: A Post-Excavation Assessment and Research Design*. Birmingham University Field Archaeology Unit Project report 811.
- Rayner, T. 1998. *Market Stainton New Farm Crops Proposed Glasshouse Complex; NGR: TF 22700 80291; Archaeological Evaluation*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 320.
- Rayner, T. 2002. *Archaeological Watching Brief on Land at Church Road, Huttoft, Lincolnshire*. Archaeological Project Services report 102/02.
- Reece, R. and S. James. 1986. *Identifying Roman Coins: A Practical Guide to the Identification of Site Finds in Britain*. London: Seaby.
- Residential Development, Michaelgate, Lincoln, Lincolnshire: Archaeological Watching Brief*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 369 (1999).
- Reynolds, A. 1999. *Later Anglo-Saxon England: Life and Landscape*. Stroud: Tempus.
- Reynolds, A. 2003. Boundaries and Settlements in Later Sixth to Eleventh Century England. In D. Griffiths, A. Reynolds and S. Semple (eds), *Boundaries in Early Medieval Britain*, 98-136. Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History 12. Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology.
- Reynolds, A. 2009a. *Anglo-Saxon Deviant Burial Customs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reynolds, A. 2009b. Meaningful Landscapes. In R. Gilchrist and A. Reynolds (eds),

- Reflections: 50 Years of Medieval Archaeology, 1957-2007*, 409-34. Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 30. Leeds; Maney Publishing.
- Reynolds, A. and L. Ten Harkel forthcoming. *The Eleventh-century Pewterer's Hoard from Cheapside, London*.
- Reynolds, S. 1987. Towns in Domesday Book. In J. C. Holt (ed.), *Domesday Studies*, 295-309. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
- Richards, J. D. 2002. The Case of the Missing Vikings: Scandinavian Burial in the Danelaw. In S. Lucy and A. Reynolds (eds), *Burial in Early Medieval England and Wales*, 157-70. London: Society for Medieval Archaeology.
- Richards, J. D. 2004a. Excavations at the Viking Barrow Cemetery at Heath Wood, Ingleby, Derbyshire. *The Antiquaries Journal* 84: 23-116.
- Richards, J. D. 2004b. *Viking Age England*. Stroud: Tempus.
- Risvaag, J. A. and A. Christophersen. 2004. Early Medieval Coinage and Urban Development: A Norwegian Experience. In J. Hines, A. Lane and M. Redknap (eds), *Land, Sea and Home: Proceedings of a Conference on Viking-Period Settlement at Cardiff, July 2001*, 75-91. Leeds: Maney Publishing.
- Roberts, B. K. 1996. *Landscapes of Settlement: Prehistory to the Present*. London: Routledge.
- Roberts, B. K. 2008. *Landscapes, Documents and Maps: Villages in Northern England and Beyond AD 900-1250*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Robertson, A. J. (ed. and trans.). 1925. *The Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robinson, T. and M. Aston. 2003. *Archaeology is Rubbish: A Beginner's Guide*. Channel 4 Books.
- Rodwell, W. 2007. St Peter's Church: Its Setting and Community. In: *St Peter's, Barton-upon-Humber, Lincolnshire: A Parish Church and its Community. Volume 2: The Human Remains*, T. Waldron, 1-14. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Rodwell, W. and K. Rodwell. 1982. St Peter's Church, Barton-upon-Humber: Excavation and Structural Study. *Antiquaries Journal* 62: 283-315.
- Roesdahl, E., J. Graham-Campbell, P. Connor and K. Pearson. 1981. *The Vikings in England and in their Danish Homeland*. London: The Anglo-Danish Viking Project.
- Roffe, D. 1986. *Domesday Book* and the Local Historian. *Nottinghamshire Historian* 37: 3-5.
- Roffe, D. 2000. *Domesday: The Inquest and the Book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roffe, D. 2007. *Decoding Domesday*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
- Rogers, N. 1993. *Anglian Finds from 46-54 Fishergate*. The Archaeology of York 17/9. York: York Archaeological Trust.
- Rogers, N. 2009a. Copper-alloy Vessels and Container Mounts. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 115-21. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Rogers, N. 2009b. Jewellery. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 28-29. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Rogers, N. 2009c. The Pins. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 32-79. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Rogers, N. 2009d. Silver Ingot for Bullion-based Exchange. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 422. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Rogers, N. 2009e. Toilet Implements. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 30-32. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Rogers, N. and P. Ottaway. 2009. Buckles. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 22-28. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Rogers, N., J. Hines, P. Ottaway, J. Jones and I. Panter. 2009. Brooches. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 1-7. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Roskams, S. 1996. Urban Transition in Early Medieval Britain: The Case of York. In N. Christie and S. T. Loseby (eds), *Towns in Transition: Urban Evolution in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, 213-34. Aldershot: Scolar Press.
- Roskams, S. 2001. *Excavation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rylatt, J. 2000a. *Archaeological Evaluation Report; Land at the Green, Orby, Lincolnshire; NGR: TF 4911 6728*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report 00/29.
- Rylatt, J. 2000b. *Archaeological Watching Brief Report; Manor Road, Hagworthingham, Lincolnshire*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report 00/19.
- Samellas, A. 2002. *Death in the Eastern Mediterranean (50-600 A.D.); The Christianisation*

- of the East: An Interpretation. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Sawyer, B. 2003. *The Viking-Age Rune-Stones: Custom and Commemoration in Early Medieval Scandinavia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sawyer, P. 1986. Early Fairs and Markets in England and Scandinavia. In B. L. Anderson and A. J. H. Latham (eds), *The Market in History*, 59-77. London: Croom Helm.
- Sawyer, P. 1998. *Anglo-Saxon Lincolnshire*. A History of Lincolnshire 3. Lincoln: History of Lincolnshire Committee.
- Senior, J. R. 1991. Regional Geology. In J. Lang, *Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture Volume III: York and Eastern Yorkshire*, 11-15. Oxford: Oxford University Press for The British Academy.
- The Sessions House, Monks Road, Lincoln: Archaeological Watching Brief*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit Report 312 (1999).
- Shanks, M. 2008. Post-Processual Archaeology and After. In R. A. Bentley, H. D. G. Maschner and C. Chippindale (eds), *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*, 133-44. Lanham: Alta Mira Press.
- Sheehan, J. 2004. Social and Economic Integration in Viking-Age Ireland: The Evidence of the Hoards. In J. Hines, A. Lane and M. Redknap (eds), *Land, Sea and Home: Proceedings of a Conference on Viking-Period Settlement at Cardiff, July 2001*, 177-88. Leeds: Maney Publishing.
- Sillar, B. 1997. Reputable Pots and Disreputable Potters: Individual and Community Choice in Present-Day Pottery Production and Exchange in the Andes. In C. G. Cumberpatch and P. W. Blinkhorn (eds), *Not So Much a Pot, More a Way of Life: Current Approaches to Artefact Analysis in Archaeology*, 1-20. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Sills, J. 1982. St Peter's Church, Holton-le-Clay, Lincolnshire. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 17: 29-42.
- Sills, J. and F. A. Heath. 1976. *Holton-le-Clay*. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 11: 58-59.
- Simmel, G. 1904. Fashion. Reprinted in: *American Journal of Sociology* 62 (6): 541-558.
- Simpson, G. 1982. Two Medieval Pottery Kilns. In C. Mahany, A. Burchard and G. Simpson, *Excavations in Stamford, Lincolnshire, 1963-1969*, 155-75. London: The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 9.
- Sjøvold, T. 1957. *The Oseberg Find and Other Viking Ship Finds*. Oslo: Universitetets Okdsaksamling.
- Small Find*. <http://www.answers.com/topic/small-find>.
- Smart, V. 1970. A Note on the Moneys of the Mint of Lincoln. In H. R. Mossop (ed.), *The Lincoln Mint c. 890 - 1279*, 20-27. Newcastle: Corbitt & Hunter Limited.
- Smart, V. 1985. The Moneys of St Edmund. *Hikuin* 11: 83-90.
- Smart, V. 1986. Scandinavians, Celts, and Germans in Anglo-Saxon England: The Evidence of Moneys' Names. In M. A. S. Blackburn (ed.), *Anglo-Saxon Monetary History*, 171-84. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Snee, J. 2000. *Archaeological Watching Brief of Development at Hall Lane, Burgh-le-Marsh, Lincolnshire*. Archaeological Project Services report 106/00.
- Staecker, J. 2003. The Cross Goes North: Christian Symbols and Scandinavian Women. In M. Carver (ed.), *The Cross Goes North. Processes of Conversion in Northern Europe, AD 300-1300*, 463-482. York: York Medieval Press.
- Stafford, P. 1978. Historical Implications of the Regional Production of Dies under Æthelred II. *The British Numismatic Journal* 48: 35-51.
- Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Excavation*. IFA document, available on <http://www.archaeologists.net/modules/icontent/index.php?page=15>.
- Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Field Evaluation*. IFA document, available on <http://www.archaeologists.net/modules/icontent/index.php?page=15>.
- Standard and Guidance for the Collection, Documentation, Conservation and Research of Archaeological Materials*. IFA document, available on <http://www.archaeologists.net/modules/icontent/index.php?page=15>.
- Steane, K. 1991. St Paul-in-the-Bail: A Dated Sequence? *Lincoln Archaeology 1990-1991*, 28-31.
- Steane, K., M. J. Darling, M. J. Jones, J. Mann, A. Vince and J. Young. 2006. *The Archaeology of the Upper City and Adjacent Suburbs*. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 3. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Steane, K., M. J. Darling, M. J. Jones, J. Mann, A. Vince and J. Young. forthcoming. *The Archaeology of the Lower City and Adjacent Suburbs*. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 4. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Steane, K., M. J. Darling, J. Mann, A. Vince and J. Young. 2001. *The Archaeology of Wigford and the Brayford Pool*. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Steedman, K. 1994. Excavation of an Anglo-Saxon Site at Riby Cross Roads, Lincolnshire. *Archaeological Journal* 151: 212-306.

- Steedman, K. and M. Foreman. 1995. Excavations at Aylesby, South Humberside, 1994. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 30: 12-37.
- Stenton, F. 1979. *Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stenton, F. 2001. *Anglo-Saxon England*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stewart, I. 1967. The St Martin Coins of Lincoln. *The British Numismatic Journal* 36: 46-54.
- Stewart, I. 1983. The Anonymous Anglo-Viking Issue with Sword and Hammer types and the Coinage of Sihtric I. *The British Numismatic Journal* 52: 108-16.
- Stewart, I. 1990. Coinage and Re-coinage after Edgar's Reform. In K. Jonsson (ed.), *Studies in Late Anglo-Saxon Coinage; In Memory of Bror Emil Hildebrand*, 455-85. Numismatiska Meddelanden XXXV. Stockholm: Svenska Numismatiska Föreningen.
- Stocker, D. 1986. Discussion. In B. J. J. Gilmour and D. A. Stocker (eds), *St Mark's Church and Cemetery*, 83-93. The Archaeology of Lincoln XIII/1. The Council for British Archaeology for the Trust for Lincolnshire Archaeology.
- Stocker, D. 1989. Review of G. Beresford, 'Goltho: The Development of of an Early Medieval Manor c. 850-1150'. *Archaeological Journal* 14: 627-29.
- Stocker, D. 1991. *St Mary's Guildhall, Lincoln: The Survey and Excavation of a Medieval Building Complex*. The Archaeology of Lincoln 12.1. London: The Council for British Archaeology for the City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Stocker, D. 1993. The Early Church in Lincolnshire. In A. Vince (ed.), *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, 101-22. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 1. Lincoln: Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Stocker, D. 2000. Monuments and Merchants: Irregularities in the Distribution of Stone Sculpture in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire in the Tenth Century. In D. M. Hadley and J. D. Richards (eds), *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, 179-212. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Stocker, D. 2006. *The East Midlands*. London: Collins.
- Stocker, D. 2007. Funerary Stonework: Pre-Conquest Stonework – The Early Graveyard in Context. In: *The Churchyard*, S. Mays, C. Harding and C. Heighway, 271-87. Wharram: A Study of Settlement on the Yorkshire Wolds XI. York University Archaeological Publications 13. York: Wharram Research Project and Department of Archaeology.
- Stocker, D. forthcoming. Aristocrats, Priests and Burghers: Patterns in the foundation of Lincoln's Urban Churches. In D. M. Hadley and L. Ten Harkel (eds), *Everyday Life in Viking 'Towns': Social Approaches to Viking Age Towns in Ireland and England, c. 850-1100 AD*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Stocker, D. and P. Everson. 2001. Five Towns Funerals: Decoding Diversity in Danelaw Stone Sculpture. In J. Graham-Campbell, R. Hall, J. Jesch and D. N. Parsons (eds), *Vikings and the Danelaw: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress, Nottingham and York, 21-30 August 1997*, 223-43. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Stocker, D. and P. Everson. 2003. The Straight and Narrow Way: Fenland Causeways and the Conversion of the Landscape in the Witham Valley, Lincolnshire. In M. Carver (ed.), *The Cross Goes North: Processes of Conversion in Northern Europe, AD 300-1300*, 271-88. York: York Medieval Press in association with Boydell & Brewer.
- Stocker, D. and P. Everson. 2006. *Summoning St Michael: Early Romanesque Towers in Lincolnshire*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Stocker, D. and A. Vince. 1997. The Early Norman Castle at Lincoln and a Re-evaluation of the Original West Tower of Lincoln Cathedral. *Medieval Archaeology* 41: 223-33.
- Storey, G. R. (ed.). 2006. *Urbanism in the Pre-Industrial World: Cross-Cultural Approaches*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Stovel, E. M. 2005. The Archaeology of Identity Construction: Ceramic Evidence from Northern Chile. In P. P. Funari, A. Zarankin and E. Stovel (eds), *Global Archaeological Theory: Contextual Voices and Contemporary Thoughts*, 145-66. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Sutherland, C. V. H. 1974. *Roman Coins*. London: Barrie & Jenkins.
- Svanberg, F. 2003. *Death Rituals in South-East Scandinavia AD 800-1000*. Acta Archaeologica Lundensia Series in 4^o no. 24. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Swanton, M. 2000. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*. London: Phoenix Press.
- Symonds, L. A. 1999. *Landscape and Social Practice: The Production and Consumption of Pottery in Tenth-Century Lincolnshire*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of York.
- Symonds, L. A. 2003a. *Landscape and Social Practice: The Production and Consumption of Pottery in Tenth-Century Lincolnshire*. BAR British Series 345.
- Symonds, L. A. 2003b. Territories in Transition: The Construction of Boundaries in Anglo-Scandinavian Lincolnshire. In D. Griffiths, A. Reynolds and S. Semple (eds), *Boundaries in Early Medieval Britain*, Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History 12, 28-37. Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology.
- Tann, G. 1995a. *Alford, John Spendluffe School: Archaeological Watching Brief during*

- Groundworks for a New Sports Hall*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report.
- Tann, G. 1995b. *Burgh-le-Marsh – Ingoldmells Rising Main: Archaeological Watching Brief*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report.
- Tann, G. 1995c. *The Calceby (Lincolnshire) Rebuild Project: Archaeological Monitoring during the Renewal of the Electricity Transmission Network in Parts of Driby, Calceby and South Ormsby*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report.
- Tann, G. 1995d. *Grimsby College (Nuns Corner) New Sports Hall: Archaeological Watching Brief*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report.
- Tann, G. 1996. *Louth: Eastgate; Archaeological Monitoring of Office Development on the Site of Meridian House and The Marquis of Granby Hotel*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report.
- Tann, G. 1997. *Stenigot Reservoir to Kenwick Pumping Station: Archaeological Watching Brief and Excavations during Groundworks for a Water Trunk-Main*. Lindsey Archaeological Services Report 97/16.
- Tann, G. 2000. Desk-based Assessment. In: *Land to the North of Conging Street, Horncastle, Lincs; NGR: TF 2599 6977; Archaeological Evaluation, 2-7*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 481.
- Tann, G. 2002. *Land North of the Old Rectory, South Willingham, Lincs. Archaeological Watching Brief*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 595.
- Tann, G. 2003. *Holton-Cum-Beckering – Welton Gathering Centre Gas Pipeline (Reepham, Fiskerton, Barlings, Newball, Bullington, Goltho, Rand and Wragby parishes): Archaeological Desk-based Assessment*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 703.
- Taylor, T. 2008. Materiality. In R. A. Bentley, H. D. G. Maschner and C. Chippindale (eds), *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*, 297-320. Lanham: Alta Mira Press.
- Taylor-Wilson, R. and A. Telford. 2002. *Archaeological Investigations at Land off Baldwin Avenue, Bottesford, North Lincolnshire; Summary Report and Data Assessment*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report.
- Ten Harkel, L. 2002. *The Ringwalburgen as Ideological Constructs: Towards a New Interpretation of the Ninth- and Tenth-century Circular Fortifications in Flanders*. Unpublished MA dissertation, University of York.
- Ten Harkel, L. forthcoming a. Land or Gold? Changing Perceptions of Landscape and Wealth in Viking-Age Lincolnshire (c. 800-1000 AD). In: *Assemblage* 11.
- Ten Harkel, L. forthcoming b. Of Towns and Trinkets: The Production and Consumption of Metalwork in Tenth-century Lincoln. In D. M. Hadley and L. Ten Harkel (eds), *Everyday Life in Viking 'Towns': Social Approaches to Viking Age Towns in Ireland and England c. 850-1100*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Ten Harkel, L. in prep. a. Landscapes of Defence in the Netherlands: The Late Ninth- and Tenth-century *Ringwalburgen*. In J. Baker, S. Brookes and A. Reynolds (eds), *Landscapes of Defence in the Viking Age*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Ten Harkel, L. in prep. b. *Metalwork from Viking Age Lincoln in its Regional Context: A Selection Catalogue*. BAR report (British Series).
- Thomas, G. 2000a. Anglo-Scandinavian Metalwork from the Danelaw: Exploring Social and Cultural Interaction. In D. M. Hadley and J. D. Richards (eds), *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, 237-55. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Thomas, G. 2000b. *A Survey of Late Anglo-Saxon and Viking Strap-Ends from Britain*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Institute of Archaeology, University College London.
- Thomas, G. 2001. Strap-ends and the Identification of Regional Patterns in the Production and Circulation of Ornamental Metalwork in Late Anglo-Saxon and Viking-Age Britain. In M. Redknap, N. Edwards, S. Youngs, A. Lane and J. Knight (eds), *Pattern and Purpose in Insular Art*, 39-48. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Thomas, G. 2009a. The Hooked Tags. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 1-7. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Thomas, G. 2009b. Strap-ends. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 7-16. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Thompson, S. and J. Snee. 2001. *Archaeological Watching Brief During Development at Huttoft Primary School, Church Lane, Huttoft, Lincolnshire*. Archaeological Project Services report 194/00.
- Thompson, V. 2004. *Dying and Death in Later Anglo-Saxon England*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
- Tibbles, J. 2001. *Archaeological Watching Brief on Land off Baldwin Avenue, Bottesford, North Lincolnshire, for J. S. Bloor (Measham) Ltd*. Humber Field Archaeology report 408.
- Tibbles, J. and K. Steedman. 1990. *Trial Excavations at Birkett's Garage. Barton On Humber,*

- April 1990. Humberside Archaeology report.
- Tilley, C. 1991. *Material Culture and Text; The Art of Ambiguity*. London: Routledge.
- Tilley, C. 1994. *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments*. Oxford: Berg.
- Tilley, C. 1999. *Metaphor and Material Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tilley, C. 2006. Introduction: Identity, Place, Landscape and Heritage. *Journal of Material Culture* 11: 7-32.
- Tönnies, F. 2002. *Community and Society*. Trans. C. P. Loomis. Mineola: Dover Publications Inc.
- Trafford, S. 2000. Ethnicity, Migration Theory, and the Historiography of the Scandinavian Settlement of England. In D. M. Hadley and J. D. Richards (eds), *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, 17-39. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Treasure Annual Report*. 2000. Department of Culture, Media and Sport.
- Treasure Annual Report*. 2001. Department of Culture, Media and Sport.
- Trigger, B. G. 1995. Expanding Middle Range Theory. *Antiquity* 69: 449-58.
- Trimble, R. 1995. *North Lincolnshire College (New Student Accommodation Blocks)*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 145.
- Trimble, R. 1998. *St Mark's Station, High Street, Lincoln: Archaeological Investigation*. 2 vols. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 338.
- Trimble, R. 2001. *Site of the Proposed City & County Museum, Danesgate, Lincoln; Archaeological Evaluation*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 458.
- Tweddle, D. 2004. Art in Pre-Conquest York. In: *Aspects of Anglo-Scandinavian York*. The Archaeology of York 8/4. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Tweddle, D., J. Moulden and E. Logan. 1999. *Anglian York: A Survey of the Evidence*. The Archaeology of York 7/2. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- Ulriksen, J. 2004. Danish Coastal Landing Places and their Relation to Navigation and Trade. In J. Hines, A. Lane and M. Redknap (eds), *Land, Sea and Home: Proceedings of a Conference on Viking-Period Settlement at Cardiff, July 2001*, 7-26. Leeds: Maney Publishing.
- Valdez del Alamo, E. and C. S. Pendergast. 2000. Introduction. In E. Valdez del Alamo and C. S. Pendergast (eds), *Memory and the Medieval Tomb*, 1-15. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Van de Noort, R. and P. Davies. 1993. *Wetland Heritage: An Archaeological Assessment of the Humber Wetlands*. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- Van de Noort, R. and S. Ellis (eds). 1997. *Wetland Heritage of the Humberhead Levels: An Archaeological Survey*. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- Van de Noort, R. and S. Ellis (eds). 1998. *Wetland Heritage of the Ancholme and Lower Trent Valleys*. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- Van de Noort, R. and S. Ellis (eds). 2000. *Wetland Heritage of the Hull Valley: An Archaeological Survey*. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- Van de Noort, R., H. Fenwick and R. Head. 1998. Introduction to the Archaeological Survey. In R. Van de Noort and S. Ellis (eds), *Wetland Heritage of the Ancholme and Lower Trent Valleys*, 123-40. Kingston Upon Hull: Humber Wetlands Project, The University of Hull / English Heritage.
- Van Heeringen, R. M. 1988. Verslag van het Noodonderzoek op de Vroeg-Middeleeuwse Burcht van Burgh in 1987. *Kroniek van het Land van de Zeemeermin (Schouwen-Duiveland)* 13: 5-14.
- Van Heeringen, R. M., P. A. Henderikx and A. Mars. 1995. *Vroeg-Middeleeuwse Ringwalburgen in Zeeland*. Goes: De Koperen Tuin.
- Van Wie, P. D. 1999. *Image, History and Politics: The Coinage of Modern Europe*. Lanham: University Press of America Inc.
- Viking and Anglo-Saxon Landscape and Economy*, <http://www.york.ac.uk/depts/arch/vasle/index.html>. Updated on 12 December 2006; used on 1 March 2007.
- Vince, A. 1993a. Approaches to the Study of Lincoln and Lindsey before the Vikings. In A. Vince (ed.), *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, 1-5. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 1. Lincoln: Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Vince, A. 1993b. Forms, Functions and Manufacturing Techniques of Late Ninth- and Tenth-Century Wheelthrown Pottery in England and their Origins. In D. Piton (ed.), *Travaux du Groupe de Recherches et D'Etudes sur la Céramique dans le Nord - Pas-de-Calais; Actes du Collque D'Outreau (10 -12 Avril 1992)*, 151-64. Numéro hors-série de Nord-Ouest Archéologie.
- Vince, A. (ed.). 1993c. *Pre-Viking Lindsey*. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 1. Lincoln: Lincoln

Archaeology Unit.

- Vince, A. 1994. Saxon Urban Economies: An Archaeological Perspective. In J. Rackham (ed.), *Environment and Economy in Anglo-Saxon England*, 108-19. CBA Research Report 89.
- Vince, A. 2000. Fired Clay from the Saltfleetby Gas Pipeline: Assessment Report. In M. Allen and G. Tann, *Saltfleetby Pipeline; Howdales, South Cockerington-Theddlethorpe Gas Terminal; NGR: TF 415 909 – 487 872; Archaeological Watching Brief and Excavation*, Appendix 3. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 398.
- Vince, A. 2005. Ceramic Petrology and the Study of Anglo-Saxon and Later Medieval Ceramics. *Medieval Archaeology* 49: 219-45.
- Vince, A. 2006. Coinage and Urban Development: Integrating the Archaeological and Numismatic History of Lincoln. In B. Cook and G. Williams, *Coinage and History in the North Sea World, c. AD 500 – 1250: Essays in Honour of Marion Archibald*, 525-43. Leiden: Brill.
- Vince, A. 2009. Imported Pottery from Continental Europe. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 364-68. Excavations at Flixborough vol. 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Vince, A. and B. Precious. 2004. Identification of Pottery from the Fieldwalking. *An Archaeological Evaluation at Countess Close, Alkborough, North Lincolnshire*, Bradley, J., J. Fraser and K. Steedman, 32-37. Humber Archaeology report 153.
- Vince, A. and J. Young. 1991a. East Midlands Anglo-Saxon Pottery Project. *Lincoln Archaeology 1990-1991*: 38-39.
- Vince, A. and J. Young. 1991b. Mapping the Saxon City. *Lincoln Archaeology 1990-1991*: 23-28.
- Voss, B. L. 2008. *The Archaeology of Ethnogenesis: Race and Sexuality in Colonial San Francisco*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Waldron, T. 2007. *St Peter's, Barton-upon-Humber, Lincolnshire: A Parish Church and its Community. Volume 2: The Human Remains*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Walker, J. 1945. A Hoard of Anglo-Saxon Coins from Tetney, Lincolnshire. *The Numismatic Chronicle and Journal of the Royal Numismatic Society, Sixth Series*, Vol. 5: 81-95. London: Bernard Quaritch.
- Walster, A. 2000. Metalwork. *Fieldwork in Fillingham, Lincolnshire*. Vol. 2, 20-24. University of Sheffield report.
- Walton Rogers, P. 1997. *Textile Production at 16-22 Coppergate*. The Archaeology of York 17/11. York: York Archaeological Trust.
- Walton Rogers, P. 2006. *Cloth and Clothing in Early Anglo-Saxon England: AD 450-700*. York: Council for British Archaeology.
- Walton Rogers, P. 2009. Textile Production. In: D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 281-316. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Wastling, L. M. 2009. Lead and Lead Alloy Mensuration Weights. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 422-24. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Wastling, L., N. Rogers and C. Mortimer. 2009. Non-ferrous Metalworking. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 329-38. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Watson, P. J. 2008. Processualism and After. In R. A. Bentley, H. D. G. Maschner and C. Chippindale (eds), *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*, 29-38. Lanham: Alta Mira Press.
- Watt, J. 1995. The Other Finds. 1995. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 30: 30-32.
- Watt, M. C. (ed. and trans.). 1928. *St Martin of Tours: The Chronicles of Sulpicius Severus done into English from the French of Paul Monceaux and with an Introduction by him*. London: Sands and Co.
- Weber, M. 1958. *The City*. Trans. and ed. D. Martindale and G. Neuwirth. Glencoe: Free Press.
- Webster, G. S. 2008. Culture History: A Culture-Historical Approach. In R. A. Bentley, H. D. G. Maschner and C. Chippindale (eds), *Handbook of Archaeological Theories*, 11-27. Lanham: Alta Mira Press.
- Webster, L. E. and J. Cherry. 1977. Medieval Britain in 1976. *Medieval Archaeology* 21: 204-62.
- Wenham, L.P., R.A. Hall, C.M. Briden and D.A. Stocker. 1987. *St Mary Bishophill Junior and St Mary Castlegate*. The Archaeology of York 8/2. London: Council for British Archaeology.
- West, S. E. 1968. The Deserted Medieval Village of Snarford, Lincs. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 3: 93-97.
- West, S. E. 1998. *A Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Material from Suffolk*. Ipswich: Suffolk County Council Planning Department.

- White, A. J. 1977. *Fiskerton. Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 12: 73-74.
- White, A. J. 1981. Horncastle, Anglo-Saxon Burial. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 18: 71-72.
- White, A. J. and P. Everson. 1983. Small Finds; 27 High Street. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 18: 72-74.
- White, R. 1982. *Non-Ferrous Metalworking on Flaxengate, Lincoln, from the 9th – 11th centuries*. Unpublished MSc dissertation.
- White, R. 1992. *Non-Ferrous Metalworking in Lincoln; Assessment of Potential for Examination and Outline of Resource Implication; 1st Draft*. Unpublished document.
- Whitelock, D. 1959. The Dealings of the Kings of England with Northumbria in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries. In P. Clemoes (ed.), *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of their History and Culture Presented to Bruce Dickins*, 70-88. London: Bowes.
- Whitelock, D. 1979. *English Historical Documents 1, c. 500-1042*. 2nd ed. London: Eyre Methuen.
- Whittlewood Project: Medieval Settlements and Landscapes in the Whittlewood Area*, <http://www.le.ac.uk/elh/whittlewood/index.htm>. Updated on December 2003; used on 11 January 2009.
- Whitwell, B. 1991. Flixborough. *Current Archaeology* 126: 244-47.
- Whitwell, J. B. 1966. Archaeological Notes. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 1: 33-53.
- Whitwell, J. B. 1967. Archaeological Notes. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 2: 31-54.
- Whitwell, J. B. 1992. *Roman Lincolnshire*. History of Lincolnshire Volume 2. History of Lincolnshire Committee for the Society for Lincolnshire History and Archaeology.
- Whitwell, J. B. and C. M. Wilson. 1968. Archaeological Notes. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 3: 19-40.
- Whitwell, J. B. and C. M. Wilson. 1969. Archaeological Notes, 1968. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 4: 99-119.
- Wickham, C. 2006. *Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean 400-800*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wickholm, A. 2008. Reuse in Finnish Cremation Cemeteries under Level Ground – Examples of Collective Memory. In F. Fahlander and T. Oestigaard (eds), *The Materiality of Death: Bodies, Burials, Beliefs*, 89-97. BAR International Series 1786.
- Wilkie, L. A. 2001. Race, Identity and Habermas's Life World. In C. E. Orser (eds), *Race and the Archaeology of Identity*, 108-24. Salt Lake City: The University of Utah Press.
- Wilkinson, J. and J. Young. 1995a. BLM93 and AM93: Assessment Report on the Post-Roman Pottery. In G. Tann, *Burgh-le-Marsh – Ingoldmells Rising Main: Archaeological Watching Brief*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report.
- Wilkinson, J. and J. Young. 1995b. *Castle Farm, Torksey (CFT94): Medieval Pottery Assessment Report*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 157.
- Wilkinson, J. and J. Young. 1996. Post-Roman Pottery Assessment. In M. Jarvis, *Central Library, Lincoln. Archaeological Excavation and Assessment*, 52-53. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 173.
- Williams, D. 1997. *Late Saxon Stirrup-strap Mounts: A Classification and Catalogue: A Contribution to the Study of Late Saxon Ornamental Metalwork*. York: Council for British Archaeology.
- Williams, D. 2002. Two Late Saxon Spur Fragments from Sussex and Hampshire. *Medieval Archaeology* 46: 115-18.
- Williams, G. 2000-02. Monetary Economy in Viking-Age Scotland in the Light of Single Finds. *Nordisk Numismatisk Årsskrift; 6th Nordic Numismatic Symposium: Single Finds: The Nordic Perspective*: 163:72.
- Williams, G. 2006. The Circulation and Function of Coinage in Conversion-period England, c. AD 580-675. In B. Cook and G. Williams (eds), *Coinage and History in the North Sea World, c. AD 500 – 1250: Essays in Honour of Marion Archibald*, 145-92. Leiden: Brill.
- Williams, G. 2007. Kingship, Christianity and Coinage: Monetary and Political Perspectives on Silver Economy in the Viking Age. In J. Graham-Campbell and G. Williams (eds), *Silver Economy in the Viking Age*, 177-214. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.
- Williams, G. forthcoming. Towns in the Danelaw: Cultural, Regional and Political Identities. In D. M. Hadley and L. Ten Harkel (eds), *Everyday Life in Viking 'Towns': Social Approaches to Viking Age Towns in Ireland and England, c. 850-1100 AD*. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Williams, G. in prep. Publication on the Vale of York hoard.
- Williams, G. and Ager, B. 2010. *The Vale of York Hoard*. London: British Museum.
- Williams, G. and L. Webster. 2009. *The Cuedale Hoard*. http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ancient/vikings/cuedale_01.shtml. Last updated: November 2009.
- Wilson, C. M. 1970. Archaeological Notes, 1969. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 5: 3-20.
- Wilson, C. M. 1971. Archaeological Notes, 1970. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 6: 3-

17.

- Wilson, C. M. 1972. Archaeological Notes, 1971. *Lincolnshire History and Archaeology* 7: 3-19.
- Wilson, D. M. 1964. *Catalogue of Antiquities of the Later Saxon Period vol. 1: Anglo-Saxon Ornamental Metalwork, 700-1100, in the British Museum*. London: British Museum.
- Wilson, D. M. and D. G. Hurst. 1969. Medieval Britain in 1968. *Medieval Archaeology* 13: 230-87.
- Wilson, S. 1983. Introduction. In S. Wilson (ed.), *Saints and their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History*, 1-53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, E. and A. de la Haye. 1999. Introduction. In A. de la Haye and E. Wilson (eds), *Defining Dress: Dress as Object, Meaning and Identity*, 1-9. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Wolff, K. H. (trans.) 1950. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Wood, I. 2006. Constantinian Crosses in Northumbria. In C. E. Karkov, S. Larratt Keefer and K. L. Jolly (eds), *The Place of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England*, 3-13. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press.
- Woolf, G. 1998. *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wragg, K. 1997. *Land to the Rear of 5 and 6 Eastgate, Lincoln*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 30.
- Wragg, K. 1998a. *Land at Main Road/Station Road, Donington-on-Bain, Lincolnshire; Archaeological Evaluation*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 360.
- Wragg, K. 1998b. *Northern Subsidiary Sewer Scheme; Archaeological Watching Brief*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 340.
- Wragg, K. 2000a. *Development at Driby St Michal, Driby, Lincolnshire: Archaeological Watching Brief*. Lincoln Archaeology report 409.
- Wragg, K. 2000b. *Greestone Centre, De Montfort University, Lindum Road, Lincoln: Landscaping and External Works. Archaeological Evaluation*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 444.
- Wragg, K. 2001. *Development at 'Poacher's Paddock', Main Road/Station Road, Dodington-on-Bain, Lincolnshire; Archaeological Excavation and Watching Brief*. Lincoln Archaeology report 420.
- Wragg, K. 2006. *Land Adjacent to 24/26 Torksey Street, Kirton-in-Lindsey, North Lincolnshire; Archaeological Evaluation*. Lincs Archaeo-tech report 19.
- Wragg, K. and R. Trimble. 2000. *Flood Alleviation Scheme: Minting, Lincolnshire. Earthwork Survey and Archaeological Watching Brief*. Lincoln Archaeology report 400.
- York Archaeological Trust. 2009. *Celebrating Jorvik: A New Look at the Viking Age Artefacts from the Coppergate Excavation 1976-1981*. York: York Archaeological Trust.
- Yorke, B. 1990. *Kings and Kingdoms of Early Anglo-Saxon England*. London: Seaby.
- Yorke, B. 1993. Lindsey: The Lost Kingdom Found? In A. Vince (ed.), *Pre-Viking Lindsey*, 141-50. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 1. Lincoln: Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Yorke, B. forthcoming. West-Saxon Fortifications in the Ninth Century: The Perspective from the Written Sources. In J. Baker, S. Brooks and A. Reynolds (eds), *Landscapes of Defence in the Viking Age*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Young, G., P. Wagner, K. Miller and P. Abramson. 2001. *Archaeological Fieldwork on the Hatfield Gas Pipeline for Scottish Power Ltd*. Northern Archaeological Associates report 01/31.
- Young, J. 1991. The Pottery. In D. Stocker (ed.), *St Mary's Guildhall, Lincoln: The Survey and Excavation of a Medieval Building Complex*, 66-69. *The Archaeology of Lincoln* 12.1. London: The Council for British Archaeology for the City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Young, J. 1996. The Pottery. In G. Tann, *Louth: Eastgate; Archaeological Monitoring of Office Development on the Site of Meridian House and The Marquis of Granby Hotel*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report.
- Young, J. 1998a. *Archaeological Evaluation at Haith's Farm, Birkett Lane, Covenham St Bartholomew, Lincolnshire*. Archaeological Project Services report 31/98.
- Young, J. 1998b. *Archaeological Excavation at Haith's Farm, Birkett Lane, Covenham St Bartholomew, Lincolnshire*. Archaeological Project Services report 53/98.
- Young, J. 1998c. MSG98 Pottery Catalogue. In T. Rayner, *Market Stainton New Farm Crops Proposed Glasshouse Complex; NGR: TF 22700 80291; Archaeological Evaluation*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 320.
- Young, J. 1998d. Post-Roman Pottery. In R. Trimble, *St Mark's Station, High Street, Lincoln: Archaeological Investigation* (vol. 2), 6-8. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 338.
- Young, J. 1999a. Medieval and Later Pottery. In C. Colyer, B. J. J. Gilmour and M. J. Jones, *The Defences of the Lower City: Excavations at the Park and West Parade 1970-2 and a Discussion of Other Sites Excavated up to 1994*, 210-22. *The Archaeology of Lincoln*

- VII/2. Council of British Archaeology for the City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit.
- Young, J. 1999b. Post-Roman Pottery Analysis and Archive. In J. Albone, *Archaeological Field Evaluation Report: Land off St Peter's Close, Holton-le-Clay, Lincolnshire*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report 99/20.
- Young, J. 2000a. Anglo-Saxon and Later Pottery from Excavations at Fillingham, Lincolnshire. *Fieldwork in Fillingham, Lincolnshire*. Vol. 2. University of Sheffield report.
- Young, J. 2000b. Archive Report on the Pottery from an Evaluation at Conging Street, Horncastle, Lincolnshire. In: *Land to the North of Conging Street, Horncastle, Lincs; NGR: TF 2599 6977; Archaeological Evaluation*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 481.
- Young, J. 2000c. Archive Report on the Pottery from an Evaluation at Orby, Lincolnshire (tgo00). In J. Rylatt, *Archaeological Evaluation Report; Land at the Green, Orby, Lincolnshire; NGR: TF 4911 6728*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report 00/29.
- Young, J. 2000d. Post-Roman Pottery Archive List. In: *Saltfleetby Pipeline; Howdales, South Cockerington-Theddlethorpe Gas Terminal; NGR: TF 415 909 – 487 872; Archaeological Watching Brief and Excavation*, M. Allen and G. Tann. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 398.
- Young, J. 2000e. Post-Roman Pottery: Archive Report. In K. Wragg and R. Trimble, *Flood Alleviation Scheme: Minting, Lincolnshire. Earthwork Survey and Archaeological Watching Brief*. 2000. Lincoln Archaeology report 400.
- Young, J. 2001a. Anglo-Saxon and Later Pottery. In G. Young, P. Wagner, K. Miller and P. Abramson, *Archaeological Fieldwork on the Hatfield Gas Pipeline for Scottish Power Ltd*, 29-31. Northern Archaeological Associates report 01/31.
- Young, J. 2001b. Appendix C: Post-Roman Pottery. In R. Trimble, *Site of the Proposed City & County Museum, Danesgate, Lincoln; Archaeological Evaluation*. City of Lincoln Archaeology Unit report 458.
- Young, J. 2001c. Post-Roman Pottery: Archive Report. In K. Wragg, *Development at 'Poacher's Paddock', Main Road/Station Road, Dodington-on-Bain, Lincolnshire; Archaeological Excavation and Watching Brief*. Lincoln Archaeology report 420.
- Young, J. 2001d. Pottery Archive. In J. Tibbles, *Archaeological Watching Brief on Land off Baldwin Avenue, Bottesford, North Lincolnshire, for J. S. Bloor (Measham) Ltd*. Humber Field Archaeology Report 408.
- Young, J. 2002a. Pottery. In R. Taylor-Wilson and A. Telford, *Archaeological Investigations at Land off Baldwin Avenue, Bottesford, North Lincolnshire; Summary Report and Data Assessment*, 28-33. Pre-Construct Archaeology report.
- Young, J. 2002b. The Pottery. In J. Bradley, *An Archaeological Evaluation at Barrow Road, Barton Upon Humber, North Lincolnshire*, 43-53. Humber Field Archaeology report 97.
- Young, J. 2002c. Pottery Archive SWOR01. In G. Tann, *Land North of the Old Rectory, South Willingham, Lincs. Archaeological Watching Brief*. Lindsey Archaeological Services report 595.
- Young, J. 2005a. Appendix 5: Summary of Post-Roman Pottery from sites in the Upper City and Wigford. In A. Vince and J. Young, *A Corpus of Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Pottery from Lincoln*, 280-82. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 7. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Young, J. 2005b. Pottery Archive CLMN05. In M. P. Daley, *The Horse Close, Chapel Lane, Minting: Archaeological Watching Brief Report*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report.
- Young, J. 2005c. The Post-Roman Pottery From a Watching Brief at Old Bolingbroke, Lincolnshire. In R. Pullen, *Old Bolingbroke, Lincolnshire: Archaeological Watching Brief, Anglian Water Sewerage Pipeline across land in and to the south of Old Bolingbroke*. Lindsey Archaeology Services report 718.
- Young, J. 2007. Report on the Post-Roman Pottery from St Mary's Works, Barton upon Humber, North Lincolnshire. In *Archaeological Field Evaluation, St Mary's Works, Barton Upon Humber*. Pre-Construct Archaeology report.
- Young, J. and A. Boyle. 2006. Post-Roman Pottery: Archive Listing. In K. Wragg, *Land Adjacent to 24/26 Torksey Street, Kirton-in-Lindsey, North Lincolnshire; Archaeological Evaluation*, 28-29. Lincs Archaeo-tech report 19.
- Young, J. and K. Hollamby. 2004. *Results of an Archaeological Watching Brief: The Former Wrights' Building Yard, 48-50 Park Street, Lincoln (Planning Application Reference: 20004/0455/CAC); NGR SK 9733/ 7135*. John Samuels Archaeological Consultants report 672/03/06.
- Young, J. and A. Vince. 2005. *A Corpus of Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Pottery from Lincoln*. Lincoln Archaeological Studies 7. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Young, J. and A. Vince. 2009. The Anglo-Saxon Pottery. In D. H. Evans and C. Loveluck (eds), *Life and Economy at Early Medieval Flixborough, c. AD 600-1000: The Artefact Evidence*, 339-401. Excavations at Flixborough 2. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Youngs, S. 2004. Lead Alloy Brooches. In H. Wallis, *Excavations at Mill Lane, Thetford, 1995*,

38-40. East Anglian Archaeology 108. Norfolk: Norfolk Museums and Archaeology Service.

Youngs, S. M., J. Clark and T. B. Barry. 1984. Medieval Britain and Ireland in 1983. *Medieval Archaeology* 28: 203-65.