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Abstract

This thesis will explore the theme of travel and communication in early medieval Wessex by examining the physical means, the routes of communication, by which people, ideas and goods moved through the landscape. Whilst there is good evidence for the distribution of Anglo-Saxon type-sites in the landscape, such as towns, manors, wics, assembly places and churches, of the thoroughfares that connected these places, their character and function, relatively little is known. There is as yet no document that sets out the map of Anglo-Saxon roads for Wessex. Employing the rich topographical data that survives in Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses, this research project sets about reconstructing aspects of the early medieval route network in ten case-study areas from Hampshire, Devon, Dorset and Wiltshire. The project addresses a number of issues that arise out of the boundary clause evidence. These include critically assessing the role the Roman road network played in the seventh to eleventh centuries and developing an understanding of the hierarchy of routes that had emerged by the tenth century. The impact of improved river crossings is also considered as a factor in the development of the route network, along with the manner in which routes were signposted and inscribed and how access through the landscape was controlled. Finally, the thesis addresses elements of how the nexus of communications changed to reflect developments in the early medieval economy and the concomitant shift in the patterns of trade.
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**Introduction**

Studies of travel and communication have become a standard feature in our understanding of modern historical periods yet further back into our past the interplay between the networks through which goods, people and ideas moved and the societies they were part of becomes less tangible. This is particularly true of the early medieval period. Should it not be considered however that the role of travel and communication was equally important then as it is in our studies of more recent history? The impacts of the internal combustion engine, the advent of the railways, the developments in air freight and steam shipping, the stagecoaches and turnpikes, the network of inland-waterways and the digital revolution have all been heralded as central to the definition of the periods within which their impact was most keenly felt. Yet for the early medieval period commentary on the way in which individuals and groups communicated and moved around on the local, regional and national scale is sparse.

This is a situation remarked upon by David Pelteret who pointed out, over twenty-five years ago, our failure to seek topographical explanations for significant political, social, and cultural developments in Anglo-Saxon history.¹ This circumstance, with a few notable exceptions², pervades today and the impact of this paucity on the popular understanding of archaeological and historic periods, as Richard Muir has observed, is that for the general reader, ‘the literature directly concerned with the interpretation of communications in historic landscapes is small’.³ So what really do we know about Anglo-Saxon roads today? David Harrison concluded in his study of medieval bridges that a majority of the bridges that supported the economy of the fourteenth century were in existence by the end of the eleventh century and must therefore have formed part of a highly developed network of roads. He goes on to write that it is ‘inherently implausible’ to assume that investment was made in ‘splendid’ bridges whilst the roads and ways that connected them remained mere ‘oceans of mud’.⁴ Christopher Taylor concurs with this view and asserts that the alterations have since been slight to the network of roads that was, for the most part, already in place by the end of the Saxon period.⁵

Anecdotal evidence has been used to illustrate the standards that late Saxon road-building had attained. Oliver Rackham points out that Harold’s feat in 1066 of marching an

---

² Studies reviewed in Chapter One under ‘Medieval Ways and Paths’.
army from London to York in four and a half days would seem to suggest that Anglo-Saxon roads were capable of carrying a large contingent of fighting men and their retinue at speeds similar to those achieved in the Roman period. Citing King Æthelstan’s journey from Winchester to Nottingham in eight days and the moving of Bishop Æthelwold’s body from Beddington to Winchester, a distance of over sixty miles in two days, David Hill suggests that such journeys ‘could hardly have been undertaken by people creeping apologetically along the margins of irate peasant’s fields, or blundering through trackless woods.’ The roads, therefore, must be there. It is simply a matter of finding them.

We may well have been guilty of not seeking to place travel and communication as a more central issue in our understanding of the Anglo-Saxon period, but this is not necessarily because of a lack of direct references to the theme. It is very much more the case that the material that lies at our disposal is of such a diverse nature. This is a view clearly shared by Norbert Ohler in his *Medieval Traveller*:

‘We can get a fairly accurate idea of the stages of princely journeys from the places and dates listed in documents, annals and chronicles; but we do not know very much about the exact location and condition of the roads. There are many gaps in our knowledge and we have to fill in the picture by studying traces in the landscape, field-names, indicators of resting places or inns, archaeological remains, old maps, aerial photographs and other details.’

This research project will adopt an interdisciplinary approach to the study of travel and communication in the landscape of Anglo-Saxon Wessex making use of historical, topographical, toponymic and archaeological evidence to gain a greater understanding of the route network of early medieval Wessex and the experience of people using that network as they communicated through the landscape. The time is ripe for such an undertaking not least because of recent developments in our understanding of the middle-Saxon economy, the emergence of towns, the identification of a complex system of administration, justice and governance, a wider understanding of civil defence and clear evidence for an intensity of agricultural productivity. How do the pattern of routes and the
nexus of communications in the early medieval landscape serve as both a function of these processes and a contributor to them?

This is a common theme amongst commentators on communications in archaeological and historical periods. Peter Fowler for example writes that, ‘If landscape is not only the result of dynamics but is itself dynamic at any one time, then movement within and through it by people and their materials is both a lubricant and a product of those dynamics’. The same sentiments are expressed by Paul Hindle: ‘Roads and tracks are important in that they have allowed virtually every other feature of the landscape to develop, and have themselves developed because of those features’. It is then this ‘dynamic’; the reciprocity between developments in communications and wider societal and economic transition, that is so crucial to understand if we are to move beyond merely observing change to identifying why change takes place and, for our purposes, the role that evolving communications play. Taking Wessex as a case study, this research project proposes a methodology for the exploration of early medieval communications. Through a review of current scholarship this thesis develops avenues of enquiry and a set of key research questions that are intended to address the gaps in our knowledge. What emerges from the analysis of ten study areas across Wessex is a complex pattern of routes in a highly structured landscape of movement and one that was intricately related to the processes of change and development that have elsewhere been observed for this formative period of English history.

PART 1 serves as a literature review but also offers some synthesis of archaeological, historical and place-name evidence in a bid to draw together some coherent themes for further analysis. Chapter One considers the landscape of communications and explores not only the scholarship that has to date been undertaken on the early medieval route network but also the currently accepted views on what the prehistoric and Roman legacy was in terms of the roads, tracks and ways that survived into the Anglo-Saxon period. The current thinking on bridge building in the later Anglo-Saxon landscape is assessed along with recent work on the extent of early medieval waterways and the scale of water transportation in the period. The objective of this chapter is to establish what we know of early medieval overland and riverine communication networks but crucially where there is scope and potential for in improved understanding. Equally,

Chapter Two sets out the current state of knowledge concerning the range and types of journeys that were made through the Anglo-Saxon landscape and considers why individuals and groups from every level of society had cause to travel. One of the main stimulants to travel and communication in the early medieval period was the need for the redistribution and exchange of good and materials. With a particular focus on Wessex, Chapter Three reviews the current thinking on the developments and changes in the Anglo-Saxon economy from the period of the eighth century through to the eleventh. The shift in trading practices, from an allocative economy to one based on price-making markets must be seen to have had an impact on the way goods of both a bulk and prestige variety were moved from place to place and via which routes. In conclusion to PART 1 the key research questions that this thesis will address are presented.

PART 2 is concerned with the sources and approaches that will be adopted across ten study areas to address the first key research question which is whether at all we can reconstruct early route networks and if so, to what extent? The primary historical source employed by this study is the corpus of Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses that survive for the kingdom of Wessex from the eighth to the eleventh centuries. Chapter Four will demonstrate the veracity of this source material and will set about justifying the degree of confidence we can have in placing the topographical detail of the boundary clauses in a landscape context. The chapter concludes with the solution of a boundary clause as a means of illustrating the levels of assuredness that underpin the use of this data over much wider study areas. Chapter Five begins by reviewing certain methodologies employed in the study of archaeological and historical landscapes. The objective of this is to outline the approaches that landscape archaeologists take that allow them to say what they do about the chronology of landscape development. It is also hoped that it will be demonstrated that there is an increasing consciousness on the part of landscape archaeologists and historians that in the early editions of the Ordnance Survey we have a record not only of the nineteenth-century landscape but a document that allows us to identify and interpret very much older configurations of landscape organisation. Thus the case is made for using early edition Ordnance Survey maps to aid in the reconstruction of the early medieval route network. The chapter concludes with a detailed study of an area in north Hampshire through which passes a Roman road and the Harroway, a track widely accepted as being of prehistoric date. The method employed in this study involves the comprehensive mapping of all cartographic linear data for the area. The results will illustrate that such a detailed approach is not necessarily required to draw conclusions on a wider regional scale and that
in any case, the topographical information recorded in the Ordnance Survey is both superior and more uniform on a national scale than the vast majority of estate and tithe maps that also survive for most areas. This therefore makes it the more appropriate baseplate upon which to project the detailed topographical information found in Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses and justifies the methodology – one involving less intense cartographic analysis – that is then applied in PART 3 to ten study areas throughout Wessex.

PART 3 consists of four chapters, each covering one of the four counties within which the ten case studies have been undertaken (Figure 14). It begins by setting out the process by which the studies were constructed and explaining the rationale behind the display of information (see also the key to maps in Volume 2 of the thesis). The study areas were selected in an attempt to cover a range of differing geologies, terrains and geographical situations in southern England. In central Wessex, where the chalk downland predominates, Study Areas 2 and 8 were selected in the lower valleys where the settlement pattern was more developed (Winchester and the Upper Itchen Valley and the Salisbury Basin). Parts of Study Areas 1 and 7 (The Harroway, Whitchurch, and the Bourne Rivulet and The Ebble Valley) provided coverage on the Upper Chalk where the settlement pattern was more dispersed and the land was used less intensively for agricultural purposes.

Studies 3 and 4 were undertaken in Devon (Crediton and the South Hams) to observe what the charter evidence had to say of a landscape very different in its geological and agricultural character, and also in its historical and cultural background, from the chalk ‘heartlands’ of Wessex. Study areas 4 and 5 were undertaken in coastal zones to explore the arrangement of communications in conjunction with harbours, beaches and coastal look-outs (the South Hams and the Isle of Purbeck). The varying geology (Lower Oolite, Lias Clay and Lower Greensand) of study areas 6 and 9 (Shaftesbury’s Southern Hinterland and Bradford-on-Avon) offer environmental comparison in the Wessex heartlands with the chalk downland areas but these studies were also selected because of the role that important early medieval central places had on the hinterland geography of routes. Finally, the Kinwardstone Hundred study area, 10, has been selected to explore how a frontier zone might impact on the configuration of routes. In each of the study areas certain themes predominate. For example, the commentary on the Crediton study area (3) is centred primarily on the evidence for the herepath network whilst the focus in the Kinwardstone Hundred study area (10) is necessarily on the numerous gates that are mentioned in the boundary clauses for the region.
In PART 4, consisting of Chapters Ten and Eleven, the observations made in PART 3 are used to address the key research questions raised in the conclusion to PART 1. In places, information from outside the study areas is used to support discussion, as are references made back to various studies reviewed as part of Chapters One and Two. Chapter Ten begins by addressing the issue of Roman roads and the degree to which they continued to function into the early medieval period. The chapter also summarises the evidence from the study areas for how the landscape, and in particular routes, were inscribed with markers of both practical and ideological purpose and links this evidence with the current thinking on Pagan, Christian, political and judicial monumentalism in the landscape. In the final section to the chapter, the issue of how access was controlled in the landscape is covered in both relation to the frontier zone of the Kinwardstone Hundred area but also in the control and movement of livestock in upland zones and for the purposes of driving herds. Chapter Eleven employs the evidence from all ten study areas, in conjunction with outside examples, to address the early medieval route network in both its physical form and the evidence for the designated status and functions that certain roads enjoyed. It creates a link between what we know of bridge-building in the period and the ubiquitous herepath to demonstrate that the people of Wessex took a conscious and proactive role in the functionality of the communication networks that connected their destinations of trade, governance, worship and work.

This research project demonstrates that between the places of Anglo-Saxon Wessex lay anything but ‘oceans of mud’ and in doing so it illustrates that the means and the methods are there to reconstruct in some detail the routes that furnished a large part of the early medieval landscape of Wessex. As a sample, the ten study areas chosen for this project represents only a small part of the early medieval British landscape that is documented through Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses. Yet, by modelling the patterns that emerge in these areas and employing such models in areas where charter data is lacking, in conjunction with place-name evidence and landscape archaeology approaches, we can further fill out the landscape with a more comprehensive map of Anglo-Saxon roads than that provided by the template of Roman roads (Figure 1). This thesis takes a step in that direction and the conclusion draws together some of the key findings discussed in PART 4 whilst also recommending avenues of future research.
PART 1: Literature Review

Chapter One: The Landscape of Routes and Communications

Prehistoric Trackways

The ‘lost’ or ‘ancient’ ways of Wessex and the wider landscape through which they pass, have proven a popular subject for writers and publishers over the course of the last century. With an appeal to a wide audience of ramblers and walkers with increasing access to the countryside, works such as The Lost Roads of Wessex and The Ancient Trackways of Wessex sit more comfortably into an appreciation of landscape that owes more to the ‘English Landscape Tradition’ of Wordsworth and W. G. Hoskins – with its Romantic undertones and nostalgic tendencies – than they do in the realms of the theory and practice that characterises modern interdisciplinary landscape studies. Whilst many of the routes described in these books can be seen to traverse the landscape for considerable distances and are thus thought to be some of the primary features of our landscape, the common consensus currently amongst landscape archaeologists is that at best, such routes are notoriously difficult to date and at worst, they are entirely speculative as long-distance prehistoric routes. Paul Hindle, a historical geographer whose work is primarily focused on the post-Conquest period, views the numerous claims made that certain roads and tracks are of prehistoric origin as ‘unsubstantiated’. Christopher Taylor in his Roads and Tracks of Britain warned against the desire to see obvious ridgeways as necessarily facilitating long-distance communication and was particularly dismissive of the so-called ‘Jurassic Way’. John Barnatt has discredited, on the basis of a lack of convincing


15 Taylor, Roads and Tracks of Britain 34-37.
evidence, the idea that a long distance Iron Age or Bronze Age route traversed the Peak District from the Trent Valley in a north-westerly direction. The North Downs Trackway is a route that supposedly makes use of the ridge of chalk downland that traverses Kent on an east/west alignment. Although popularly referred to as the medieval ‘Pilgrim’s Way’ in places, the likelihood that such a route existed in the pre-Roman period has been brought in to question. Similar concerns have been voiced for the Icknield Way, a route that at its maximum extent runs from the Wash in East Anglia via a crossing point of the Thames at Goring to the English Channel. Archaeological evidence would appear to substantiate these dismissive claims. Sarah Harrison draws attention to excavations undertaken at Aston Clinton (Bucks.) where the ‘accepted’ line of the Icknield Way slights features of early Iron Age to late Roman date. P. J. Fowler observes the same relationship between ‘The Ridgeway’ (the definite article of which he takes issue with) and ‘two axially arranged organised field systems’ of late Iron Age/Romano-British origin on the Fyfield and Overton downs (Wilts.). Further north of Fowler’s study area, the same route passes Uffington Hill Fort near where excavations revealed that a layer of compacted chalk overlay a filled-in late Bronze Age boundary ditch implying an Iron Age date at the earliest.

It would seem then that the consensus is against long-distance trackways, connecting up far-flung parts of the British Isles via various ridgeways in British prehistory. The presumption with such routes is that they are in permanent and regular use and in the instances of the above studies, this is a notion that is clearly refuted. What if such routes hosted more intermittent usage though, serving large-scale seasonal gatherings and only the occasional long-distance communication? Such movement might not require a fixed, constrained and metalled surface but might rather be reflected, in Fowler’s description of sections of The Ridgeway, in a ‘bundle of former track lines’, sinuous and braided as they negotiate open country. From his analysis of Wansdyke in the southern parts of the parishes of Fyfield and West Overton, he considers the construction of the post-Roman bank and ditch and the regularity of original gates within the earthwork as a response to a 5km (3.1 miles) wide corridor of movement that required marshalling. As early as 1951 W. F. Grimes demonstrated that the distribution of material culture along the line of a
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17 Turner, 'The North Downs Trackway'.
18 Harrison, 'The Icknield Way: Some Queries'.
20 Fowler, 'Moving through the Landscape', 30.
conjectural 'Jurassic Way' represented a ‘corridor for traffic rather than a single track’ and that it constituted what was in effect a ‘Jurassic Zone’ of movement as recent as the late Iron Age. So whilst such ridgeways may not have been regularly functioning socio-economic transport networks in prehistory (i.e. premeditated and planned highways), as stretches of open (certainly by the late Bronze Age) and dry country they fundamentally allowed for ease of movement and were thus attractive thoroughfares.

On the local level, much more success has been had in identifying the pattern of prehistoric routes. In Part 2, the origins of co-axial field systems and their likely influence on the structure of landscape is discussed with reference to the method of horizontal stratigraphy and its contribution as an approach to phasing landscapes. At this juncture however it is important to highlight Tom Williamson’s concluding remarks in his most recent assessment of the longevity of prehistoric field systems. Williamson believed the boundaries that constrained prehistoric fields – particularly those on the long axes that created the courses of their ‘slightly wavy brickwork’ appearance in plan form – may actually have been, in their first incarnation, ways that served communities within valleys by running at right-angles to a parallel banding of resources. These routes allowed the people dwelling in the valleys access to woodland, summer pasture, arable fields and alluvial meadows and their continued use throughout the Romano-British period, early medieval period and beyond represents, in Williamson’s words, ‘a response to similar environmental circumstances’.

In Wessex, Fowler, like Williamson, suggests that the earliest linears in the landscape of his study area in West Overton and Fyfield are the trackways allowing access to woodland and downland pasture and that these go on to form the main axes of later field systems. They were in the Romano-British period, as he states, ‘already old’ and that ‘they contributed to the shaping of the land units, the tithings and the parishes and goodness knows what before them’. A further characteristic of these field systems is that their long axes (i.e. those that run from the valley bottom to the higher ground) tend to terminate at watersheds. Of the Scole-Dickleborough field system for example, the long axes appear to terminate at a ‘traverse element which was variously a watershed trackway,
a parish boundary and a hundred boundary’ and the same relationship occurs at both examples of co-axial field systems identified in Hertfordshire (Figures 11 and 12).

Despite scepticism over the extensiveness of individual long-distance tracks, the local approach to route ways, contextualised through the analysis of concomitant field systems, presents good evidence for a network of ways, tracks and paths serving, certainly by the late Iron Age, a relatively dense settlement pattern in SE Britain. How did the Anglo-Saxons describe these routes, what functions did they have and how were they incorporated into the network of routes that served the travel and communication needs of early medieval Wessex?

**Roman Roads**

Very often the network of major Roman roads in Britain identified by the likes of Thomas Codrington, G. M. Boumphrey and Ivan Margary is used to furnish the distribution and location maps of historical and archaeological studies of the early medieval period (Figure 1). Without wishing to single out any one study, in such works there is an implicit assumption that the entire Roman road network continued in use from the Roman period through to the medieval period. The extent however, to which this network survived the ravages of time and impacted upon the development of post-Roman society in Britain has yet to come under closer scrutiny.

On the evolution of the road network in early medieval Europe, Albert Leighton suggests that Roman roads had become something of a liability during the period. In his eyes, they served better the marauders and plunderers of the migration and invasion period and stretched beyond the horizons of the political and geographical zones of the day. Put literally, ‘they no longer led where people wanted to go’. Similarly, Norbert Ohler draws attention to the anachronistic character of Roman roads after the fall of the empire. They were, he argues, designed for military purposes and to get the quickest and most effective action from the smallest amount of troops. By the middle centuries of the first millennium they had in his view become defunct. Their fate, however, was variable. Some found themselves robbed, some abandoned, some formed boundaries (as they may well
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have done during active service) and others, whilst experiencing continuing usage, would have suffered through lack of maintenance. Some evidence from the continent shows that Roman roads were used as quarries for the construction of local buildings. As far as maintenance is concerned, R. J. Forbes, in his *Studies in Ancient Technology*, has estimated that Roman roads would have stood up under the onslaught of iron-shod and iron-tyred wheels for no more than seventy to one hundred years. Maintenance would have undoubtedly been costly and Lynne White considers that it was even beyond the financial capabilities of the Byzantine and Islamic Empires of the eastern Mediterranean to keep Roman roads in a serviceable condition.

This view is contrasted with the accepted view on the survival of Roman roads in Britain where it appears, certainly from analysis of later medieval maps that, ‘many Roman roads remained in use’ into and beyond the post-Conquest period. Many studies too of the early medieval period imply that the Roman road network was a functioning entity. For example, Anne Cole’s recent assessment of water transport in early medieval England has identified a series of place-names which indicate early ports and harbours and a key shared characteristic of these sites was their proximity to Roman roads. Likewise, Leigh Symonds and R. J. Ling’s representation of socio-geographical concepts of time and travel in early medieval England suggests that the Roman roads of the Lincolnshire area survived as viable routes with which to conduct trade and communicate. Although Katharina Ulmschneider herself is reserved in her assessment of the proximity of single coin finds of the mid-Saxon period to Roman roads, her map (Map 21) is reproduced by Ben Palmer who concludes that, ‘Roman roads are clearly important in the distribution of coinage’ (Figure 9). There is always a danger however that the interrelationships presented in such studies are the results of the ‘accidents of geography’: the fact that Roman roads might occupy and

connect the corridors of landscape most conducive to centres of occupation and settlement spanning multiple time frames. Keith Briggs has demonstrated that without rigorous statistical analysis we ought to be careful of how assured we are of any apparent positive correlations between certain place-names and Roman roads.\textsuperscript{41}

It is also clear that in some places Roman roads fell almost entirely out of use. O. G. S. Crawford demonstrated, through an analysis of the London to Bath Roman road, the complete abandonment of the Roman roads in favour of higher ground and river crossings better suited to fording than those crossing points prescribed by the trajectories of Roman roads.\textsuperscript{42} Although an absolute chronology for the abandonment of the Roman road is lacking in Crawford’s study, elsewhere the early failure of all Roman \textit{urbs} in an east-west belt through central southern England has been observed.\textsuperscript{43} It is therefore likely, certainly by Forbes’s reckoning, that the London to Bath Roman roads, via Silchester, fell out of use soon after the demise of the towns and cities they served.

Christopher Taylor’s study of the local road network around Stamford illustrates how when the Roman bridge over the River Welland on Ermine Street fell out of use, a fording place further east was favoured and the course of the road subsequently diverted. A second shift however is observed further east to a bridging of the river at ‘Danish Fort’ (north of Welland) and ‘English Fort’ built by Edward the Elder in 918. Significantly, Taylor’s case study illustrates parallels with that of Crawford in that for Roman roads, the loss of a crossing point could impact upon the wider use of the road.\textsuperscript{44} Della Hooke finds a similar situation at Stratford-on-Avon in her study of a route that runs parallel to the Roman road. Key places such as the ford itself, a pagan Saxon cemetery, and a site of Romano-British occupation are used to suggest an apparent shift away from an ancient route and crossing of the Avon to the course of the Roman road.\textsuperscript{45} However, the presence of a minster church and assembly place on the course of the ancient route might yet suggest a reversion to that thoroughfare in the mid-to-later-Anglo-Saxon period.

From his study of the evolution of Watling Street through Kent, Tim Tatton-Brown observed from the outset that there was ‘good evidence’ to suggest that in the early Anglo-Saxon period much of the Watling Street route through northern Kent was probably not used at all and that ‘only in the late Anglo-Saxon period’ did it once again become an

\textsuperscript{41} K. Briggs, ‘The Distribution of Certain Place-Name Types to Roman Roads’, \textit{Nomina}, 32 (2009), 43-56 at 44.
\textsuperscript{42} O. G. S. Crawford, \textit{Archaeology in the Field} (London: Phoenix House, 1953) 67-73.
\textsuperscript{44} Taylor, \textit{Roads and Tracks of Britain} 97-101.
overland route between Canterbury and London. However, when this route did come back into existence, few stretches respected the alignment of the original Roman road which itself survived only as parish boundaries, hedgerows and local tracks. It was not until the building of the A2 in 1924, Tatton-Brown observes, that the line of the original course of the Roman road was once again taken up.  

One possible approach to measure the extent to which Roman roads continued to function beyond the fifth century and into the medieval period would be to review the site reports for excavations that have taken place on and along the courses of the roads themselves. However, it was decided at a very early stage in the research for this project that site reports of Roman road excavations were too numerous, variable in quality and inconclusive in their findings (because of the inherent problems in dating road surfaces) to be consulted as part of the methodology. That said, one particular excavation highlights the varied history these roads enjoyed and the complexities of re-use and redundancy. In the mid-1970s, an analytical earthwork survey and a number of cuttings were made through the projected course of the Roman road from Silchester to Winchester in the location of East Stratton.

In one cutting, a phase of activity characterised by a humus- and phosphate-rich dark soil overlay the first two phases of road construction that were in themselves believed to be of the Roman period. Thirty-seven sherds of pottery recovered from this 20cm thick dark soil yielded a date range from the sixth to seventh century and this deposit was interpreted as a mid-Saxon occupation layer. ‘Period 3’, as it was designated, was in turn overlain by a layer of flint cobbles believed to correspond to a phase of ‘late Saxon road building’.

Whilst the evidence from Stratton Park suggests that the Roman road may have very naturally slipped into redundancy, a more deliberate ‘decommissioning’, represented by the desire to restrict free movement along the course of Roman roads, must also be considered. This is best illustrated by excavations undertaken at Bokerley Dyke where successive blockings and re-openings of the course of the Roman road from Old Sarum to Badbury Rings were in evidence from the fourth century and later. The iconic network of straight Roman roads throughout Britain was clearly subject to variable conditions that

48 Ibid. 167-71.
49 Ibid. 172.
impacted upon its survival. Even where a Roman road exists as an operating road in the landscape of today, the possibility must be entertained that it may have been brought back in to service, after a period of redundancy, by a later period of road construction and may not have enjoyed a continuous operational status from the first and second centuries through to the present.

Another problem with the tendency of early medieval scholars to use only the pattern of Roman roads to furnish their distribution maps is that as a consequence, the dense network of prehistoric routes that had serviced a blossoming economy in late Iron Age Britain are ignored (Figure 5). Where are these – the ‘Romanised roads’ – in Ivan Margery’s maps? Roman road hunting can be, quite literally, a straightforward pursuit, but finding the Romanised roads, the late Iron Age routes that provided the weft for the warp of later Roman roads is not so easy. As Richard Muir states: ‘the straight roads of the textbooks were only the top status elements in a system that also included un-surfaced routes, winding tracks and pre-existing route ways’. 51 Archaeological evidence suggests that the Romans were not the first to introduce sophisticated road-surfacing techniques to the British Isles. Very recently, Thermo-Luminescent dating of sediments recovered from successive surfaces of a road excavated in Shropshire suggest that phases of gravel resurfacing and cobbling are dated to the late Iron Age. At 95% probability the first phase of the Iron Age droveway falls in the period 200-5 cal BC, with the successive road constructions at 125 cal BC-cal AD 35, 110 cal BC-cal AD 70, and 105 cal BC-cal AD 105 for the final phase: i.e. an 82% probability, using Baysian modelling, that this last event was also Iron Age rather than Roman. 52 Also, a metalled surface of limestone fragments and quartzite pebbles dating to the Bronze Age was recovered from a site at Yarnton, near Oxford. 53

In summary, these studies all illustrate that a much more critical perspective needs to be taken on the survival and subsequent impact of the Roman road network in the early medieval period. Not only does this research project need to evaluate how the top tier of Roman roads were affected by the apparent collapse of the Romano-British infrastructure but the degree to which a lower level of routes still functioned and the level at which local people had recourse to ridgeways for the purposes of long-distance movements must also come under scrutiny. Ridgeways, or ‘watersheds’, by their very nature require much less
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maintenance and upkeep than the kerbed, gravelled and cobbled Roman roads that occupied the valley bottoms. Irrespective of whether they served as corollaries of long-distance contact in prehistory, we must consider them as viable alternatives to the Roman roads. What, then, was the travel and communication network – the physical means of moving around the landscape – that early medieval Wessex inherited from the Romano-British and prehistoric periods? Which elements of it fell redundant and which elements went on to impact upon the dynamics of society and economy?

**Medieval Ways and Paths**

If the study of the early medieval road network of Wessex involves in the first instance establishing what can be brought forward from the prehistoric and Roman periods, the parallel challenge is that of attempting to project back from what emerges in the post-Conquest period in the network of medieval and early modern roads that can be found in cartographic sources such as the *Gough Map* (c. 1360), John Ogilby’s *Britannia Atlas* (1675) and John Speed’s county maps (1610/11). Frank Stenton made use of the *Gough Map* in his study of the character of the medieval road network and, by comparison to the network he identified for the thirteenth century onwards, he ultimately arrived at a quite disparaging view of Anglo-Saxon roads. Since, with regards to the post-Conquest road network, it is to Paul Hindle that our greatest debt is owed. Through the 1970s and 1980s, his work on medieval roads established that a developed system of communications existed in much of lowland Britain from at least the thirteenth century onwards. Much of his work was derived from the analysis of early maps, used in conjunction with various documentary sources that enabled commentary on the processes of construction, the condition and the maintenance of a hierarchy of both local and national route ways. More recently, publishing with James Edwards, attempts to place this route network into a wider trading nexus integrated with water transport has come under scrutiny and the debate within which Edwards, Hindle, John Langdon and Evan Jones were engaged in the pages of the *Journal of Historical Geography* is discussed below. What can be said of the road network however, irrespective of how tied in it was to riverine and coastal transport, is that
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there was clearly an expectation, on both the local level and amongst the ruling elites in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, for a standard of roads to serve not only the economic and social needs of the period but also, in the borderlands of Wales and Scotland, to support military campaigning and subjugation.

What elements we can take from this portrayal of a road network and retrospectively impose on the Anglo-Saxon period it is difficult to know. There does seem however, to be a consensus amongst some commentators that an earlier developed network of roads provided the foundations for this later medieval system. There are few studies devoted specifically to early medieval roads. Hill’s *Atlas of Anglo-Saxon England* reconstructed some of the major arterial route ways including the four royal roads (The Fosse Way, Watling Street, Icknield Way and Ermine Street) and a handful of other significant routes.57 These included Della Hooke’s network of ways servicing the Droitwich salt industry and an inset of Hampshire roads from F. R. Aldsworth’s B. A. dissertation.58 If anything though, this map serves better to illustrate how little was known, back in 1981, of the early medieval route networks throughout England. David Pelteret’s ‘The Roads of Anglo-Saxon England’ did much, four years later, to set out the situation, highlighting our failure to consider the importance of understanding systems of travel and communication in the period whilst at the same time, setting out profitable avenues of enquiry.59 Chief amongst these suggested avenues was the employment of references to the communications network in Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses and prominent in this review, therefore, should be the work of G. B. Grundy who dedicated many years to exploring and publishing the charter boundary clause evidence for the shires of Wessex. Grundy’s first publications of this material were concerned with what he termed the ‘Ancient road system’ or ‘Ancient highways and tracks’ as described in the charter boundary evidence.60 In his second of three papers published on the subject, he offers a classification for the main types of roads and notes the various terms applied to them in Saxon times.61 To date, this stands as one of the best assessments of the nature of Saxon

57 Ibid. 115-6, Figure 199.
communications in Wessex and many of Grundy’s conclusions are broadly concurred with by later commentators. His comments are reprinted here in full:

A. Pre-Roman roads

(1) Ridgeways: They are really watershed ways; and in the case of the larger watersheds of this country, may be traced for miles through county after county. Their importance as lines of communication made their character well known to the Saxons, who usually called them by the name Hrycgweg. Even quite short stretches of ridgeway were called by this name. For example, the road from Faringdon to Wantage in Berkshire is only a watershed way for the first few miles out of Faringdon; but it is called Hrycgweg in a Berkshire charter.

But, as these ridgeways were mostly through-roads, the Saxons sometimes applied to them the more generic term Herepath, which means literally ‘army way’, but is obviously used in the modern sense of ‘highway’ or ‘through-road’.

The ridgeway owes its genesis to the necessity of avoiding streams, which, even if small, would in the winter have quagmires in their neighbourhood, or deeply cut channels difficult of passage.

This leads to the second type of pre-Roman road.

(2) The Summerway. This type has not been recognised; but it is represented again and again among the present highways of the country. In the summer season the upper waters of streams, especially in the chalk districts, tend to run dry, and so during this season it was not necessary for the traveller to climb to the actual top of the ridge, for he could make his way unimpeded by quaggy ground along the lower slopes of it. Nearly every one of the great ridgeways has its accompanying summerway. The Saxons did not distinguish this as a special type of road; but, inasmuch as such roads were nearly always through-roads, they frequently applied the term Herepath to them.

B. Roads of the Romano-British age.
(1) Roman roads. To these the Saxon nearly always applied the term *Straet*, ‘street’ or ‘made road’. Not having the method or money to ‘make’ roads himself, he was keen to notice the presence of ‘making’ in a road. Sometimes, though rarely, he may apply the term *Herepath* to them, as being through-roads.

It is, of course, known that, apart from the great Roman roads, there existed short stretches of vicinal way running from these roads to Villas. No instance occurs in the Hampshire, Berkshire or Wiltshire charters in which the term *Straet* may be suspected to be applied to such a way.

(2) Romanised Roads. These are really earlier roads in a modified form, i.e. ridgeways or summerways which have been ‘made’ in some way, either by both metalling and straightening, or by metalling only. Examples of straightening are to be found on the Icknield Way in Berkshire, on the same road in Oxfordshire, on a piece of road in Meon, Hampshire, and on a piece of road in Farnborough, Berkshire.

C. Roads of Saxon age.

(1) The Saxon developed new through-tracks, to which the term *Herepath*, ‘highway’, is commonly applied.

(2) *Weg*, ‘way’, is a generic term which may be applied loosely to all kinds of roads, but is usually used of purely local roads, probably the tracks from the village to its outlying lands.

Grundy numbered the various routes he identified from the charters and described their course through the shires of Berkshire, Hampshire, Somerset and Wiltshire, and it is easy to see why, of all of the landscape phenomena described in charter boundary clauses, he went first to the theme of highways and tracks. In his introduction to his 1918 study of ancient highways he remarked how, ‘It will be seen that the charters are sufficiently thickly distributed about the county [Wiltshire] for them to intercept at some point or other most of the main lines of communication’.\(^{62}\) He went on to say the same thing about the system in Hampshire: ‘It is fortunate that the charters are distributed fairly evenly over the whole

\(^{62}\) Ibid. 70.
of the county area, because that renders it probable that they give information of some kind with regard to all the *main* lines of communication within the county*.\(^{63}\) As Oliver Rackham has pointed out, one in six of the features mentioned in English charter boundary clauses are concerned with communications. He states that a total of 1654 streets, ways and paths are mentioned making up 11.6 per cent of all English boundary features and that they outnumber every other class of artificial object. What is more, references to fords and bridges make up a further 4.6 per cent of features.\(^{64}\) Like Grundy, and perhaps for the same reasons, Della Hooke was first attracted to the idea of reconstructing route ways from charter boundary evidence. Hooke went on to publish widely on Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses but some of her first publications dealing with this material concerned the reconstruction of route ways generally in the West Midlands area and more locally in the hinterland of Worcester.\(^{65}\) Her later study of the Droitwich salt industry drew on the same evidence and here she demonstrated the significance of understanding the network of roads dedicated to serving what was an important industry of the time. The various ‘salt’ roads referred to in charters were clearly not mere byways but the major ‘made-up’ route ways of the day.\(^{66}\) Already, from these studies it is clear that a complex hierarchy of routes existed in the Anglo-Saxon landscape and that charter boundary clauses could further comment on the function of some routes. Returning to Wessex, in a short piece on ‘Communications’ in a paper employing charters as evidence for settlement in Wessex in the tenth century, Michael Costen develops the idea of three groupings of routes.\(^{67}\) The first category he describes consists of major routes that carried communications between significant political, religious and trade centres. The second category he suggests is comprised of local routes between central places and finally, a third category describes routes that link smaller dependent and tributary estates.\(^{68}\) A similar ranking of routes has been suggested by Andrew Reynolds who employs the useful device of letters ‘A’, ‘B’ and ‘C’, broadly comparable to Costen’s ranking, to indicate the relative hierarchy between routes in the early medieval landscape at the same time pointing out that importance is, of course, subjective and relative to the user.\(^{69}\)

\(^{63}\) Ibid. 175.
\(^{64}\) Rackham, *The History of the Countryside* 259.
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\(^{68}\) Ibid. 105.
Hierarchy and function are aspects of the early medieval networks of travel and communication that this research project will address and in particular, one term that occurs widely in the charter boundary material will be brought under greater scrutiny. In Grundy’s classification there are incidences when what he calls the ‘generic’ term Herepath was applied to rideways, summerways and Roman roads but that the term, translated by him as ‘army path’, was most commonly applied to ‘new’ Saxon through-tracks. The term itself has divided opinion amongst scholars but has curiously, in view of its ubiquity in the charter boundary material, only recently gained systematic analysis. Oliver Rackham seems to have gone furthest in attempting to quantify the evidence for herepaths and in the first instance he observes that the term occurs 221 times in the charters. He also observes that they rarely have proper names and that there is a regional difference in terms of distribution: ‘In the Midlands, north-east England and Kent’, he states, ‘stræt is the commoner term and is used for almost all main roads. In Wessex and Devon most main roads were called herepað’. The incidences where the term appears as a place-name further confirm their confinement to Wessex and the South-West Midlands.

On the term itself, although Margaret Gelling and Anne Cole simply see it as West Saxon term for a ‘main road’, most commentators are in agreement that herepaths have some kind of role associated with military activity. Christopher Taylor, for example, describes a track used primarily for military purposes but he also suggests a role in the governance of the realm in stating that they were so named because they were ‘followed by government administrators travelling with armed escorts’. He observes a further characteristic of herepaths as enabling the wider populace to travel distances beyond the normal limits of local economic and social demand but warns against the ‘dangers of linking up isolated occurrences of the name [herepath] and so producing spurious major route ways’. The herepath observed as running through the late Saxon residence at Yatesbury is considered by Andrew Reynolds to play ‘a significant local role in civil defence’ and he further observes that it was spurred into parts of the Roman road network that were still in use and that they comprised, with beacons, a ‘parallel means of communication’.

Justification for those interpretations which see the here- element associated with a defensive military force can perhaps be found in a set of laws dated to the immediate post-Conquest period (discussed in more detail below) within which we are told that ‘the
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royal road should be wide enough for two ox carts to pass each other, and the drivers to touch their goads at full length, and for sixteen armed knights to ride side-by-side’.\(^76\) The latter requirement led Rackham to put forward the possible definition of a herepath as being a path wide enough for an army.\(^77\) Yet, he goes on to observe that they, ‘usually turn out to be ordinary roads without apparent military importance’ and a further reflection of this is found, he believes, in the observation that when Latin terminology is used, via publica (‘possibly meaning a road maintained at public expense’) is used in preference to the expected via militaris.\(^78\)

Alan Cooper draws attention to the consistency with which the word here is used in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle to refer to the Viking armies and raiding bands and uses this to justify his translation to ‘hostile-raiding-party path’.\(^79\) Cooper’s discussion of Anglo-Saxon highway law is reviewed in more detail below but as part of his study he is keen to promote the idea that there was a suspicion and general distrust of strangers in the Anglo-Saxon period. He therefore attaches to the use of the term hostile connotations and urges against it implying a highway as something useful for the movement of armies for the common defence of the realm. ‘On the contrary,’ he says, ‘it is a further indication of the fear with which the highway could be regarded’. This interpretation confirms his general observation made of attitudes to the highway whereby the term herepath ‘is reminiscent of the distrust of strangers expressed in the law codes’.\(^80\)

That herepaths therefore represented the routes travelled by armies, and on the basis of the here- element, probably offensive armies, seems now to have become widely accepted along with a likely administrative function on the local level.\(^81\) However, a more detailed analysis of the network on the ground and in relation to other elements of the West Saxon landscape of civil defence puts this assumption to the test. John Baker and Stuart Brookes’ study of the Kennet Valley and Avebury region represents the first concerted attempt to set out to analyse and interpret herepaths in a wider landscape context.\(^82\) Building on the work of Andrew Reynolds\(^83\), they employ archaeological, historical (in the form of charter boundary clauses) and place-name evidence to reconstruct
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the pattern of communications in an area of north Wiltshire. To characterise the routes in this region, they carried out a friction surface test to model the suggested isotopic energetic costs of moving across different slopes. Elsewhere this method of ‘least-cost’ path analysis has been employed, in the context of military logistics, in the prediction of optimum communication routes through a landscape and whilst the results of such analysis are necessarily of a purely environmentally determined type, the independent data set that is created can be demonstrated to improve analytical and historical investigations. Baker and Brookes’ model found a negative correlation with those routes described as herepaths in the place-name and documentary record and this led them to observe that, in fact, herepaths appear to link together the natural or ‘best-fit’ paths rather than be themselves the optimum routes through a landscape. Alongside this, they observed that herepaths also provided the primary link between static defences in the region. The implication of their analysis was an interpretation of the term that, in contrast to Guy Halsall for example, implies that such routes were not the most likely/direct routes that a harrying army (i.e. a here) might adopt. Significantly, Baker and Brookes present, on a scale beyond Reynolds’ study of the Yatesbury/Avebury herepath, the first key study to link the herepath network with a system of defensive forts allowing both to be analysed as dual characteristics of the same coherent system. This study prompted Baker and Brookes to conclude that, ‘the use of here in the Chronicle to describe Viking hosts should not be seen as relevant to the meaning of herepath’ and this therefore pulls the interpretation of the term back towards a definition wherein the here- element is seen as generically referring to armies of either a defensive or offensive character.

We are left then with a confusing and potentially unresolved enigma. It seems likely that a herepath was a fairly major road and that it played a role if not for a local militia then for hostile raiding parties or both. Of all our roads, however, the herepath alone stands out as a distinctly Anglo-Saxon (perhaps even more specifically West Saxon) creation notionally as well as physically. Grundy demonstrates how the notion of a herepath can overlay what might otherwise have been called a ridgeway, summerway or Roman road and alongside this primacy of the term when applied to existing routes, the possibility clearly exists for new roads to have been laid out in the period. It is reiterated here that despite the frequency with which the term is used in Anglo-Saxon charter
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boundaries, there has clearly been a failure to apply more scrutiny to these roads and the role they played over the region in which references to them are most numerous. Can, contrary to Taylor’s views, their courses be traced for some distance? What character do they take in the landscape? How are they associated with other travel and communication features such as bridges, fords and gates? And perhaps most importantly, what types of settlement do herepaths connect – where do they actually run from and to? These are some of the key questions that this project will set out to address.

**Bridges and Fords**

Few structures in the landscape can be seen to alter so significantly the geography of movement and the flow of traffic than the construction of a bridge. The profound effect of medieval bridges and their impact on the societies and settlements of medieval Britain has been explored recently in two key texts. In both of these detailed studies the consensus is that the beginnings of the medieval bridge building programme can be found in the late Saxon period. Alan Cooper writes: ‘The conclusion to be drawn from the charter bounds, place-names and narrative evidence is that there were few bridges in England before the tenth century, and that the great period of the building of bridges at points previously un-bridged was between 900 and 1200’. This is a view broadly shared by David Harrison and like Cooper he draws attention to the obligation on estates recorded in charters of the period for work on or repair of bridges. This obligation is one of three, including service in the army and work on forts that has come to be known as the *Trinoda Necessitas*. However, the frequency of the occurrence of this clause in ninth- and early tenth-century charters and the seeming lack of bridges prior to the mid-tenth century presents us with a curious paradox. There is an apparent delay between when the obligation to build bridges is reserved in charters and the first documentary references for bridges. Below is a table which represents a summary of the figures quoted by Cooper of the number of bridges that feature in boundary clauses attached to genuine Anglo-Saxon charters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>No. of genuine bounds</th>
<th>No. of bridges</th>
<th>No. of fords</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 1: Bridges that feature in charter boundary clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of Bridges</th>
<th>Number of Ferries</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seventh, eighth and ninth centuries</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900-925</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>926-950</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951-975</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976-1000</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relative increase in bridge numbers suggested by charters of the mid-tenth century seems to find corroboration in the fact that the terminology of the bridge obligation in the *Trinoda Necessitas* changes to reflect an emphasis on ‘repair’ rather than ‘building’ beyond the mid-tenth century. Harrison is wary of the statistics borne out of the charter evidence and suggests that, as early bridges invariably only appear in one written source, more written sources might easily point us towards more bridges. There is undoubtedly a marked increase in charters from the ninth to the tenth centuries and this must be kept in mind when proffering any potential increase. Furthermore, it should be observed that boundary clauses get progressively more detailed during the tenth century and therefore present us with a risky bias (discussed in more detail in PART 2). This, coupled with the fact that they describe only the very extremities of estates mean that Cooper’s numbers should be treated with caution. Harrison also draws attention to John Blair’s study in Anglo-Saxon Oxfordshire where in a comparatively small but well documented study area numerous bridges are recorded crossing smaller streams and brooks. Both Cooper and Harrison do agree, however, that broadly speaking, the place-name evidence suggests an increase, progressively, in ‘bridge’ elements against the number of ‘ford’ places and furthermore, Cooper observes that the term ‘old ford’ does not appear in a single set of bounds prior to 945 but appears in thirteen sets after that date. Ultimately it seems likely that as we move through the centuries of the early middle ages, in line with rising economic growth, more and more bridges are replacing fords as crossing points on rivers and streams. What seems in dispute is the scale and pace of change.

Cooper puts the stimulus for this campaign of bridge building down to changes and developments in the wider landscape such as the alteration in river courses, speed of flow

---

92 Ibid. 10.
caused by programs of drainage, embankments and other reclamation in the period. Woodland clearance would no doubt, he argues, have created a greater run off with mill races, mill ponds, weirs and dams all making fords unusable – or at least less reliable.\textsuperscript{96} We should also consider though the financial benefits of building bridges and, despite some of the effects on the landscape stressed by Cooper, even in the best of conditions, fording rivers was never without risk. If we do see a rise in economic activity in the late Anglo-Saxon period in Wessex (discussed below) we must surely anticipate an increase in traffic reliant on carting which in turn would impact upon the continued viability of using fords for crossing rivers. Put simply, if the economy of early medieval England was to experience any form of growth it needed to know that produce, goods and commodities could move freely between markets without fear of both seasonal and non-seasonal weather conditions determining which rivers were and were not traversable. David Harrison suggests that an increase in prosperity was one of the major factors behind the program of bridge building in the medieval period that, from both his and Cooper’s numbers would seem to have started in the pre-Conquest period.\textsuperscript{97}

The character and function of the bridges described in this period of bridge-building defined by Cooper and Harrison requires some analysis. Until recently, the greater emphasis in the study of military obligations has been placed on the requirement to build forts and towards the defensive character of the bridges that might be associated with such structures. Nicholas Brooks’ in depth study of Rochester Bridge demonstrates phases of repair that can be linked to the lathes of Kent – whereby each lathe had a duty to maintain a particular pier-base\textsuperscript{98} and as a consequence of this and his other work on military obligations he was drawn to the conclusion that fort and bridge should be seen as a ‘single military unit’.\textsuperscript{99} Much therefore has been made of the connection between bridges and forts and how the two were part of the same strategy and a scheme of defence implemented by Alfred (and possibly earlier in Mercia by Offa)\textsuperscript{100} to ward off the threat posed by the Vikings.\textsuperscript{101} Certainly, Charles the Bald met with a degree of success when implementing this strategy in \textit{Francia} in the 860s and this may have influenced Alfred’s

\textsuperscript{96} Ibid. 18.
adoption of the policy.\textsuperscript{102} David Harrison draws attention to possible Alfredian examples of fort and bridge at Wareham, Exeter, in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle’s record of the events on the River Lea, and Asser’s account of the bridge connecting two fortresses built at Athelney.\textsuperscript{103} A similar scenario is described in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for Edward the Elder’s capture of Nottingham from the Danes when, in 920, he is recorded as building a stronghold to the south of the river and a bridge between it and the existing town.\textsuperscript{104} As discussed earlier at Stamford, forts either side of the River Welland would have served the same purpose in 918, and such a design is envisaged for both London Bridge and at Bristol in the eleventh century.\textsuperscript{105} So when bridge-work is being referred to as an obligation in Anglo-Saxon charters it has overwhelmingly been associated with large defensive structures over major navigable rivers and in conjunction with forts.

Archaeological evidence however conflicts with the idea that the bridges referred to in the \textit{Trinoda Necessitas} are of the ‘double-burh’/‘bridgehead’ type. John Baker and Stuart Brookes note that with the exception of Rochester, ‘there is no archaeological support in England before the late tenth century for a model of deliberate construction of strongholds and bridges, sited to stop movement up-river and to hinder advances along major waterways’.\textsuperscript{106} It is in the mid-ninth century that the first genuine Wessex charters including military obligations appear so, if bridge-work is not referring to large defensive bridgeheads, what kind of work is it referring to?\textsuperscript{107} The excavation of a landmark recorded in the boundary clauses of charters granting land at Ducklington (S 678) and Witney (S 771)(Oxon.) give some indication as to of what the role of bridge-work consisted. The landmark in question is referred to as a \textit{stanford} in the Ducklington charter of 958 and because the same landmark is referred to as a \textit{stan bricge} in the later Witney charter of 969, it might reasonably be concluded that between these dates a bridge was built to replace the ford. However, excavations revealed a stone-paved surface linking a rubble-built causeway across what was once a much wider streambed. This led the excavators to conclude that in this instance the term ‘bridge’ and ‘ford’ were synonymous and the
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interchangeability of the words in the epic poem *The Battle of Maldon* (in lines 74, 88) is cited as supporting evidence.\textsuperscript{108}

This project is well placed to contribute to the current debate on the character and function of early medieval bridges. Through localised case studies the impact they had on the wider landscape of rural and urban development can be explored. Furthermore, by closer analysis of bridges referred to in charters and place-names in relation to the route networks they supported and were part of, it will be possible to cast more light on the purported phase of bridge-building identified by Harrison and Cooper. It will also provide a greater understanding of why bridges were being constructed and place them in the wider context of the other processes of change identified in the early medieval networks of travel and communication in Wessex.

**Waterways and Water Transport**

In the 1990s, a series of papers debated the extent and functionality of the medieval inland waterways network, its interconnectivity with the medieval road network and the subsequent contribution it made to the economy of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Paul Hindle, having dedicated much of the 1980s to elucidating the medieval road network, turned his attention, along with James Edwards, to navigable rivers and their role in the growth of a transport network to serve a rise in medieval towns from the 50 or so recorded in Domesday Book to the 500 to 600 towns in existence in the early fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{109} The conclusions they drew from their study, the full extent of inland waterway transportation and the degree to which it was integrated into the network of overland routes in the twelfth to fifteenth centuries was thought by John Langdon, to have been overstated. Langdon furthermore questioned the importance of inland water transport to the medieval economy.\textsuperscript{110} Edwards and Hindle robustly defended their original article and settled on the conciliatory note that different sources ultimately lead to the differing theories presented by both parties.\textsuperscript{111} Nonetheless, the impression given from this protracted debate and a further review of the source material is very much of a long-term decline in water transport over the wider medieval period.\textsuperscript{112}

\textsuperscript{112} E. Jones, ‘River Navigation in Medieval England’. 

34
There therefore exists the opportunity at an earlier stage for a waterways ‘heyday’ where, in John Blair’s words, ‘there had been more incentive to invest in water’.\footnote{J. Blair, ‘Introduction’, in J. Blair (ed.), \textit{Waterways and Canal-Building in Medieval England} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 1-18 at 1.} Blair was introducing an edited volume entitled \textit{Waterways and Canal Building in Medieval England}, published in 2006, and covering the period from 900 to 1250. It had become increasingly apparent from various landscape studies of wetlands and river passages throughout England that vast engineering works were well within the capabilities of early medieval institutions and this volume collected together some of the current thinking on the subject. In Blair’s introduction two maps of England are compiled from a range of data used by scholars contributing to the book. The first (Figure 3) depicts place-name elements for waterways set against twelfth- and thirteenth-century purveyance account loads, coin loss during the period 950 to 1180 and selected Roman roads.\footnote{Ibid. 16, Figure 4.} The second (Figure 4) described by Blair as ‘perhaps rash, certainly broad-brush and speculative,’ represented an attempt to interpret the data in Figure 3.\footnote{Ibid. 17-18, Figure 5.} The conclusion to be drawn from these maps is that whilst navigable rivers and known watercourses appear to service the hinterlands of major rivers such as the Thames, the Severn and the Wash, Wessex seems not to have been similarly penetrated inland by navigable rivers. The Itchen is depicted as navigable only as far as Winchester and the Avon not necessarily even as far as Old Sarum, whilst the River Frome does not extend beyond Wareham. Further evidence for the lack of activity on Wessex’s rivers comes from the analysis of certain place-names associated with water transport. Anne Cole’s paper in the same volume looks at the evidence for water transport in the pre-Conquest period through the distribution of \textit{port, }hįð, \textit{ēa-tun, lād} and \textit{stæð} elements and in particular the Thames stands out as a major arterial waterway along with those of eastern England.\footnote{Cole, ‘The Place-Name Evidence for Water Transport in Early Medieval England’, 83, Figure 19.} For Wessex though, a complete lack of \textit{hįð}s away from the coast and into the chalkland areas is thought to indicate the seasonal nature of rivers over this geology, a fact that prompts us to question the importance of waterborne transport to the economic development of the area.\footnote{Ibid. 84.}

The limited geographical range of Wessex’s navigable waterways has therefore impacted upon the extent to which this study has explored the role of river communications and their influence on the wider landscape. Only two study areas as part of this project deal with coastal zones (South Hams in Devon and the Isle of Purbeck in Dorset) and for the most part studies have been undertaken of inland areas beyond the
reach of the navigable rivers identified by Blair. This review will therefore restrict itself to considering Christopher Currie’s identification of an early medieval watercourse on the Itchen (Hants.) and the limited charter boundary clause evidence for similar structures and arrangements of water transport in the region. It will also consider briefly how the lack of navigable waterways in the Wessex region might have impacted upon the distribution of wealth throughout the kingdom in the middle-Saxon period and how processes of landscape change in the later Saxon period may further have blighted the viability of river transportation throughout the region. Ultimately, if water transport was geographically limited in Wessex from the outset, irrespective of further hindrances, developments in overland transport might be more identifiable and may well be seen to have played a more vital role in the growth of the economy in later Anglo-Saxon southern England.

First identified in an analysis of the landscape evolution of the south-central Hampshire Basin and subsequently discussed in two papers, Christopher Currie employed evidence from charter boundary clauses and field survey to identify a possible canal cut to improve navigation up the River Itchen in the direction of Winchester.118 Two sets of charters survive for an estate at South Stoneham dating to 990 x 992 and 1045.119 In the boundary clause of the later charter, a reference is made to a niwan ea [a new river], a boundary mark that does not feature in the boundary clause of the earlier charter. Currie took this to suggest that an alteration was made to the course of the Itchen between the granting of the two charters and he uses map regression and landscape analysis to identify a man-made channel cut between two mills. The suggestion from Currie’s findings is that navigation at least as far as Bishopstoke (from where cargoes could have been moved onto Winchester by road) was being either maintained or inaugurated at this point and a tentative link is made between this undertaking and the migration of functions upstream to Winchester from the declining settlement at Hamwic.120

A similar reference can be observed in the charter boundary clause for Romsey (dated 967x975) suggesting an alteration of the course of the River Test.121 Here it is not a new river that is being referred to but rather an old one as the boundary is recorded as running Of huntes ige inand ban alde tersten andlang þan ealde terste ondþe hit comeþ in

---
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bare streit bare purstan seyt [From hunter’s island into the old Test, along the old Test until it comes to the street where the Test runs]. Whilst the evidence from the South Stoneham charters indicates a dual function for the artificial watercourse in providing both navigation upstream and mill-power, similar evidence is lacking in the instance of the Romsey charter. Landscape analysis of the Romsey area undertaken to identify the old and new Test may go some way to determine its character and function but that navigation further upstream is a concern of both the Romsey and South Stoneham canal builders is suggested by instances of the term stæð that appear in charter boundary clauses for estates granted up-river.

Currie observes the reference to a stæð that appears in the charter for Bishopstoke dated to 960.122 The traditional view of this term was that it was a ‘landing-place’.123 Recently though this interpretation has been revised by Margaret Gelling and Anne Cole who prefer a meaning of ‘shore’ or ‘bank’, i.e. a natural feature that could nonetheless be used for unloading. The meaning of ‘landing-place’ is, they argue, established only in the later medieval period.124 Despite their reasoning, it is difficult to see how, without comparable and dateable archaeological evidence from sites where the application of a place-name can be reliably assigned a terminus post quem, such a distinction can be made. A complicated arrangement of water management consisting of two stæðs, a ‘beam weir’ and two fords is referred to in a charter for St Mary Bourne and Hurstbourne Priors.125 Such an arrangement suggests a degree of construction – not least if we see fords, in Blair and Millard’s view, as constructed causeways – and this all occurs at the confluence of the Bourne Rivulet and the River Test, upstream of Romsey’s ‘Old Test’ (Map 1.5, SU44NW). Other examples of stæðs appear in the Wessex study area where the æfene stæpe is found on the Wiltshire Avon,126 a noddre staþe is recorded near Wilton on the River Nadder127 and a pilig stæp is recorded on the River Wylve.128 In all three recorded examples from Wiltshire the stæð has taken the name of the river it serves but whether or not these are constructed landing places or natural river banks is difficult to say for sure without archaeological fieldwork, map analysis and very likely, excavation.

Another option for exploring early medieval river navigation in Wessex, as with the road network, is to work forward from what is known archaeologically from earlier periods.

122 S 683.
125 S 359 - where the boundary is recorded as running utt on tersten on þone syberan sted þonne andlang stapes þæt be neoðan beamwar on þone norpere stæp and lang stapes æft on twyfyrdre [out to the Test to the southern stæð, then along the stæð that is beneath the beam weir to the northern stæð, along the stæð back to the two fords].
126 S 348.
127 S 438, S 493.
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Drawing attention to Andrew Sherratt’s map of major navigable waterways of late Prehistory, Blair suggests that the ‘size and shape’ of early medieval riverine transport may have more in common with the main arterial waterways of a long durée from the late Iron Age onwards. In Sherratt’s map, the rivers of Wessex are not seen to penetrate much beyond the coastal fringe with the exception of the Hampshire and Wiltshire Avon which, he suggests, was navigable as far as the Amesbury area. Ben Palmer redraws this prehistoric network of rivers for the purposes of his analysis of the hinterland of Hamwic in the middle-Saxon period. From it, he argues that the lack of waterway transport in the region was, in part, responsible for the lack of sites producing metalwork and coin finds of the seventh and eighth centuries (discussed below).

A key question that arises out of the Wessex evidence is what ‘navigable’ is considered to mean. There can be no doubt that floating bulk goods down river was inordinately easier than attempting to pilot the same goods up river and we therefore have to envisage a situation where voluminous and potentially heavy goods (bulk items) are only moving in one direction; being floated down stream to commercial centres in coastal locations for redistribution and consumption. It may very well have been the case that the load capacity of river vessels meant that only when they were empty could they be successfully hauled, rowed or sailed upstream. Anecdotal evidence of the relative time taken to navigate up and down river is provided by Albert Leighton who observed that flatboats took 2-5 days to float down the Rhône from Lyon to Avignon but took almost a month to return needing several animals to tow. Norbert Ohler draws attention to Frederik Barbarossa’s (1152x1190) attempt to foster trade along the course of the Rhine where in a law code it states, ‘no one should hinder the merchants who travel up the Rhine or who pull a tow rope along the bank, which is acknowledged to be the King’s Highway, on the pretext of demanding a toll or in any other way’. Returning to the 1990s debate on later medieval water transport, John Langdon considered that a system dependent on hauling empty vessels upstream on the river Thames could not be seen as an economic proposition. Whilst no attempts have been made to identify towpaths in early medieval
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Wessex, Christopher Currie did observe a path (designated a ‘pathway’ in a tithe map and award for South Stoneham) alongside the artificial water channel at Stoneham which he thought might possibly represent the remnants of one. Many more such paths may have existed alongside short sections of adapted and constructed watercourses but such embankments running alongside the entirety of navigable natural rivers and streams must surely have been beyond the logistical capabilities of early medieval Wessex.

What complicates the issue further is the growing evidence for a whole range of other industries that were making use of waterpower in early medieval England and the possibility that many would come into direct competition with those using rivers for transport. Alongside the documentary references, there is growing archaeological evidence in support of watermills from as early as the seventh century on sites throughout England. The number of mills recorded in Domesday Book is 6082 according to H. C. Darby however; because the survey is incomplete, John Langdon and Martin Watts argue that this figure should be much higher. The view from the editor and various contributors to the Waterways and Canal building in Medieval England book is positive in the sense that despite the growing number of mills and the increasingly sophisticated and ubiquitous fisheries of the period it was, in Della Hooke’s words, ‘unlikely that enormous problems were created for shipping’. Blair suggests too that, providing the incentives were there, we should expect human effort to overcome the physical obstacles provided by changes in river conditions. Of the later medieval rivers of the Humber Estuary, Edwards and Hindle see the numerous inquisitions relating to the obstructions and complaints about hindrances to navigation as evidence of their continuing importance and the many examples of man-made watercourses discussed in Waterways and Canal Building are surely evidence of the value placed on waterborne transport.

---

Yet, is it the case that the demise of inland water transport identified in the post-Conquest period might actually have started, as part of a longer-term process, in the early medieval period and are the canal-building endeavours described in Waterways and Canal Building also a reflection of increasing problems? Other factors may well have taken their toll on the viability of water transport in England and the effects of economic development on the environment and in particular the intensification of agricultural production from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries (together termed ‘the second landscape Evolution’) might very well have had an impact. In the late ninth and tenth centuries for example, the middle section of the Thames valley exhibits increasing evidence for alluviation, silting and sedimentation, a clear indication of an increased level of arable cultivation. Deforestation can also be seen as a major contributor to soil erosion and there is a broad consensus that the period spanning the ninth to thirteenth centuries was also characterised by a phase of woodland clearance. Although Rackham writes that Anglo-Saxons, in the course of 600 years did not ‘radically reorganise the wooded landscape’, he does suggest that woodland shrank from 15% in 1086 to perhaps 10% by 1350.

So in summary, it is clear that Wessex’s rivers never really enjoyed the same level of navigability as the Thames, the Severn and those in eastern England. Even if we take the least parsimonious view that the Itchen was navigable as far as Winchester, and the Avon as far as Amesbury, goods seem likely to have been moving only in one direction – towards the coast. As will be illustrated in Chapter Three, it may be that the locations of Christchurch, Hamwic and the mercatorium located at Hamblemouth are a result of this pattern and we must therefore envisage, with the growth of the economy in the tenth and eleventh centuries and the rising wealth on inland sites, a shift in how and where goods were being moved about the landscape. It is therefore re-iterated that because of the existing limitations in water transport in Wessex, developments in overland transport might be more identifiable and may well be seen to have played a more vital role than they did elsewhere in the growth of the economy in later Anglo-Saxon southern England.
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Chapter Two: Travellers and Journeys

Rad byþ on recyde  rinca gehwylcum
Seft, and swiþhwæt  ðam ðe sitteþ
Onufan meare mægenheardum  ofer milpaþas

Riding, in the hall, for each person,
Is sweet, yet severe for him that sits
Upon a sturdy mare over miles-long pathways

The following chapter, through the analysis of existing research and scholarship, will profile the range of journeys and the types of travellers that would have moved through the landscape of early medieval Wessex. As the Old English Rune Poem states, travelling was arduous and not to be undertaken lightly, but the opportunities for advancement, knowledge and worldly experience made it an important and rewarding endeavour. Reviewing this material is important because it can help place these events and their actors and actresses in a landscape that had to accommodate them. How in practice were these journeys committed and how was the landscape altered and inscribed to create a conceptual geography in the minds of the medieval traveller?

Pilgrimages

Pilgrims represent the most renowned group of medieval travellers and many of the stories associated with the lives, miracles and travels of the saints and the pilgrims who journeyed long distances to worship at their resting places provide us with colourful insights into life on the road. There is a high level of sophistication suggested by the account of the pilgrimage to Jerusalem made by Willibald and his company in the eighth century where ship travel, tolls, customs, and fares are all mentioned. Early missionaries enjoyed a high level of mobility and individuals like Boniface were known to have travelled at least on three occasions to Rome, a popular destination for pilgrimages of the seventh and eighth centuries. Ian Wood in his ‘Northumbrians and Franks in the Age of Wilfred’ touched upon the extensive preparations by Ceolfrith for his journey to Rome, including

147 The Lives of S.S. Willibrord, Boniface, Strum, Leoba and Lebuin, together with the Hodoeporicon of St. Willibald and a Selection from the Correspondence of St. Boniface are all covered in C. Talbot, Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Germany (London: Sheed and Ward, 1954).
hiring a ship, collecting gifts and having good letters of introduction. All of these suggest that affluence and influence were prerequisites for the undertaking of long journeys.\textsuperscript{148} What comes across from these written sources therefore is a sense that in the early days such pilgrimages were the preserve of the wealthy in society.

For the late Saxon period however, we witness the rise in popular pilgrimages and a growing culture of saint worship amongst the lower orders of the social hierarchy.\textsuperscript{149} The \textit{Translatio et Miracula S. Swithuni}, for example, provides us with a fascinating insight into life on the road in Anglo-Saxon Wessex for a range of individuals from varying backgrounds. The document is a record of the miracles performed posthumously by St Swithun in the later tenth century.\textsuperscript{150} St Swithun’s relics were translated from a tomb outside the west door to the chancel on 15\textsuperscript{th} July, 971 and Lantfred’s account is thought to have been written a short while afterwards.\textsuperscript{151} The \textit{Translatio et Miracula S. Swithuni} describes aspects of journeys made to Winchester from near and far. For the most part travellers are the infirm, the visually impaired or the physically disabled journeying to the tomb of St Swithun in search of a miracle cure. The emphasis of the work is very much on the role of St Swithun and each chapter is rhetorically loaded to persuasively elaborate on the power of the English saint as a force for righteousness and the restoration of health. In some aspects, therefore, the document is problematic as the focus is not necessarily on providing accurate accounts of the exact nature of each journey. This is clearly demonstrated, for example, in the tale of the ‘hump-backed’ cleric who, after receiving a vision of St Swithun one night, immediately rises from his bed and travels to Winchester on crutches. Upon arriving in Winchester we are told that the moneyer, with whom the cleric intends to stay, is ‘at first greatly surprised as to why the sick man had awakened him at that hour’.\textsuperscript{152} Problems arise in this account when we consider that we are told that the cleric was travelling from Alderbury in Wiltshire. Was Lantfred aware that to travel such distances overnight would be near impossible – taking eight hours or more for even the fittest of walkers? In the winter months it is just possible that an invalid, ‘sustaining his infirmity on two crutches’ could leave at sunset and arrive before sunrise (a maximum of ten hours). Yet, we are specifically told that this journey was made on 4\textsuperscript{th} of July (at around sixteen and a half hours of sunlight, one of the longest days and shortest nights of the year).

\textsuperscript{151} Ibid. 217.
\textsuperscript{152} Ibid. 269.
Irrespective of these inconsistencies, Lantfred’s account is useful in illustrating the varied provenances of people journeying to visit Winchester in the tenth century. Locally, we are told of people travelling from the province of ‘Ham’ (Hampshire), Collingbourne (Wilts.) and the Isle of Wight. Yet, further afield individuals and groups were travelling from Bedfordshire, London, Rochester, Hunum (? Huntingdonshire), ‘far away areas to the west’, and ‘various regions of England’. In one account a thief awaiting the death penalty in France hears of St Swithun’s miracles through merchants who were crossing the Channel. St Swithun was clearly beginning to have a European-wide draw and it is clear that the roads in and out of the city of Winchester would have been well trodden by the feet of pilgrims seeking out the tomb of the popular saint. Of particular interest in the Translatio et Miracula S. Swithuni is the frequent mention of guides, particularly young boys, for the blind and infirm. Clearly, those that could not see would have been in need of help in finding their way through the landscape of Wessex to the city of Winchester. In one instance, three blind women travelling from the Isle of Wight are furnished by their lord with a mute man of ‘about 20 years of age’ who leads them to Winchester ‘by a winding road’. Another story is especially insightful for our purposes when we are told that a blind woman and her mute female companion travelled together from ‘far away areas to the west’ and whilst the mute one guided the blind one, the latter ‘asked directions of passers-by for her guide’. It is tantalising to think of what directions were verbally conveyed and the kinds of landmarks that were being listed en route to the holy site. One story gives an insight into the types of monuments that may have marked out such a journey. In it, a blind man is guided by a young boy, both from a remote part of England and, we are told by Lantfred, they rest at a large stone cross some three miles out of Winchester. In this final incident we are invited to consider the types of monuments and signs that will have been used to inscribe a landscape and to communicate between the travellers local and foreign. Elsewhere the distinction has been made between ‘associative’ and ‘direct’ experience of moving from one place to another, using the landscape as a document to record and explore the mental mapping of journeys. This research project will explore some of these aspects in more detail and will demonstrate that through the
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reconstruction of Anglo-Saxon landscapes in Wessex, we can develop an understanding of how space could be meaningfully structured to communicate to those moving through it.

**Clerics and the Mobility of the Church**

Whilst the success of pilgrimages was emerging, there continued the need for members of the church to travel so that it could maintain its influence in the wider world and administer care to its people. Pastoral care carried out in the Anglo-Saxon period—particularly on the minster system—consisted of members or groups of secular clergy travelling from a central minster throughout large, expansive minster *parochia* carrying out such duties as preaching, performing baptism, saying mass, prescribing penance and caring for the sick—duties that would require them to travel regularly and to lesser and perhaps isolated settlements.\(^\text{159}\) In return though, parishioners would be required to visit the places of worship to receive basic religious rites. Not all of the emerging manorial parish churches of the tenth and eleventh centuries would have had graveyards as is clear from the laws of Edgar which stipulate that tithes should be paid according to whether or not a thegn’s church had a graveyard.\(^\text{160}\) It is therefore important to consider the network of roads that would have served local and minster churches and the very real need to deliver recently deceased family members to burial grounds and newly born babies to baptismal fonts.

Such were the concerns at the very local level of ensuring safe passage to and from lesser religious centres but for the bishops and abbots of cathedral and monastic foundations, a different range of travelling issues existed. Bishops and archbishops with important roles in the affairs of the state travelled, probably with considerable retinues, to attend council meetings and are attested to in the witness lists of charters issued at such events.\(^\text{161}\) Catherine Cubitt has assembled a list of church councils for the period 650 to 850 with not only dates and locations of where the meetings were held but also a discussion on attendees.\(^\text{162}\) Her work clearly indicates that the Christian church in Anglo-Saxon England was dependent on individuals and groups from institutions throughout Britain journeying, on occasions, considerable distances to carry out their work. Religious and institutional travellers of this nature must therefore have represented a significant, if not the most

\(^{159}\) A. Thacker, ‘Monks, Preaching and Pastoral Care in Anglo-Saxon England’, in J. Blair and R. Sharpe (eds.), *Pastoral Care before the Parish* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1992), 137–70.


\(^{161}\) S. Keynes, *An Atlas of Attestations in Anglo-Saxon Charters* at http://www.trin.cam.ac.uk/chartwww/Attestations1.html (12/05/09)

adept, group of travellers in Anglo-Saxon England. A harsher illustration of the mobility of the church in early medieval society is to be found in Albert Leighton’s observation that disease was ‘one of the most influential medieval travellers’ and it undoubtedly says something of the mobility of the monks, clerics and other church offices that they were the most susceptible to epidemics.\textsuperscript{163}

How can this level of movement on the part of institutions whose effectiveness was dependent on travelling have influenced the pattern of routes in the landscape and furthermore, is that influence detectable? A charter from the early ninth century gives us an insight into how such retinues may have provided for themselves whilst on the road. Bishop Ealmund of Winchester granted an estate at Farnham, Surrey, to Brihthelm in exchange for four estates in Wiltshire but retained the right to two nights of hospitality in Farnham each year.\textsuperscript{164} Farnham is located at approximately the half-way point on the road, via Alresford and Alton, from Winchester to London and it is likely that this charter reflects the needs of the bishop to enjoy secure and fitting hospitality whilst on business to London. That the entertainment of a Bishop and his retinue could be an onerous commitment is suggested by a charter purporting to date from the reign of King Ine (688-726) but likely to be a later forgery, possibly of the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{165} The charter grants a range of privileges to the Abbey at Glastonbury and amongst the many obligations of which the Abbey was to be free was the uninvited visitation of the bishop who, when he had been invited, was to limit his retinue to three or four men and stay in one of only two lodgings in Poelt (Pilton). Although the main fabric of this charter might have been deemed spurious, it seems likely that it represents the desires, at the very least, of the forgers who themselves had an aversion to the hospitality demands being placed on them by the bishop.

The distributions of apparently isolated and remote estates belonging to large ecclesiastical foundations has been used in some instances to reconstruct the pattern of communications and the likely routes employed by bishops as they attended councils and synods throughout the kingdom and administered within their own dioceses. It seems likely that an importance was placed by the bishops of Lindisfarne on the acquisition of properties connecting to the Roman road network so that easier access and overnight accommodation would be provided for journeys to the episcopal centre of the shire.\textsuperscript{166} A similar scenario is observed in Kent where the archbishop of Canterbury obtained various
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properties that would have enabled movement throughout Kent but also along the Thames Estuary coastline to conduct business in London.  

Julia Barrow has considered the evidence for ‘way-stations’, estates in the ownership of the bishops of Worcester, to reconstruct the likely routes by which the bishop and his retinue would travel to conduct business in London. A second study on a particular group of properties under the ownership of the church of Hereford goes even further in illustrating that the changing values of such places over time can indicate changes in journey patterns. In Wessex, Barrow considers the Domesday properties of the bishops of Winchester at Downton (Wilts.), Fonthill (Wilts.) and Rimpton (Som.) as a chain of estates that would facilitate journeys from Hampshire towards the large episcopal estate at Taunton. Whilst there can be no doubt that the acquisition of these properties provided sumptuous accommodation for a bishop on the road and ministering to his flock, the motivation for their purchase may have lain just as much in the ability to move produce derived from different ecological zones widely and securely over a landscape, all under the auspices of the one institution. In some ways, the string of properties from Winchester to Taunton also served as a self supporting network of estates where specialised produce moving from the wetlands of Somerset could, en route to the estate centre at Winchester, be distributed amongst other properties from which other specialised produce could be collected. A similar situation might be envisaged for the Worcester ‘way-stations’ where produce brought in to London from the continent, recorded as remitted from tolls in the eighth century, could be moved (and distributed) securely from way-station to way-station en route to Worcester. Such ‘way-stations’ therefore also have the capacity to enable us to reconstruct a certain type of trade route – one that reflects the internal economy of monastic houses and large ecclesiastic institutions.

Both the Regularis Concordia and the Benedictine Rule detail the correct conduct of monks should they gain permission to travel. Colourful insights are provided on the reservations churchmen had in letting clergy travel far from the sanctuary of the monastic compound. For example, in the Regularis Concordia, a rule of the tenth-century Benedictine reform, it is stipulated that travelling bishops were not to take in their retinue youths but rather ‘grown-up persons from whose conversation they may take profit’.

---
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Monks too were not permitted to travel without permission as experience of the secular world was clearly deemed to have a negative effect on the communities of monasteries as reflected in the *Benedictine Rule*:

> When brethren return from a journey, let them on the day they return, at the end of each canonical Hour of the Work of God, lie prostrate on the floor of the oratory and ask the prayers of all on account of any faults that may have surprised them on the road, by the seeing or hearing of something evil, or by idle talk. Nor let anyone presume to tell another what he has seen or heard outside the monastery, because this causes great harm.\textsuperscript{173}

Clearly, those churchmen travelling between the way-stations and to synods and councils beyond were subject to a set of strict guidelines but one stipulation in particular is of relevance to our study of the early medieval landscape of Wessex. In the *Benedictine Rule*, monks are urged to pray at the usual hours when away, and a similar expectation is made in the *Regularis Concordia* which further recommends engagement in the singing of psalms or other necessary business.\textsuperscript{174} The role that stone and timber crosses played in the need for clergy to conduct regular rites whilst on the road might therefore be considered. Such monuments survive as standing remains, relocated fragments of stone (usually in churches), in place-names and in charter boundary clauses. Alexander Rumble has interpreted their functions variably as, ‘wayside edifices at which travellers pray to Christ’, and those ‘sited on significant hills or on coastal promontories’ as ‘landmarks for travellers’ as well as ‘Christian Symbols in the landscape’.\textsuperscript{175} Sam Turner makes the point that these were monuments ‘whose impact would have been maximised when viewed by as many passersby as possible’ supporting the view that roadside locations were important factors in their distribution in the landscape.\textsuperscript{176} Although those recorded in Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses naturally fall on significant early medieval boundaries, John Blair has
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stressed that crosses are not to be seen in the first instance as boundary markers but rather roadside monuments.\textsuperscript{177}

In summary then: Of the types of travelling and journeying by both those in service to the church and by those in pursuit of the church’s services, there appear two areas within which a landscape approach may contribute. The first of these is in the inscribing of landscapes – particularly with Christian iconography. It might be argued that of all the many travellers reviewed in this chapter pilgrims represent the first group travelling without any prior knowledge of long distance routes. Can it therefore be posited that a rise in signposting and inscription within the landscape was intended to meet with the rise in popular pilgrimages in the late ninth and tenth centuries? Was this form of sign-posting as much a means by which roadside prayer could be facilitated as it was the desire within the established church of this period to make Christianity more a part of daily life?\textsuperscript{178} Pilgrims as well as churchmen would have prayed at roadside edifices and this study can set about identifying crosses, roods and stones and characterising the distribution of such monuments in a landscape context to gain a greater understanding of which routes might have served these purposes. So inscription of the landscape is one particular area that can be focused on. The second area that a landscape approach can contribute to is in identifying the major route ways that would have served the internal economies of major ecclesiastic centres. We might see these economies as having a vested interest in the maintenance and clear passage of routes between their estates and it certainly seems clear that a regular form of travelling and transportation would have existed between ecclesiastical centres and their distant estates.

**Messengers**

Undoubtedly, the church would have required a considerably complicated network of messengers to carry out its work throughout Europe and beyond and the overwhelming number of individuals listed as ‘messengers’ in the *Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England* are recorded as carrying out the work of the Christian mission. The *Prosopography* is a web-based resource providing access to structured information on all of the recorded inhabitants of Anglo-Saxon England from the late sixth to the end of the eleventh century and of the 127 individuals listed as ‘messengers’, 101 remain anonymous whilst 26 are referred to as named individuals.\textsuperscript{179} The kinds of messages being conveyed under this list

\textsuperscript{178} B. A. E. Yorke, pers. comm. 2012
\textsuperscript{179} http://www.pase.ac.uk/pase/apps/occupations/index.html (30/02/2010)
include everything from Gregory I’s first ‘message’, sent via Augustine, to the English people through to the messengers sent out by Cnut in 1017 in search of a wife.  

It is clear from the various listings that messengers played an important role in all manner of institutions and carried information far and wide throughout the landscape. Where the burden of obligation to perform this service lay in secular society is indicated in a letter sent to King Edgar within which Oswald, Bishop of Worcester, set out the conditions in which leases were granted and stipulated that certain men of a noble class were expected to perform specific services including riding to deliver the bishop’s messages.

In a legal compilation of status entitled Geþyncðo [Dignities] and dated to the first quarter of the eleventh century, the status – or at least a term of service – of Radstefn [riding persons/force] is listed. A similar term is found in the Domesday Book where there are approximately 583 references to radmanni and radchenistre (riders or riding men) to be found in a band of counties stretching from Cheshire, along the western border of England to the English Channel. The exact functions of this position and the service it renders are not entirely obvious from the 1086 survey. The term itself might suggest the role of a bodyguard and proximity to the Welsh border might have required an extra level of vigilance for elites and the king, but Dorothy Whitelock and Frank Stenton have also drawn parallels with the position of the geneat in the Rectitudines Singularum Personarum, a list of the ‘rights and ranks’ of people, drafted in the eleventh century. Amongst the many services placed on the shoulders of the geneat, the care of horses, acting as a guard to the lord and riding are stipulations alongside the duty to ærendian fyr swa nyr, swa hwyrde swa him man to tæcð [carry messages far and near wheresoever he is directed].

The geneat and Radstefn were therefore likely to have played a crucial role in the linking of the manor with the wider world. Whilst the provision of horse and carts and the obligation to ride and provide carrying service may have kept the geneat within the orbit of daily affairs (discussed below), it seems likely that in the delivering of messages ‘near and far’, he may very well have been taken to more remote parts where directions and guidance were required. It is likely that the same types of landscape monuments used by pilgrims and churchmen will have helped in the orientation of longer distance-travelling geneats – helping them to form a mental map of where they were and where they needed to get to.
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If entirely lost on the road, they would very likely have been intercepted by other local geneats whose further obligation it was to ‘bring strangers to the village’.

**Landscapes of Governance**

Along with those exacting the affairs of the church, another group of highly mobile people would be those in service to the emerging Anglo-Saxon state. Such work can be crudely divided into tiers of involvement on the local, regional and national scale, all with varying impacts on the geography of travelling and communicating in the landscape of the early medieval period. The mobility of the Anglo-Saxon kings is best illustrated in David Hill’s *Atlas of Anglo-Saxon England* and it would seem, especially from the reigns of Æthelstan, Edgar and Æthelred, that key to the success of ruling elites in the early medieval period was the ability ‘to see and be seen’. 186

Levi Roach has recently presented the case for the importance of the *iter regis* and the constitutional role played by a charismatic king conducting face-to-face business throughout his kingdom. Drawing primarily from hagiographical works of the tenth and early eleventh centuries Roach identifies royal visitations and the pomp and ritual that was a part of them as crucial both to king and kingdom in obtaining harmony, justice and political stability. 187 Asser gives us an insight into how such royal retinues may have been comprised explaining that the king’s followers were divided into three groups which rotated service in the court, dividing their time between support of the king and their own estates. 188 Thus a large retinue of fighting men and councillors would always be in attendance with either the king’s household or that of his closest family. The witness lists of Anglo-Saxon charters record some of the people present at the king’s court when charters were issued. Whilst at great councils a larger number of dignitaries might be expected to attend, for lesser meetings, charters can provide us with information about the composition of the court. Bernard Reilly’s work on late eleventh-century Léon-Castilla serves as a good model on which to base this kind of study. In an attempt to discover just how many people travelled with King Alfonso VI from Léon to Santiago de Compostela, to Oviedo, back to Léon and on to Burgos in Castilla during a period of five months in 1075,
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Reilly analysed the witness lists and locations at which charters were signed.\textsuperscript{189} He went on to conclude that at any one time the king might be travelling with a retinue of over 220 people, 51 carts and more than 200 animals.\textsuperscript{190} His work involves a degree of extrapolation from the known dignitaries mentioned in the witness lists of charters to a conjectural body of people including servants, men at arms and other courtly figures such as falconers and masters of hounds. What is clear however from Reilly's work is that a not inconsiderable group of vehicles, animals and people would be using the route ways of northern Spain to transport the king and his court.

Whilst Anglo-Saxon charters do not provide quite the same level of detail as their counterparts from northern Spain, they say enough to give us some idea of the sizes of retinues and travelling parties either with the king or \textit{en route} to meet with him for council duties. The work of Simon Keynes has illustrated that witness lists from authentic charters of King Æthelred II record actual attendance at the exaction of their issue and Jennifer MacDonald, working from Keynes' tables, identifies that on average around thirty high status individuals were attending these meetings.\textsuperscript{191} Reilly calculated that between eight and nine dignitaries travelled with Alfonso VI, leading him to the overall numbers in the concomitant retinue stated above. MacDonald draws our attention to the sixty-four dignitaries that witnessed the granting of land at Downton and Ebblesbourne (Wils.) by charter in 997, but even with the average number of witnesses from Æthelred II's charters at about thirty, the sizes of the parties travelling and converging on these high-status official meetings would have been considerable – if we work to Reilly's calculations.\textsuperscript{192} John Maddicott, in \textit{The Origins of the English Parliament, 924-1327} comments that a factor not often considered in relation to assemblies like this was 'the state of the roads' and he surmises that 'only by circumstances which favoured relatively speedy and direct travel' were the great gatherings of the tenth century made possible.\textsuperscript{193} He goes on: 'That English rulers could bring men together from so far away was a tribute not only to their political enterprise and authority but also to the English travelling conditions, for which they too may have been partly responsible'.\textsuperscript{194}

\textsuperscript{190} Ibid. 155.
\textsuperscript{191} S. Keynes, \textit{The Diplomas of King Æthelred 'the Unready' 978-1016: A Study in Their Use as Historical Evidence} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980); J. E. Macdonald, 'Travel and Communication Network in Late Saxon Wessex: A Review of the Evidence', PhD Thesis (University of York, 2001) 131. The information on synod and assembly attendees can be found in S. Keynes, \textit{An Atlas of Attestations in Anglo-Saxon Charters} at \url{http://www.trin.cam.ac.uk/chartwww/Attestations1.html} (12/05/09).
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We now turn to the travelling required by the commitment to attend local assemblies. For this, more comparative work of continental practice is useful. In a chapter entitled ‘Mobility’ in Wendy Davies’s *Small Worlds: The Village Community in Early Medieval Brittany*, she examines the witness lists of charters and the locations of issue to determine the orbits of local dignitaries and *plebenses* (members of the village community). The community of the *plebs* is explicitly referred to in a set of unique ninth-century texts that detail membership, transactions and social developments that would affect the group. Davies’ approach helps us to get closer to ‘ground level’ and understand a more localised pattern of movement within rural communities. The majority of *plebenses* found cause only within the courts of their own *plebs* but it is clear that some notable individuals, trustworthy but not necessarily wealthy peasants, travelled further afield – sometimes distances of up to 30km (18.6 miles) – to witness transactions and serve on juries in two, or in some cases three, neighbouring *plebs*. Documents recording at this level of detail the workings of the hundred, or even shire court do not exist for Anglo-Saxon England and it might be contentious to uncritically transpose a pattern of early medieval Breton mobility on to the landscape of Wessex in the same period. It is clear however, from the *Hundred Ordinance*, a set of laws laid down between c. 939 to 961, that a regularity of local meetings on a scale similar to that in Brittany was important as the code stipulates that dignitaries were ‘to assemble every four weeks and each man is to do justice to another’.

Archaeological and place-name studies of meeting places in Anglo-Saxon England also illustrate that local governance was formalised, highly organised and structured around a dense network of designated muster points. Assembly sites have come under increasing analysis and their distribution throughout the landscape and in relation to administrative units, such as hundreds and shires, is beginning to contribute to our broader understanding of the administration of the late Saxon ‘state’. What is clear however from place-name evidence is that an earlier tier of meeting places more idiosyncratically arranged to meet judicial needs in a less formalised structure of administration existed.
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prior to the hundredal system. It might therefore be countenanced that a shift in assembly sites, in accordance with new administrative arrangements, might be both a response to changes in patterns of movement through a landscape as well as influencing the subsequent patterns of connectivity on a local level. To date, in only a very local study has the siting of an early medieval meeting place been considered in relation to the major routes through the valley in which it is located, but a recent research project entitled *Landscapes of Governance*, hosted at University College London, is beginning to bear fruits. John Baker and Stuart Brookes have identified a particular type of meeting place described as a ‘hanging-promontory’ type, a topographical characteristic of which is location immediately next to well-worn hollow ways. The edited papers from the 2012 *Power and Place* conference, hosted as part of the UCL research project, will no doubt provide a further understanding of the landscape factors that governed the choosing of certain assembly sites. This research project however, will be able to explore the network of communications in the immediate hinterlands of some meeting places and will therefore allow a form of characterisation based on local landscape communications.

Other categories of site to do with acts of governance that warrant mention are execution sites and their concomitant cemeteries. Recent studies of the distribution of execution sites in relation to other landscape phenomena have done much to contribute to our understanding of the landscape context of Anglo-Saxon justice. Boundary locations seem to be important, in particular those in prominent and highly visible locations and association with earlier monuments such as prehistoric barrows (as is the case with some assembly sites) and linear earthworks appears to be significant. From the earliest known examples, proximity to a major highway was also of major concern for those charged with the locating of these sites. At recent excavations of execution burial sites, the immediate proximity of a major thoroughfare has been observed, and whilst boundary locations for

---

198 Meaney, ‘Pagan English Sanctuaries, Place-Names and Hundred Meeting-Places’
201 J. Baker and S. Brookes, ‘Monumentalising the Political Landscape: A Special Class of Anglo-Saxon Assembly Sites’, (Forthcoming).
burials might be articulating the exclusion of social deviants and a consignment to a conceptual ‘underworld’, it was the passing through such locations by travellers in the landscape of the living where the message of law and order was most clearly articulated. Execution sites in prominent locations and highly visible to passers-by served this purpose and this research project will seek to identify – as with the case of assembly sites – the networks of routes that existed in the hinterlands within which these judicial processes were taking place.

To conclude then, the early medieval network of travel and communication would have played host to a range of mobility in service to both the emerging Anglo-Saxon state, and the conducting of judicial and government affairs on the regional and local level. On occasions, this network clearly had to accommodate the large retinues of high status individuals travelling to councils and assemblies that the King, bishops and ruling elites would have attended. More regularly though, individuals would have travelled to hundred and shire assembly sites. Travel in the service of local and national administration would clearly have been instrumental to the development of the institutions of government in Anglo-Saxon England and it seems inconceivable that care would not have been taken to ensure at all times safe and assured passage through the landscape. The level of mobility that must be posited for the successful running of the country – not least a country at war – makes it especially important to identify more specifically the types of route, their character and the extent of the early medieval network.

An Anglo-Saxon Highway Code

A review of execution sites and cemeteries runs neatly into the subject of how movement through the landscape was monitored, protected and ultimately valued by both wider society and the institutions of power. These elements manifest themselves most clearly in the evidence for an emerging medieval highway code in the laws of the twelfth century. For the Anglo-Saxon period the law codes with specific references to the highway are few but significant gains have been made in our understanding of late Saxon attitudes to highway law through the analysis of immediate post-Conquest laws and in part, by analysis of a wider European legal tradition. It is clear that late Roman legal ideas across the continent set the foundation for the early medieval notion of a ‘highway’ or a via regia.
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[royal way] and although direct influence is hard to ascertain, Anglo-Saxon law appears to have developed along parallel lines with early medieval European legislation.207

Alan Cooper’s careful analysis of the Leges Henrici Primi has demonstrated that many of the laws concerning highways in this legal treatise composed in the early twelfth century can be seen to have their origins in the Anglo-Saxon period.208 If we take a look at the evidence for execution in the laws of Henry I there is an explicit link with the king’s highway. A prefatory note describing the king’s rights stresses that:

All herestrete [army streets] pertain wholly to the king, and all qualstowa, that is places of execution, pertain totally to the king and are in his soke.209

Archaeological evidence confirms the association between ‘killing-places’ and major highways and furthermore enables that link to be pushed back into the Anglo-Saxon period. As early as 1937, the siting of four cemeteries with clear evidence of executed individuals at Meon Hill, Stockbridge Down, Roche Court Down and Old Sarum on the main Winchester to Salisbury route was believed to indicate a form of royal control.210 Recent analysis of the same sites and the individuals interred therein has demonstrated that they all fit squarely into a tradition of judicial execution present in Anglo-Saxon England.211 This link between highways and execution sites, evidenced in both the documentary sources and archaeology, implies that where archaeological or place-name evidence for an execution site or cemetery exists, we must suppose the existence of a fairly significant thoroughfare and perhaps one which enjoyed a form of legal status under the protection of the king.

The Leges Henrici Primi offer a legal definition of a via regia, a royal way, as a route that runs from ‘burh to burh’ and one justification for projecting this definition back into the late Anglo-Saxon period is founded on the restriction of trade to royal boroughs in laws of Edward the Elder and Æthelstan.212 Furthermore, it has been observed how certain terms in the Leges Henrici Primi have a distinctly Anglo-Saxon ring to them. For example, the crime of Stretebroche is the illegal obstruction or ‘breaking’ of a road, an offence
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punishable by a fine of a 100s to the king. The Domesday Book for Kent includes similar laws:

If anyone has made a fence or ditch whereby the King's public road is narrowed, or has felled into the road a tree that stood outside the road, and has carried off branch or foliage from it; for each of these offences he shall pay 100s to the King.

Again, when concerned with laws relating to the roads in and out of the city of Canterbury:

If anyone digs or fixes a post within these public roads within the City or outside it, the King's reeve follows him wherever he has gone, and receives the fine for the King's works.

Finally, on the road from Nottingham to York:

If anyone ploughs or makes a ditch within 2 perches of the King's road, he has to pay a fine of £8.

It is clear then, certainly by the late eleventh century, that highways enjoyed a degree of protection. Ease of passage was clearly valued by the king and the physical surface of the highway itself was not to be tampered with. But what of those who used the highways? Most of the continental law codes of the period extend protection to women and strangers on the highways and it seems likely that in Anglo-Saxon England similar steps were taken to ensure safe passage for all. One of the earliest direct references to the safety a stranger might enjoy travelling on designated highways can be found in the laws of King Wihtrid of Kent and Ine of Wessex. The respective clauses in each law code are in fact so similar that they suggest a degree of co-operation between these loosely allied kings and detail how, Gif feorcund mon oððe fremd e butan wege geond wudu gonge and ne hrieme
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ne horn blawe, þeow he bið to profianne: oððe to sleanne oððe to áliesanne [If a man from afar, or a stranger, quits the road (wege), and neither shouts, nor blows a horn, he shall be assumed to be a thief, [and as such] may be either slain or put to ransom].

This law implies that whilst on the road, individuals enjoyed the protection of the law and they perhaps allow us to tentatively push the notion of a king’s ‘peace’ into the late-seventh century.

In later law codes however chapters covering the reservation of protection to foreigners, strangers and ‘men from afar’ are more regular. Alfred’s code, for example, stipulates that: *Utan cumene and elðeodige ne geswence þu no* [Do not harass foreigners and visitors from abroad], although such protection is not specific to the highway. That Emperor Justinian’s sixth-century ‘presumption of innocence’ existed as a concept in the Anglo-Saxon period is implied in the laws of Cnut (1020-3) where the king’s protection is extended to those on their way to assemblies. The highway was clearly intended to provide sanctuary to those whose guilt had yet to be proven. In the Domesday Book, we find similar assurances given that whilst on the road, the protection of the king could be enjoyed: The men of the lathes of east Kent agree on a set of royal laws within which it stipulates:

On breach of the peace, if anyone commits it and is charged on the road or attached he shall pay a fine of £8 to the King.

This research project offers the opportunity to explore some of these concepts in the landscape of early medieval Wessex. By looking at the language used in Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses to describe different types of routes, is the notion of a legally defined highway – a type of public space – whereon the people could travel in peace, borne out? Can we identify the *burh* to *burh* routes and if so, what is their character and how are they described? Can we find further evidence to help project back into the Anglo-Saxon period the notion of a highway code as detailed in Henry I’s laws?
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Driving Drovers and Leading Loads

This final section of the chapter will review the travelling and transportation that was necessary for the effective management of early medieval estates. This will not include the network of routes within the immediate vicinity of the estate centres but rather the longer distance routes that must have existed to enable estates to effectively exploit the detached parcels of land that provided seasonal grazing and resources such as wood and hay.222

For the purposes of seasonal grazing, transportation is a fairly straightforward affair; the beasts themselves are driven over long distances, seasonally, between summer pastures and winter pounds.223 The hay harvest, as well as bean and cereal harvests, would also have commanded only a seasonal use of a route. The transportation of timber however, as well as repeated visits to more regular markets, would have required accessible thoroughfares through the landscape at more regular intervals. In particular, whilst the transportation of beans and cereals may have been achievable through the carrying of pack-animals, the transportation of timber and other bulky resources will have required the use of wheeled vehicles. It may be considered that our understanding of the growth of the early medieval economy is dependent on the critical issue as to how prevalent carts were during the period and, perhaps more importantly, whether we can hypothesise an increased use in wheeled transportation from the eighth through to the eleventh century. The evidence from documentary sources and illustrations suggests a varied use for wheeled vehicles in the period. Evidence for increased usage is, like the evidence for an increased number of bridges, encumbered by the fact that an increasing number of documentary sources (and therefore more references) exist for later periods.

The salt routes identified by Della Hooke were clearly capable of carrying carts or ‘wains’ as a charter dated to the 880s records the granting of rights to the church at Worcester specifying that, buton þæt se wægnscilling and se seampending gonge to ðæs cyninges handa swa he ealning dyde æt Saltwic [the wagon-shilling and the load-penny at Droitwich go to the king as they have always done].224 It seems that so developed was this
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system of long-distance transportation that as early as the ninth century, the obligation had been commuted to a cash render. That carts were being used to undertake basic functions in the agricultural economy on a local level also seems likely from a reference in a riddle from the Exeter Book (dated to the tenth century\textsuperscript{225}). The riddle is widely believed to be referring to a plough that is, at one point, referred to as being \textit{wegen on wægne} [carried on a ‘wain’] suggesting that at the time the riddle was composed in the late tenth century, such a role for a cart was not considered out of the ordinary.\textsuperscript{226} Further evidence of regular use of wheeled vehicles comes from the \textit{Laws of the Northumbrian Priest} where there is a section that forbids assemblies, all work and the carrying of goods, whether by wagon or by horse or on one’s back.\textsuperscript{227} Carrying and carting were duties placed upon the \textit{geneat}, a manorial steward or bailiff recorded in the \textit{Rectitudines Singularum Personarum}. In the same document though the \textit{gebur}’s obligations (a hierarchical tier below the \textit{geneat}) are restricted to only carrying (using pack animals).\textsuperscript{228} This may be an indication of who had responsibility for cart provision as much as an insight into what levels of the manorial hierarchy had access to them. The obligation for cart provision may share a common origin with a reference in Charlemagne’s \textit{Capitulare de villis} where the onus was placed on royal estates to construct carts to support armies in the field.\textsuperscript{229} This obligation finds itself repeated in 869 in the levies raised by Charles the Bald (King of West Francia, 840x877) where we are told that \textit{de mille mansis unum carrum cum duobus bobus} [from each thousand mansi, one cart with two oxen] must be supplied to fulfil manpower and equipment requirements for the building of the Pont de l’Arche.\textsuperscript{230} Similar explicit references to the provision of carts for military service are absent from Anglo-Saxon sources but despite this, evidence suggests that carts were used to support military campaigning in the ninth century.\textsuperscript{231} So carts appear to be in use for the purposes of industrial transportation – in this case salt – funded in part, as suggested by the Worcester charter, by cash renders. They are conducting day-to-day operations around the estate under the auspices of the \textit{geneat} and in service to the army presumably as part of the military obligations owed by manorial estates. But what form did these vehicles take?
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David Hill has analysed manuscript illustrations of Anglo-Saxon carts and drawn ethnographic parallels of their construction with those observed in service to the rural economy of twentieth-century Portugal (Figure 8). In *Cotton Claudius B. iv, 67r*, two teams of oxen are illustrated pulling a cart where the driver is stood at the back of the vehicle with a goad. Detail on the wheel construction is lacking and the vehicle is ‘gated’ whereby a single rail holds in place the heads of the uprights that form the ‘carriage’. A similar arrangement regarding the superstructure of the carriage can be observed in both *Cotton Julius A. iv, fo. 5v* and *Cotton Tiberius B. v, fo. 6* (not pictured). Similarities in the scenes depicted in each manuscript indicate a common provenance and in both cases the carts are being used to carry timber. Two beams running the length of the chassis and also comprising the draw bar are coupled together at the point where they are attached to the yoke. In *Cotton Julius A. iv, fo. 6v* the cart is depicted with a similar chassis to the two mentioned above but it is clear that a wattle has been woven through the uprights of the carriage. In this instance, the labourers are transporting sheaves of grain crops, illustrating the versatility of the design.

Iron tyres are used to hold together the structure of modern cartwheels, being heated up and then cooled onto the frame of felloes, spokes and hubs to draw the structure fast together. Further iron bands are shrunk on to the hubs to prevent it from splitting under shock. It is just possible that these Anglo-Saxon carts could be constructed without the use of metal but even in the event of iron tyring, when the cart had reached the end of its serviceable life, such a vital material would hardly be discarded for the benefit of future archaeologists. So whilst the documentary evidence for cart use in early medieval England is anecdotal, direct archaeological evidence for carts would theoretically be extremely hard to identify. Commentary on any increase in the usage and abundance of carts in the period must therefore remain hypothetical.

The obligations placed on the *geneat* in the *Rectitudines Singularum Personarum* find parallels in two other documents of the period, a customary for an estate at Tidenham (Gloucs.) and a statement of services rendered at Hurstbourne Priors (Hants.). All three documents have been used to suggest that by the tenth century a model concept for how an estate should be run was in circulation. In the *Rectitudines*, discussed in Chapter One, one of the *geneat’s* roles was to *ridan and auerian and lade lædan* [ride, and carry (?with pack animals) and lead loads] and in the Tidenham customary to these roles is added the
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term, *drafe drifan* [drive droves]. All these functions are considered of importance not only to the internal economy of the estate but as Rosamond Faith has argued, in the long-distance trade that gave the eighth century the name ‘the age of emporia’.

To gain some idea of how ubiquitous carting was by the twelfth century, estate records that deal with the conveyance of produce from outlying estates to estate centres can provide some insights. What emerges in the Glastonbury records of 1135 to 1201, and those from Shaftesbury and Burton Abbeys a generation earlier, is clear evidence of the level of obligation placed on manors to provide carrying services and the importance of this service to the management of large dispersed estates. Records include the carting of wood, hay, corn, beans, dung, lime and peat – obligations that could also be commuted to cash renders. Due to the paucity of direct references, projecting this level of mobility back to the eleventh century and beyond becomes problematic. However, from some of the earliest documentary sources and from place-name evidence, it seems that institutions were exploiting resources at considerable distances from estate centres. Timber for building, cooking, brewing, baking and heating would clearly have been one of the key resources in demand in early medieval England and the collection of this raw material in bulk, illustrated in the manuscript evidence above, was dependent on carts. The best evidence of woodland exploitation comes from Kent where place-names and some of our earliest reliable charters allow us to identify the rights estates based on the coast had to ownership of woodland as far south as the later boundary between the shires of Kent and Sussex.

Frank Stenton has observed that the early forms of the place-name Tenterden *Tenetwaradenn* implies a *denn* [woodland] belonging to the men of Thanet and the two places are nearly 65 kilometres apart. Similar arrangements can be observed in a charter dated to 724, where the *Limenwearawalde* and *Weowerawealde* can be seen to belong to the respective ‘lathes’ of Lyminge and Wye. Elsewhere Wychwood may have been the wood of the Kingdom of the *Hwicc* and the prevalence more widely of ‘-ingfield’ place-
names are an indication of the ownership and rights of early kin-groups to detached woodland resources in potentially very early periods.\textsuperscript{241}

In Wessex the evidence for such wood transportation is not dated as early as it is for Kent. A charter, purporting to date to 909, recording the grant of Overton by Edward the Elder to Winchester Cathedral, with attached hidages of woodland at Tadley, North Waltham and Bradley indicate that the same arrangements were desirous in Wessex in at least the eleventh century, the likely period of its forgery.\textsuperscript{242} The Domesday entry for South Newton (north of Wilton, Wilts.) records how belonging to the manor was a customary due from Melchet Forest of 80 cartloads of timber (along with fodder for 80 pigs and ‘what was needed for the repairing houses and fences’).\textsuperscript{243} This customary due is recorded in an earlier charter for South Newton, dated to 943, where attached woodland is described as at \textit{fyreste felda}, a place-name that survives only as Frustfield Hundred which itself contains a large tract of Melchet Forest.\textsuperscript{244} Domesday Book also records an identical customary due for a manor at Washern (immediately south of Wilton)\textsuperscript{245} and in both this, and the case of South Newton, a total of 160 cartloads of timber per year passed between the two manors and their outlying woodland. Clearly, there will have existed the need to move timber resources from distant woodland to points of consumption and carts must have fulfilled this role. The routes that they would have used can be scrutinized as part of this research project’s aim to reconstruct aspects of the early medieval route network in Wessex. What route did the wood-carters take between Wilton and Melchet? Did an existing route allow these kinds of grants to be made, or in issuing the grant, was it foreseen that a serviceable route between the two would be maintained?

There is another reason however, as to why these detached and distant parcels of woodland were of interest to early medieval institutions and this lies in their use as woodland pasture for pigs and cattle. It may very well have been the case that it was not just loads of wood that were being moved the 65 kms (40.4 miles) from Tenterden to Thanet and that in fact, large herds of pigs and cattle were also being driven between the two places. References to attached pasturage, and more explicitly swine-pasture, are common occurrences in grants of land conveyed by charter and the driving of livestock

\textsuperscript{243} DB Wilts 13,10
\textsuperscript{244} S 492.
\textsuperscript{245} DB Wilts 13,18
Transhumance and its impact on the landscape of early medieval south-western England has been explored in detail by both Harold Fox and Susan Pearce. Using post-Conquest source material, Anglo-Saxon charters, place-name evidence and topographical analysis, Fox has been able to project back a system of transhumance in Devon into the pre-Conquest period. Tenurial arrangements recorded in Domesday Book and other later documentary sources provide a link between low-lying coastal estate centres and upland pastures on Dartmoor. In the example of Cockington, which is recorded in 1086 as having an outlying pasture at Dewdon on Dartmoor, the place-name Cockingford on a direct route between the two places establishes a physical link that may place this arrangement in the pre-Conquest period. In another example, Fox has convincingly made the case for the extensive tract of land on the high moorland of Dartmoor, recorded in an undated boundary clause for land at Peadington, being the summer pastures appurtenant to the coastal town of Paignton. These connections between the higher ground of Dartmoor and the settlements on the coast and in the surrounding river valleys is made explicitly in a boundary clause from a charter for land at Meavy. Here the boundary is recorded as passing along the *boc sætena hig wege* translated by H. P. R. Finberg (quoting D. L. Farmer) and the *Place-Names of Devon* as ‘the people of Buckland’s high way’. Both Finberg and Susan Pearce favour an identification with a route that runs from the settlement of Buckland Monachorum up on to the moor in the direction of Princetown. Della Hooke prefers to translate *hig* as ‘hay (?waggon)’, suggests a slightly alternative route and believes, like Fox, that this is evidence of summer grazing rights on the moor belonging to Buckland. However, in the early medieval period mowing and reaping of hay formed part of the ‘rustic labours’ owed as a customary rent by most ranks of society from *thegns* downwards, and this route may just as well have been the means by which hay owed to
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the landowning abbey was conveyed to the manorial centre at the bottom of the valley for consumption during the winter months. Meadow grasses were a crucial resource in the rural economy of early medieval England and where an estate granted by charter was located in land unsuitable for hay-making, meadowland elsewhere would be found. Detached meadows are another common occurrence in the charters and we must suppose that cartloads of this important resource would also have been moved, if only seasonally, from summer cutting grounds to winter storage.255

It is likely that Dartmoor generated its own unique set of circumstances that impacted upon the pattern of exploitation and subsequent tenurial arrangements in this part of south-west England, but in other parts of the west of Britain, similar arrangements have been observed. In Somerset, for example, a system as large, as complex and with roots as ancient as those on Dartmoor has been proposed.256 In Cornwall, place-name evidence can be seen to indicate a system of transhumance that goes back into the early medieval period, if not further.257 The place-name evidence has been used to suggest similar systems in the Black Mountains of Wales whilst more widely in Wales, the pattern of commote boundaries across large tracts of uplands suggest division between valley communities in the Roman or per-Roman periods.258

Harold Fox had extended his interest in transhumance beyond the south west though and most recently, through the analysis of smeoru [smear/grease/butter], butere [butter] and wīc [dairy farm] elements in place-names, has identified evidence for transhumance in regions as diverse as Cornwall, Wales, Derbyshire, Gloucestershire and the Isle of Wight.259 In Hampshire, Christopher Currie has identified areas of common pasture and their concomitant drove roads through analysis of the boundary clauses describing the limits of estates at North and South Stoneham, Bishopstoke and Durley.260 The presence of gateways in the boundary clauses lead Currie to conclude that areas now known as Southampton Common, Horton Heath and tracts of land in Allington, Shamblehurst and Townhill manors were all enclosed wood-pastures where a system of grazing existed similar to that operating in the New Forest as recently as the nineteenth
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Further analysis of the drove ways, as identified on early edition Ordnance Survey maps, suggests provisioning routes, from these identified pastures, leading directly to *Hamwic*. Currie’s work on these wood pastures and his suggestion that the same arrangement existed in the New Forest finds support in the analysis of the faunal remains from *Hamwic* that have demonstrated that a well-managed and ‘productive’ hinterland was serving the *emporium* with a large number of high quality beasts for slaughter and processing.262

The point of covering all of this information is that it forces us to project on to the early medieval landscape a pattern of routes constituted to deal with the exploitation of varied resources and the drawing of such resources to estate centres. Whilst the droving of animals such as swine, cattle and sheep to summer pastures, markets and fairs may have required only the most basic of passage to be provided, it is important to consider how this movement was managed in the landscape. Christopher Currie draws attention to the importance of gates as an indication of enclosures to keep livestock from wandering onto precious arable land and in the moving of larger herds, clearly the routes taken must have sought to avoid any areas where damage may have been incurred by errant beasts. The regularity with which timber, grain, hay and other crucial resources were moved from outlying manors and detached woodland and meadow, to places of consumption and sale raises the possibility/necessity for serviceable route ways upon which heavily laden carts could safely travel – potentially all year round. This research project, through a reconstruction of the early medieval landscape of Wessex, will enable further commentary on this form of transportation and will further contribute to our understanding of transhumance, driving droves and leading loads.

261 Ibid. 116-7.
Chapter Three: From *Emporia* to Markets – Trade Networks in Wessex

In this final chapter of PART 1, the impact that changes in trading and exchanging in the early medieval period had on the landscape of travel and communication in Wessex will be considered. As stated in the introduction to this project, there is a widely held belief amongst many commentators on historic and archaeological communications that improvements in the networks through which goods and people moved can be seen as both a function of, and a contributor to wider processes of change. This project, by looking in greater detail at the networks through which goods were moved through the landscape is well positioned to contribute to the debate concerning the economy of the early medieval period and in particular, the transition from a network of trading in the eighth century, characterised by *wics*, minsters and other ‘productive’ sites, through to the market-based economy that emerges in the later Saxon period. As will be demonstrated in Chapters Four and Five, the Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clause evidence for routes along with a wider analysis of their topography in conjunction with map regression, enables a reconstruction of early medieval route networks. Yet, can these be characterised and their chronology explored in order that any shifts in the patterns of trade can be detected in Wessex from the eighth through to the eleventh century?

For Europe in general, the historical sources relating to trade in the early medieval period are few and Michael McCormick, in his monumental work *The Origins of the European Economy*, has identified the lack of explicit references to information on commerce as a hindrance to understanding its role in the wider communications of society.\(^{263}\) In Anglo-Saxon England, this dearth in the documentary record is best illustrated by the lack of explicit references to merchants. We shall see from a review of the archaeology of trade (below) that commercial exchange was an occupation that must surely have been commonplace in, at least, the later Anglo-Saxon landscape. It is enigmatic then that a mere eight specific references to merchants are made in *The Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England*.\(^{264}\) Furthermore, the references we do have to merchants are for the most part incidental to a narrative rather than being in any way descriptive of the conduct and mechanisms of exchange. Good examples of this are the occasion when, having humbly fled from his election to the papacy in 590, Gregory I (590x604) took refuge in the company of merchants. Equally, Benedict Biscop (c. 628 – 690), founder and abbot of the
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monastery at Monkwearmouth and Jarrow, on his third visit to Rome commandeered the services of a merchant ship to provide him with safe passage from Lérins. Charlemagne’s correspondence with Offa concerning the status of merchants masquerading as pilgrims implies a form of opportunistic exchange, but reference in their letters to an agreed set of rules for individuals engaged in trade is a reflection of the desire on their part that such activity was permitted only by royal control. In the same period, the royal overseeing and promotion of trade is suggested by the evidence for tolls. Susan Kelly looks at a group of ten documents that, with the exception of one (S 98), are concerned with the remission of tolls on ships owned by ecclesiastic communities in the North Kent and Thames Estuary area. Although difficult to say how reflective they are of a more widespread practice, these documents represent a fairly short-lived tradition introduced in the eighth century, seemingly abandoned relatively quickly and pertaining to coastal and overseas commerce. Royal control of trading is also suggested by evidence from the law codes, much of which has been covered by P. H. Sawyer in his article ‘Kings and Merchants’. However, a brief exploration of some of the references to trade and traders in law codes is warranted by virtue of the fact that a shift in the geography of trade is just about detectable from the laws of Ine to those of Edward the Elder and Æthelstan.

As early as the seventh century, in the codes of Wihtred and Ine, we learn of ‘men from afar’ and ‘strangers’; people who were very likely to have been engaged in trade. Equally, the Kentish laws of Hlothære and Eadric inform us that households were to be responsible for the conduct of merchants and men who come from over the border. Sawyer makes the point that such groups were likely to have been made up of men from all of the English kingdoms as well as men from overseas – particularly Frisians who were well attested in many parts of northern Europe in the eighth and ninth centuries. Finds from the middle-Saxon emporia of Hamwic, Ipswich and London, particularly imported pottery, confirm strong links with the Rhineland and the Low Countries and the likely presence of overseas traders. What is interesting is the references in these early codes to where such people might travel. In Ine’s code (688x694) for example we learn *Be ciepemonna fore uppe*
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on londe [Of traders travelling up inland] and are told Gif ciepemon uppe on folce ceapie, do þæt beforan gewitnessum [If a trader (makes his way) up amongst the folk, and (proceeds to) traffic, he shall do so before witnesses]. The suggestion here is that traders are departing from the more usual coastal trading location to travel inland to conduct their business. In the laws of King Alfred (c. 880s), traders were obliged to bring before the King’s Reeve, at a public meeting, those individuals they were taking ‘up with him’. The law states: Éac is ciepemonnum gereht: ða men ðe hie up mid him læden, gebrengen beforan kyninges gerefan on folcgemote [Also it is laid down for traders: those men that they are taking inland with them, should be brought before the king’s reeve at the folk assembly]. Bill Griffiths has translated up in this instance as short hand for ‘inland’, a sense in accordance with Ine’s laws. So in Alfred’s time we might also assume that to travel inland is to remove oneself from the usual sphere of commerce, requiring prior permissions granted by the king’s reeve. In both instances, the suggestion here is that merchants are normally engaged in trade at coastal locations and that travelling into the country required quite specific legislation.

In the laws of the tenth-century kings however, there is an unwritten recognition that trade is occurring ‘inland’, especially in the instance of Edward the Elder (c. 874x924) and Æthelstan (c. 893x939), where it is being restricted to the emerging towns. Are these laws therefore very broadly describing the same processes witnessed in the archaeological record of a shift from emporia – sites at coastal locations – to a nexus of trading sites reliant on inland trade in the tenth century?

Emporia, Minsters and ‘Productive’ Sites

One of the fastest growing fields of study of the early medieval period is in trade and exchange and this is in no small measure as a consequence of the massive increase of data that has been brought about by metal detectorist finds and the Portable Antiquities Scheme. The findings of the PAS has forced a rethink on the traditional emphasis placed on emporia which, it has been argued, have skewed our understanding of the significance
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of production in the late-seventh and early-eighth centuries and masked the fact that rising economic growth is reflected at sites throughout the country. In particular, the recent upsurge of coin finds mean that ‘hot-spots’ have been identified and these have themselves prompted interesting questions about trade routes and the way money was transferred into the region.

The *emporia* therefore sit at the top of a hierarchy of trading sites in the eighth century, although characterising that hierarchy with any degree of certainty has proved elusive. One particular type-site of the period has been easier to identify than others and John Blair has demonstrated that minsters founded in the late seventh century were the focus of ‘commercial activity’ and the likely settings for markets. By drawing attention to their provisionary needs and disposable surpluses, Blair has made a strong case for such sites playing a crucial role in town origins. It is apparent however that minsters were located in highly accessible places in the landscape – most frequently at the intersections of major routes and the crossing points of rivers. It is important to consider therefore how the location as much as the institution governed later growth. Royal estate centres, or *villa regalis* – some of which were granted to found minsters – have also been seen as important places in eighth-century Wessex and they also sit in similar central locations in the landscape. The documentary evidence for royal *tuns* as central places from which local areas were administered make them the likely places for the collection of rents, renders and surplus agricultural produce and thus also candidates for commercial activity. To these sites though, a looser and perhaps more idiosyncratic network of trading sites must be conjectured. As Chris Scull writes: ‘any development model [of urbanism] should therefore take account of diversity of site character and trajectory of development’ and he goes on to suggest that further distinctions need to be made – particularly of the middle Saxon period – between periodic activity at single function sites and seasonal activity at or
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near permanent settlements.\textsuperscript{284} It may very well be the case that the sceatt\textit{a} coin finds that have turned up at a range of locations such as road and river crossings and hillfort sites relate to a more idiosyncratic distribution of trading in the period of a type Scull is referring to.\textsuperscript{285}

Seeking to find the central places of middle-Saxon Wessex is not easy due, in part, to an archaeological paucity. Whilst minster churches theoretically occupied a role in a system that saw regional focal points acting as religious or administrative centres with economic functions, evidence, both archaeological and documentary, is in short supply for the period between foundation in the seventh and eighth centuries and what emerges in the eleventh century.\textsuperscript{286} Of all the West Saxon shires, Hampshire of this period has been studied in most detail and those minsters – the likely centres of consumption and wealth – that on documentary evidence can be closely dated to the late seventh and eighth centuries are all to be found around the Solent basin.\textsuperscript{287} This geographical limitation is also reflected in the archaeological evidence of the period. Elsewhere throughout England, what seems important in the determining geographical factors of ‘productive’ sites is their access to maritime and riverine communications – a factor that cannot be doubted to have had an influence in the developments of these trading centres.\textsuperscript{288} As we saw in Chapter One (Waterways and Water Transport), Wessex is poorly served by navigable waterways and this has been seen to explain, to a certain extent, the lack of any inland ‘productive’ sites, and indeed the small number of sites overall in Wessex, as identified in Mark Blackburn’s map of ‘productive’ sites.\textsuperscript{289} Whilst Kent, East Anglia, Lincolnshire and Yorkshire are well furnished, only Hamwic and Carisbrooke feature as significant ‘productive’ sites in Wessex.\textsuperscript{290} So, in general, those trading sites in Wessex that we have both archaeological and documentary evidence for in the eighth century seem to be restricted to locations where they share coastal and riverine connections.

\textsuperscript{284} Scull, ‘Urban Centres in Pre-Viking England’ 290.
Throughout the ninth century trade and exchange between England and the continent appears to have been in decline and recent attempts to understand this process of 'deceleration' in Francia have suggested that the limitations of a 'command' economy, one sanctioned and controlled by elites and major ecclesiastical foundations was as much responsible as the low level of agricultural efficiency of the emerging bipartite manorial system of the ninth century. Whatever the reasons for this contraction on the continent, by the end of the eighth century, it was certainly hastened by Viking raiding throughout northern Europe. In Wessex this resulted in the demise of Hamwic as a major trading centre and the sharp fall in single coin loss during these decades suggests that the economy based on coastal trading with the continent and employing the use of sceatta coinage was in decline. Is it the case though, that another economy co-existed and was in part integrated with that of the emporia? A rural-based economy that was resilient to the change in fortunes in the wider continental economy and one which carried different archaeological signatures? Despite the prolific coinage in the eighth century suggesting socially embedded exchange and a high-level integration in places like East Anglia and Kent, Grenville Astill has drawn attention to non-coin using areas and has suggested that two models of exchange co-existed – a monetary economy and a form of non-coin using exchange. John Blair, in his introduction to Waterways and Canal Building in Medieval England, drew attention to the same issue suggesting that coin and metalwork loss may not be a true reflection of the movement of bulk goods. As late as the eleventh century, where in the Domesday Book 300 motts (circa. 30 tons) of salt are recorded as payment in return for 300 waggon loads of wood, it appears that large and important transactions of bulk goods could take place without money changing hands. Is it therefore likely that larger scale transactions of lucrative agricultural and industrial produce were changing hands in the eighth century outside of the emporia and without the need for silver coins? That this rural economy carried different archaeological signatures to those of the emporia and the trade in precious metals is perhaps apparent at an even earlier period. John Maddicott contrasted the wealth of Northumbria with the apparent poverty of Wessex in the seventh century and argued that the wealth that we see travelling westwards during this period, from the estuarine coastlands of the Rhine, ‘failed entirely to
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reach the south-west’. Furthermore, he argues that, ‘If the South-West was an economic backwater when the West Saxons moved in, so it remained throughout the seventh and eighth centuries’. Despite this relative inequality in wealth however, Maddicott draws attention to the more immediate profitability of Northumbria but the more lasting legacy of West-Saxon expansionism. Was this lasting legacy founded in part upon an economy based on the production and movement of rural bulk goods, an economy that isn’t so easily detectable in the archaeological record?

In Ben Palmer’s analysis of the hinterlands of three major emporia he has identified what he termed ‘substantially different trends’ in the Hamwic hinterland, in differential terms, from the hinterlands of Ipswich and London. In Hampshire he suggests that a manorial system of royal estates, that he believes the West Saxon kingdom was first to organise its lands around, can be linked with the evidence. Ryan Lavelle’s analysis of the customary ‘farm of one night’, recorded as a levy on some estates listed in Domesday Book, and its link to patterns of landholding in the pre-Conquest periods illustrates that royal estates were part of the development of a conscious landholding strategy in the mid to late Anglo-Saxon period and a crucial part of the state’s power base. Landed wealth rather than precious metals and a circulating coinage seems to be the wealth indicator in middle Saxon Wessex. In general, there are few imported goods of this period recovered from rural sites in Hampshire and a suggestion that ‘monetary transaction had not spread into the hinterland’. This is perhaps best illustrated at Romsey where the present absence of coin finds of this period from the town is seen by Katharina Ulmschneider, in view of the clear evidence for eighth-century iron production, as ‘intriguing’. Do we have an economy in Wessex then based on landed wealth, one that profited from emporia-orientated continental trade but was not necessarily reliant on it? It is widely thought that Hamwic was the product of royal establishment and Barbara Yorke has drawn attention to the likelihood that the emporium served as a convenient place for the West Saxon kings and elites to exploit the agricultural surpluses from their estates, in return for a slice of the cross-channel trade that other regions in early medieval England were enjoying.
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has been a marked shift since the 1990s in the approach to emporia sites and in both England and on the Continent there is an increasing desire to direct the focus away from their role in long-distance trade and towards their significance in the creation of regional production and distribution.\textsuperscript{302} Placing emporia in a regional setting presupposes lines of communication by which goods moved between these large commercial centres and their agricultural hinterlands.

One of the factors behind the identification of ‘productive’ sites as early as the 1980s, along with the large scale of coinage recovered, was their identification along the main lines of transport and communication.\textsuperscript{303} This appears especially to be the case in Wessex and in particular in Hampshire and the Solent basin where a theoretical network of trading routes can be put forward: What is most apparent from middle Saxon trading sites in the region is access to the coast and maritime transport. Although the riverine geography of Wessex is limited, all of the documented minsters of the eighth century and other trading sites sit at the mouths of rivers: Christchurch on the Avon, Nursling and Eling on the Test, Hamwic on the Test and Itchen, a mercimonium (mentioned in Hugeburc’s Vita Wynnebaldi)\textsuperscript{304} at the mouth of the River Hamble and finally, Titchfield on the River Meon. They would all thus be well placed to receive bulk goods floated down-river from estates deep in the Wessex heartlands (see the above reference to stæðs [landing-places] mentioned as far north on the Upper Test as Hurstbourne Priors). Yet, to what extent were these sites also served by overland communications? Elsewhere, good access to major routes of communications has been identified for other inland ‘productive’ sites such as, South Newbald (Yorks.), Melton Ross (Lincs.) and Hollingbourne (Kent).\textsuperscript{305} Whilst at present evidence for inland ‘productive’ sites is lacking for Wessex, sceat coin finds of a type U and J recovered from excavations in Hamwic have been suggested to indicate a north-south route to a minting place in the upper Thames Valley.\textsuperscript{306} Furthermore, Series J sceattas have been recovered from excavations and metal detected sites at and around Winchester and
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are thought to suggest access to this same trade route. The law codes discussed above seem to suggest that middle-Saxon Wessex had overland routes upon which traders were travelling *uppe on lande*, so internal overland trade links must be there. Can the approach of this project identify these routes though?

The Emergence of a Market-based Economy

One of the main complications with understanding the transition from the allocative and redistributive trade that characterised the *emporia* to the market economy of the emerging towns of late-Saxon Wessex lies in separating out the political and military objectives that lay behind the construction of fortified sites throughout the region. The study of urban development during this period – particularly in Wessex – is intricately bound up with the study of the West Saxon kings’ strategy of *burh* building throughout the kingdom to counter the Viking threat. A series of excavations in Winchester in the 1960s and into the early 1970s coupled with renewed interest in the *Burghal Hidage* document gave birth to a debate that sought to tease out the economic origins of the urban centres of the tenth century from the military requirements of a nation under siege. Whilst the defensive functions of the West Saxon *burhs* is undeniably a primary factor in their creation, the regular planned grided street systems evident at Winchester during the early tenth century were believed to serve as an index of the economic aspirations of the time. More recently, the appropriateness of considering the socio-economic process of urbanisation in Wessex in political terms has been brought in to question. Ben Palmer, for example, commenting on the findings of his own doctoral thesis, suggests that those towns that ‘succeeded’ in the tenth to eleventh centuries were already well connected in terms of communications and had existing minsters founded in the eighth and ninth centuries. This is a view shared by Grenville Astill who suggests that an older, pre-*burh* pattern of trading and assembly places (one linked to minsters and royal *vills*), ‘despite royal efforts to
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the contrary, continued to determine the social and economic relationships of the majority of the population’. 312

Astill goes on to offer a model of urbanisation from the ninth to the eleventh centuries where sites can be seen to be the product of either a ‘short’ or ‘long’ chronology of development. 313 Winchester in the ninth centuries clearly experienced a phase of population growth and a rise in commercial activity, demonstrating a ‘short’ chronology of urban growth. Similar late ninth- and early tenth-century growth appears to be the interpretation of the archaeological evidence in the case of the main urban centres of England such as London, Gloucester, Exeter, Canterbury and Oxford with the hierarchical structure of towns taking shape throughout the tenth century. 314 However, Winchester, perhaps the most archaeologically studied of all burhs, could be seen as exceptional on the basis of clear evidence for both royal and ecclesiastical interests playing a major part in its development. 315 For the majority of other burhs in southern England the evidence appears to be extremely limited for urban development until the late tenth century and for these sites a ‘long chronology’ is proposed. 316

If there were therefore economic aspirations in the implementation of the burghal system, they were not realised for at least a generation later as the general picture painted by archaeological evidence is one of slow urban growth in the first half of the tenth century. 317 It is in the last third of the tenth century that urban centres experience a period of rapid expansion with many towns benefitting from new trading opportunities, a greater access to silver supplies and coinage reform. Archaeologically, street frontages – a sure sign of competition for space – become identifiable and cellared buildings indicate the need for the storage of surplus for redistribution. 318 This widespread growth is also evident in the topography of the emerging towns: the laying out of gridded streets and tenement properties, the metalling of streets and the refurbishment of walls. 319 It is also reflected in the increase in the range of craft production and the distribution of the pottery types of the main economic centres of production. Leatherworking, woodworking, pottery,
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metalworking, bone-working and textile production are all represented at archaeological excavations in the major urban centres of the later tenth century.

This later (than Winchester) urban development is seen by some as part of a ‘massive leap forward’ and the result of a ‘step-change’ wherein a dramatic change in the economic organisation and political development of Wessex is paralleled by increased cereal growing, the fragmentation of estates, the rise of a lesser nobility, the creation of open fields and further changes in the countryside that had a dramatic effect on the level and scale of agricultural production.\(^\text{320}\) Instead of large regional ‘monopolistic’ centres like Hamwic, what emerges is, in Richard Hodges’s view, a ranked hierarchy of competitive markets with places like Winchester at the top, sites like Chichester and Southampton representing middle ranking centres of limited craft-production until the mid-to-late tenth century, and lower-order markets in this hierarchy equating to locales of ‘sub-regional trade in surplus commodities’.\(^\text{321}\)

Whilst this is not the place to explore in great detail the reasons behind the apparent growth in the later tenth century of urban centres, it is the place to raise the possibility that changes in the networks of travel and communication may have affected, and been affected by, these significant shifts in production and consumption. Crucially, for the purposes of this project, Astill does not see the step changes identified as being necessarily part of an evolutionary sequence nor one directly related to state development but rather a result in a ‘shift from long-distance trade to regional trade’. The urban development in the tenth century, in contrast to that of the eighth, was unrelated to long-distance trade and a response to regional developments in the socio-economic structure of the countryside (i.e. developments to an existing rural economy based on royal estates, strategic landholding with central places (minster/royal tuns) exhibiting proto-urban functions).\(^\text{322}\) In Astill’s model, it is not till the later tenth century and into the eleventh century that long distance trade picks up again.\(^\text{323}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circa. 650 – 850</th>
<th>Circa. 800 – 1000</th>
<th>Circa. 950 - 1200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-distance trade –</td>
<td>Contraction of long-distance trade –</td>
<td>Overland transport network in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coastal connections –</td>
<td>rise of</td>
<td>place – re-establishment of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^\text{321}\) Hodges, The Anglo-Saxon Achievement 156.


limited overland routes | overland transportation | long-distance trade
---|---|---

Table 2: Simplified shift in trade patterns 650 - 1200

So can we see this shift in trade patterns, illustrated in Table 2, articulated in the route networks of early medieval Wessex? The above section (Emporia, Minsters and ‘Productive’ Sites) was concluded with a theoretical network of trading routes in the eighth century consisting of coastal connections, down-river transportation of bulk goods and limited overland routes. As we shall see, charter boundary clause evidence is at its most abundant and most reliable in the middle decades of the tenth century, that is, before the rapid urban development towards the end of the century. So whilst the evidence might be restricted in its capacity to help elucidate the inland geography of routes in the eighth century, it will be in a position, in part, to help bridge the gap between the decline of middle-Saxon coastal trading in Wessex and the rise of a network of inland market towns in the late Anglo-Saxon period. Furthermore, as the relative abundance of detailed boundary clauses (compared to the eighth and ninth centuries) continues into the eleventh century, the opportunity is provided to detect any developments in concurrence with the re-establishment of long-distance trade in that period and to assess how this may further have affected the networks of travel and communication in the late Anglo-Saxon landscape of Wessex.
PART 1: Research Questions

From this literature review and synthesis of archaeological and historical evidence, a number of themes emerge within which there are distinct areas of research potential. In this concluding section to PART 1, a set of key research questions has been drawn up to address those areas where it is believed a significant contribution can be offered towards what is currently known of travel and communication in the early medieval landscape of Wessex.

In the first instance, the methodological issue of whether or not we can reconstruct early medieval routes needs to be addressed. It is the objective of PART 2 (Chapters Four and Five) to set out the sources and approaches that this study will employ in a bid to answer this first key research question. To what extent is a comprehensive reconstruction of the network of routes and communications of the early medieval period possible? What are the limitations of the evidence and how do these impact upon the methodology developed for the ten study areas of PART 3?

In terms of the physical route network itself, the first major issue to tackle is the degree to which earlier routes, both prehistoric ways and Roman roads, impacted upon the landscape of the early medieval period. Throughout PART 3, attention will be drawn to the many routes in the ten study areas that are believed to have been in existence in the centuries running up to the early medieval period. In Chapter Eleven of PART 4, the Roman road question is addressed in detail, using examples from PART 3. Essentially, the question now needs to be asked whether it is acceptable to use the network of Roman roads to furnish the distribution and location maps of early medieval archaeological, historical and toponymic phenomena?

When we consider the range of journeys that were being made by people of all statuses in the early medieval period, it is clear that Anglo-Saxon England was a highly mobile place and that travelling through landscapes both familiar and alien was commonplace for many people. It is then important to address the issue of how the landscape was inscribed to communicate to the individuals and groups for whom a significant part of their lives were spent on the road. Monuments of both practical and ideological significance must have articulated passage through the landscape and Chapter Ten of PART 4 will review the various examples drawn from PART 3 of where there is good evidence for wayside markers such as posts, stones, roods and gallows.
A good indication of structured space is the control of access and in PART 3, attention is drawn in various study areas to the distribution and types of gates, as well as the linear barriers of which they were a part. How and for what reasons movement in the landscape was controlled and access was governed will be addressed in the final section of Chapter Ten in PART 4.

Of the physical form of the early medieval route network, one particular type of thoroughfare stands out as in need of very specific analysis and this is what the Anglo-Saxon boundary surveyors termed a herepath. The term features in each of the ten study areas (in some more prolifically than others) and this research project presents an ideal opportunity to study the form, character and function of these routes across the breadth of the kingdom of Wessex. In Chapter Eleven of PART 4, the observations from PART 3 will be contextualised with a discussion of the term itself and how these routes link to a wider geography of settlement, civil defence and trade.

A key research question surrounding the physical form of the route network of Anglo-Saxon Wessex is concerned with what exactly is being referred to in the obligation placed on early medieval society to build and repair bridges. This project can provide a landscape context for the bridges mentioned in charter boundary clauses of the ten study areas. In Chapter Eleven the role bridges and the critical link they have with herepaths and other major routes will be discussed along with the likelihood that both formed part of the same obligation to ameliorate passage through the landscape.

It will be seen that the language used in the charter boundary clauses can help us to separate out the various types of routes that existed in the early medieval landscape of Wessex. Herepaths were one of a range of route types that existed alongside paths and tracks of differing functions and importance. Therefore, not only can we identify the course certain routes took through the landscape, and the places they connected, but we can also begin to comment on the status that some of these routes enjoyed and explore aspects of the importance Anglo-Saxon elites placed in the maintenance of peace and the free movement of people and goods through the landscape. Whilst this is already known from the law codes of various late Anglo-Saxon kings, analysis of certain named routes in the landscape can further contribute to our understanding of the emerging state structure and the role communications played in it. These issues are all discussed in detail in Chapter Eleven with recourse to examples derived from, as well as outside of, the ten study areas on PART 3.
The final research questions centre on the development of the Anglo-Saxon economy. Can changes in the pattern of trading from the eighth through to the eleventh century be identified in the study areas of PART 3? Is the shift from coastal trading sites in the middle Saxon period to a hierarchical network of inland towns detectable in the evidence for Anglo-Saxon routes? Furthermore, is the subsequent re-establishment of long-distance trade discernable in the charter boundary clause evidence for the eleventh century? These are all questions that will be addressed in the final section of Chapter Eleven in PART 4.
PART 2: Sources and Approaches

PART 2 is concerned with the primary sources of evidence and the methodology that will be addressed to reconstruct both the route network of Anglo-Saxon Wessex and the various monuments and markers that articulated these routes through the landscape. Some of the issues surrounding the use of Anglo-Saxon charters, drawing attention to the biases in both survival and distribution will be considered in Chapter Four. The objective of this exercise is to ascertain the degree of certainty that can be placed on the location of landscape features mentioned in the boundary clauses and an example of a boundary ‘solution’ will be provided to illustrate the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence placed in a modern landscape context. How boundary clauses came to be a standard feature of Anglo-Saxon charters and the complications that arise out of using a boundary clause that derives from an otherwise suspicious document will also be considered as part of this chapter.

Having established Anglo-Saxon charters as the primary historical source material, the role the study of landscape will play in the establishment of an early-medieval route network will be set out in Chapter Five. Firstly, the introduction to Chapter Five will provide a brief overview of the theoretical bases behind the various approaches over the past 70 or so years to archaeological and historical landscape studies as a means to setting out clearly the context within which the methodology of this study sits. We shall then draw from relevant approaches to landscape some of the techniques this study will employ and finally outline the role historic Ordnance Survey data and geographic information systems (GIS) will play in the storage, manipulation and interpretation of data. As part of Chapter Five, the first of the ten study areas will be subjected to intensive cartographic analysis, employing the techniques of horizontal stratigraphy to the pattern of linears that are recorded in the earliest maps for the area as well as those recorded in the early editions of the Ordnance Survey. The aim of this study is principally to demonstrate a maximal approach that could be taken to the reconstruction of early medieval routes. Through the selection of an area containing both a renowned prehistoric route (the Harroway) and a Roman road, this micro-study will also illustrate, through the application of horizontal stratigraphy, the very real advances that can be made in our understanding of chronological developments in the nexuses of routes throughout the early medieval period. It also serves however to demonstrate that this level of detail is not necessarily required, and would anyway prove too exhaustive, for studies on a more regional scale because the
information on routes and communications that can be derived from charter boundary clauses provides a snap-shot of the situation in the ninth and tenth centuries. Thus, the process of ‘reading’ linears off early edition OS maps, guided by charter boundary clauses, presents us with enough information with which to set about addressing the issues raised in the key research questions outlined in the conclusion to PART 1.
Chapter Four: Anglo-Saxon Charter Boundary Clauses

The Veracity of Anglo-Saxon Charters

In all, the entire corpus of Anglo-Saxon charters represents an incredibly complex body of material and their study is a field within which to generalise is to play a dangerous game. The term ‘charter’, or more correctly ‘diploma’, describes a range of documents consisting of wills, writs, leases and grants of land which survive as ‘originals’ (written in contemporary script on single sheets), later copies made on to single sheets and copies made into monastic cartularies. Broadly speaking, their form and content suggests a derivation from the late Roman private deed and the earliest English examples follow many of the conventions present in sixth-century Italy, using the legal terminology of the late-Roman classical jurists.\(^{324}\) Attention however, has also been drawn to the uniqueness of the diplomatic pattern present in the earliest surviving examples from England (dated to the 670s) and, although still very much modelled on Italian exemplars, an apparent evolution of style prior to our first reliable examples is suggested.\(^{325}\) What complicates the issue of using these documents is that many cannot be taken at face value. Of the 1500 or so documents that exist, around only 300 survive as originals and the remaining circa 1200 exhibit anachronisms and later interpolations that undermine their credibility.\(^{326}\) The first issue for scholars of Anglo-Saxon diplomatic was to tease out the blatant forgeries from reliable copies and between these two extremes, harmless fabrications (i.e. drawn up to reflect a broadly believable state of affairs) and copyist errors have played their part in creating an altogether complex documentary record. The collation and critical editing of Anglo-Saxon charters can be seen to have commenced with John Mitchell Kemble who, between 1839 and 1848 published his *Codex Diplomaticus Ævi Saxonico*, a catalogue of all then known documents accompanied in places by some initial critical commentary. Of further note from the nineteenth century is Walter de Gray Birch’s *Cartularium Saxonicum* which, published between 1885 and 1893, again represented a landmark compilation. However, it remained for W. H. Stevenson to outline the various methods that should be employed to
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elucidate reliable from spurious texts and this he did in the introduction to The Crawford Collection of Early Charters and Documents of 1895.

Since then, the known corpus of charters has been subjected to a range of publishing formats. Arranged by geographical region and published by the Leicester University Press under the general editorship of H. P. R. Finberg, the Early Charters series was very much orientated around the use of these documents to the local historian. There are volumes for Devon and Cornwall, \(^327\) Wessex, \(^328\) the West Midlands, \(^329\) Essex, \(^330\) Eastern England, \(^331\) Northern England and the North Midlands \(^332\) and the Thames Valley \(^333\) and each provides a summary of the charter content with a critical note and bibliographic references. A key development in this series was the grading of charters according to their perceived authenticity so that the information they contained for use in wider studies could be checked and verified. \(^334\) By the middle of the twentieth century, studies of individual and groups of charters had become so numerous that the need for a catalogue of all known documents arose and in 1968 P. H. Sawyer published An Annotated List and Bibliography of Anglo-Saxon Charters. Regularly updated and accessible via the Internet, this list provides the numerical referencing to charters employed by this study. \(^335\)

More recently, critical editions of the Anglo-Saxon charters from the cartularies of early medieval ecclesiastic houses have been published in a series of volumes funded by the British Academy. These represent the most up-to-date revisions on aspects of authenticity and volumes in this series have been consulted for the charters used for this project’s study areas. Unlike the Early Charters series, British Academy series published the charters in the order of the scriptorium from which they derive. The most recent volumes for the religious houses of Glastonbury, \(^336\) Bath and Wells, \(^337\) St Albans, \(^338\) Malmesbury \(^339\) and St Pauls \(^340\) join existing volumes published for New Minster Winchester, \(^341\) Abingdon, \(^342\)
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\(^{328}\) H. P. R. Finberg (ed.), The Early Charters of Wessex (Ibid., 1964).

\(^{329}\) H. P. R. Finberg (ed.), The Early Charters of the West Midlands (Ibid., 1972).


\(^{333}\) M. Gelling, The Early Charters of the Thames Valley (Ibid., 1979).


\(^{335}\) www.esawyer.org.uk also provides transcriptions (and in some instances translations) of all charters (23/03/2013).


\(^{337}\) S. E. Kelly (ed.), Charters of Bath and Wells (British Academy Series, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

\(^{338}\) J. Crick (ed.), Charters of St Albans (Ibid., 2007).

\(^{339}\) S. E. Kelly (ed.), Charters of Malmesbury Abbey (Ibid., 2005).

\(^{340}\) S. E. Kelly (ed.), Charters of St Paul’s, London (Ibid., 2004).

\(^{341}\) S. Miller (ed.), Charters of New Minster, Winchester (Ibid., 2001).

Rochester, \(^{343}\) Burton, \(^{344}\) Sherborne, \(^{345}\) St Augustine’s, Canterbury and Minster in Thanet, \(^{346}\) Shaftesbury, \(^{347}\) and Selsey. \(^{348}\) (At the point of writing, the volume on Old Minster Winchester \(^{349}\) is in preparation and that for Christchurch Canterbury is forthcoming). \(^{350}\)

It remains in this necessarily brief review to say something of how archetypal this evidence base is of wider practices of land-holding and therefore how reliably it can be seen to paint a picture of what was typical in the Anglo-Saxon landscape of Wessex. Land granted by charter – or ‘book’ – is commonly referred to as \textit{bocland} and is widely accepted as a form of tenure in opposition to \textit{folcland}, yet exactly how these types of property compared to each other is difficult to ascertain on the basis of the few references to \textit{folcland}. \(^{351}\) Whilst the earliest charters were all made out to the church, by the late eighth century, laymen begin to appear as the beneficiaries of grants and by the end of the Anglo-Saxon period, grants made out to secular individuals vastly outnumber those made out to ecclesiastical foundations. The fact that charters survive only when an estate has passed into the hands of the church (and thus the charter into its archive) is believed to indicate that the existing corpus represents only a small proportion of the total number of charters issued. \(^{352}\) Furthermore, the argument for a state ‘chancery’ existing in the later Anglo-Saxon period and serving as the production centre for charters recognises the fact that granting land ‘by book’ was sufficiently widespread to be desirous of central control. \(^{353}\)

Chronologically, the overwhelming majority of charters derive from the middle decades of the tenth century and this obviously impacts on the degree to which they (and their boundary clauses) can be used to comment on landscapes of the early and middle Saxon periods. \(^{354}\) At first glance their geographical distribution (Figure 6) seems to suggest clustering in certain areas. Placing this map alongside one of Scandinavian place-names in England \(^{355}\) goes some way to indicating why survival NE of the Danelaw is so sporadic but the patches of land in southern England seemingly devoid of grants can be accounted for by the existence in these locations of areas of low density settlement and woodland cover.

\(^{347}\) S. E. Kelly (ed.), \textit{Charters of Shaftesbury Abbey} (Ibid., 1998).
\(^{349}\) A. Rumble (ed.), \textit{Charters of Old Minster, Winchester} (Ibid., in prep.).
\(^{352}\) Kelly, ‘Anglo-Saxon Lay Society and the Written Word’, 45.
\(^{355}\) Ibid. 45, Figure 68.
areas (discussed above) over which estate centres held communal rights of grazing and wood collection. The Weald of Kent, Sussex and Surrey and the New, Clarendon, Melchet and Chute Forests of the Wiltshire and Hampshire border are particularly pronounced.

In summary then, Anglo-Saxon charter scholarship of the last century has placed us in a position whereby the integrity of individual documents has been ascertained to the extent that the use of such documents in wider studies of landscapes can be conducted in awareness of the relative reliability of the source. It is not the case that the corpus (certainly from the mid-tenth century onwards) is biased towards ecclesiastical institutions as those charters that have survived the ravages of time, despite doing so through the archives of religious houses, represent a tradition of land granting by the king to both clerical and secular beneficiaries. Whilst there is a bias chronologically towards the tenth century and later, geographically it would appear that granting land by ‘book’ was a practice executed by kings (and less often by bishops) throughout the English kingdoms in a fairly uniform fashion.

Boundary Clauses: Their Development and Use

An essential question at this stage is raised by the possibility that because many Anglo-Saxon charters suffer from irregularities, they can be at times untrustworthy. If a charter is a clear forgery or, for example, a much later ‘legitimate’ fabrication of a grant known to have taken place, how should the rich topographical detail recorded in the boundary clauses be treated? In this section, the veracity of boundary clauses will be explored and it will be demonstrated that, irrespective of the likely irregularities in other parts of the charters, the perambulations themselves can be relied upon to provide an accurate and credible account of the limits of the estate being granted.

With the exception of two wills, boundary clauses – clauses that describe the various points that make up the boundary of the estate in question – appear only in grants and leases of land and primarily those of the tenth and eleventh centuries. There are 710 perambulations surviving as discrete clauses within charters (Figure 7). A further 63 survive as stand-alone documents, unattached to a legal text detailing the conveyance of land, while for certain estates multiple sets of bounds exist. The earliest reliable boundary surveys (i.e. those attached to contemporary copies or originals) are short, simple and written in Latin. They make use of the cardinal points of the compass largely using prominent topographical features such as rivers, hills, valleys and woods. In some

356 S 1486; S 1513.
instances, the extent of the granted land is defined with reference to adjacent territories. For example, the brief Latin boundary clause that features in the grant of the sub-king Frithuwold, to the monastery of St. Peter at Chertsey in 672 x 674\textsuperscript{357} describes a block of land bounded by the Thames, an ancient ditch called ‘fullingdic’ (the ‘foul ditch’) and the boundary of the province of the Sunningas. Such early boundary clauses are, therefore, devoid of the types of topographic detail that enable extensive localised landscape reconstruction. In the last quarter of the eighth century however, a fundamental change takes place in the form of the clause, marked by four charters dated to between 774 and 801. The first two are concerned with land granted in Somerset at Wellow and land on the River Parrett whilst the other two describe land at Little Bedwyn (Wils.) and Crux Easton (Hants.).\textsuperscript{358} What marks these examples out is that whilst the main text of the boundary clause is written in Latin, the boundary features or ‘marks’ are described in Old English. Furthermore, the use of the cardinal points of the compass is eschewed in favour of more complex directional terminology. The surveys begin at a point on the boundary and work in a clockwise direction around the estate – as if perambulating the boundaries themselves. Much more care is taken to describe the actual course of the boundary as it lies in the local landscape, resulting in a lengthier clause. In the instances of Little Bedwyn and Crux Easton charters (both covered by this research project), there are later, tenth-century documents describing the same landscape and here we are provided with rare opportunities to explore differences in landscapes over time. From the style of clause featuring in this small group of charters, there develops the detailed perambulations written entirely in Old English that become a standard feature of tenth- and eleventh-century charters.

One particular problem that this project will confront is the ability to commentate more generally, through the boundary clause information, on changes in the landscape over the time frame leading up to the tenth century. The chronological range of grants depicted in David Hill’s bar chart of charter dates is not, unfortunately, an accurate reflection of the chronological range of the boundary clauses for, in many cases, it is clear that detailed Old English boundary clauses that appear as part of earlier charters were added at a much later date.\textsuperscript{359} A good example of this can be seen in Alan Cooper’s statistics concerning bridges that appear in boundary clauses (summarised in Table 1). The one bridge that appears in the records for the seventh, eighth and ninth centuries is the cridian brycge [Creedy Bridge] in Crediton (Devon) in a trustworthy copy of a genuine

\textsuperscript{357} S 1165. 
\textsuperscript{358} S 262; S 267; S 264; S 268. 
\textsuperscript{359} Hill, An Atlas of Anglo-Saxon England 26, Figure 37.
The boundary clause within which the bridge is mentioned is however, completely out of character for the eighth century and likely to be an interpolation of the early eleventh century and ascribed to the date of the copy. Thus we cannot be sure that a bridge existed at this location at the time the grant purports to date to. In an attempt to circumscribe such problems and gain a clearer understanding of the introduction and development of boundary clauses, Kathryn Lowe selected the entire corpus of contemporary single-sheet diplomas (i.e. ostensibly original documents) for detailed study. She demonstrated that a mere four charters with vernacular/Old English bounds derive from the ninth centuries and that it is only in the mid-tenth century that they become a standard feature of the Anglo-Saxon diploma. This is a view shared by Michael Reed in his analysis of boundary clauses (although not only those from ‘originals’) and he concluded that ‘we can look at 200 years of landscape history (i.e. working back from 900) through no more than sixty documents and 32 of these relate to Kent’.

When arguing for centralised charter production (i.e. something like a state ‘chancery’) in the late Anglo-Saxon period, a strong part of the case made by Simon Keynes is centred on King Alfred’s push for improved levels of learning and literacy amongst the secular community. It is perhaps insightful to consider his observation that ‘any practical benefits of King Alfred’s educational programme would not be felt until the opening decades of the tenth century and thereafter, when the youth of his day had become the next generation of royal officials’. In chronological terms this would coincide with the massive increase of chartered land grants with detailed Old English boundaries in the mid-tenth century. This is therefore perhaps a reflection of a well educated ‘thegnly’ class manipulating a diplomatic tradition to reflect better their concerns, ones not as much concerned with who owned the land but rather with exactly where the boundaries of the land lay in the landscape. Susan Kelly makes the point that the inclusion of a detailed vernacular boundary clause in documents from the ninth century onwards goes some way to indicating that charters were beginning to function ‘at least in some respects, as a true written word’ rather than a symbolic title-deed. In its detail and prevalence throughout the wider corpus it is clear that the vernacular boundary clause is intended to serve as a
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working record of the bounds of the actual estate in question because, presumably, it has to stand up to the scrutiny of an increasingly literate community. An accurate and indisputable boundary clause must surely have gone some way to bolster the spurious claims of a forged charter and suggests that we can be fairly confident that even in the most outrageous of forgeries, the boundary clause at least will contain a legitimate record of early medieval topography. That a number of boundary clauses survive as standalone documents led Lowe to suggest that these represent the original text of a survey before it was copied into a legal charter – a separate provenance that may derive from a writing ‘in the field’ at the point of the actual survey.  

Thus, not only can we conclude that the landscape described by Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses is predominantly one of the tenth and eleventh century but we can also say that the surveys that do survive from these centuries would seem to be accurate descriptions of that landscape made, possibly, in the field at the point of perambulation by those with the most vested interest in ensuring an accurate legacy.

A word of caution may be needed here though. Whilst we can approach this topographic information with a degree of confidence (even when it appears in outright forgeries), there remain other limitations to the material that derive from a number of factors. In differing areas we do not know exactly who drafted the documents, how close they were to the landscape they were describing and what knowledge they had therefore of local traditions. We also need to consider the importance of local and regional linguistic usage and the varying practices of the scribes in monastic scriptoria needs to be taken in to account. This must always be borne in mind when we consider the meanings of certain terms in the boundary clauses. Are certain phrases such as herepath and stræt interchangeable in the minds of some scribes? To what extent might one scribe favour the use of one term over that of the other or was there awareness on a wider level that these terms meant quite specific things? Despite these issues, various landscape historians and archaeologists have confidently employed the rich and detailed topographical information bound up in the vast corpus of Anglo-Saxon charters in a range of academic enquiry, informing studies of settlement, industry, judicial practices, assemblies and meeting
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Before moving on to discuss details of the methodology we will take a brief look at the ‘solving’ of boundary clauses and the elucidation in the landscape of the various features described in the perambulations. In 1974 Nicholas Brooks conceded the importance of confirming the nature and extent of an estate described in a boundary clause and outlined the maximal approach to the elucidation of boundary solutions. The method requires, he suggests, both extensive linguist credentials and a good knowledge of the area in question. Also, access to the landscape is of practical importance so that solutions can be provided off the back of ‘repeated walking in various seasons and weathers’. However, Brooks, in the context of the wider study of charters, previously voiced the concern; ‘Is the paralysis resulting from over-critical condemnation of difficult charters worse than the wasted effort of results from the acceptance of spurious texts?’ Should this statement be extended to the solution of boundary clauses? Is it necessary for each boundary clause to be systematically identified in the landscape or is it possible to collectively use topographic data derived from most Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses without ‘repeated walking’ and investigation on the ground?

O. G. S. Crawford would no doubt have agreed with Brooks on the degree to which these clauses needed to be investigated in the field and he was at times quite disparaging about those who sought to elucidate solutions from the comfort of their study room. Of G. B. Grundy he wrote that, ‘his chief shortcoming was that he did practically no fieldwork’. This indictment of Grundy’s studies perhaps fails to recognise the sheer volume of work that he undertook in and around the counties of Wessex. He published on a county basis with volumes for Wiltshire, Hampshire, Dorset, Somerset, and Berkshire.
Oxfordshire,\textsuperscript{384} Gloucestershire\textsuperscript{385} and Worcestershire\textsuperscript{386}. In fact, for a period of ten years from 1918 to 1928 with a further stretch from 1933 to 1939, Grundy was almost entirely taken up with the business of relating the often-cryptic references to topographic features in boundary clauses to the landscape as described on Ordnance Survey maps. So Grundy’s approach, unlike Crawford’s, was a comprehensive coverage of the material (at least in Wessex) that, on the basis that no fieldwork was undertaken, might today be considered a ‘desk-based assessment’.

Grundy’s format is pretty much consistent throughout his publications and he offers text-based solutions that required the reader to have at hand a 6 inch (to the mile) copy of a local Ordnance Survey map to make any real sense of his work. In general, he met with what has subsequently proved to be a greater degree of success than failure in identifying features of the Anglo-Saxon landscape. His approach therefore represents a firm footing on which to begin an exploration, with a view to ultimately digitising boundary clauses and their constituent features. Certain key rules were observed by Grundy, such as the usual clockwise orientation of the perambulation and the coterminous nature of pre-Conquest bounds with those of modern parishes, tithes and estates. From Grundy’s studies it is clear that to a certain extent, one can trust in the longevity of Anglo-Saxon boundaries and their ability to survive into the modern day. Where they are not fossilised as part of existing parish boundaries, they can often become apparent from early estate maps, tithe maps, glebe terriers and other such documentation.

Della Hooke also stands out as someone with a considerable expertise in the elucidation of Anglo-Saxon boundary clauses and her work focused primarily on the charter

\textsuperscript{385} G.B. Grundy, The Saxon Charters and Field Names of Somerset (Taunton: Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society, 1935a).
\textsuperscript{387} G.B. Grundy, Saxon Oxfordshire (Oxford: Oxford Record Society, 1933b).
\textsuperscript{388} G.B. Grundy, Saxon Charters and Field Names of Gloucestershire (Bristol: Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, 1935-6).
evidence for the West Midlands. Thus the counties of Staffordshire, Worcestershire and Warwickshire have received attention in individual volumes as have, from outside her original area of study, Devon and Cornwall. Unlike Grundy, she developed her study of the topographical detail to address themes such as Anglo-Saxon woodland management, the salt industry, open field systems, communications, burials, administrative frameworks, settlement patterns, village nucleation and early units of government. The historically defined territories of the Kingdom of the Hwicce and the Western Marches of Mercia are also scrutinised through the analysis of charter boundaries.

Like Grundy, Hooke undertook much of the ‘solving’ work herself but she diverges from Grundy in her format of publication in that she more often than not provided maps – albeit in some instances sketch maps – of her solutions. Hooke strongly stresses that a combined historical, archaeological and geographical approach should be adopted in order that this historical data could be ‘spatially related to the physical and man-made environment’. Elsewhere other scholars had drawn up maps of Anglo-Saxon estates – as O. G. S. Crawford had done some fifty years earlier – but Hooke, certainly in the West Midlands, swept all before her in her critical analysis of the locations of the topographic detail recorded and in the appraisal of their collective contribution to so many aspects of early medieval life. Although it should be borne in mind that similar studies are lacking for
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other areas of central and southern Britain (a situation lamented by Hooke herself404), the broad spectrum of research issues to which Hooke and others have been able to contribute is testimony to the detailed information contained in charter boundaries.

This should come as no surprise though. Removed from the diplomatic, legal and political arena that has for the most part served as the focus of study for scholars of Anglo-Saxon charters, the boundary clauses themselves describe a landscape – a very real place – in a pragmatic and practical fashion. By their very nature, these documents had to be as accurate a description as possible. Most remarkably, Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses have the capacity to allow us to explore the lived experience, provide us with a window into a ‘local sense of place’ and illustrate what those who were tied to the land ‘thought of the landscape in which they lived’.405 Collectively therefore, they have the ability to create a new document – a vivid account of the English landscape in cartographic form; a document that should be studied in its own right and one that can be handed over to geographers, spatial analysts and archaeologists to employ the kind of techniques upon which these disciplines are founded. It is hoped that it has been proven that a high level of confidence can be placed on the topographic information to be found in Anglo-Saxon boundary clauses and that we can be assured that when routes, gates, fords, bridges and other features to do with travel and communication are being referred to, an accurate and reliable map of the Anglo-Saxon road network can be projected.

Laverstock and the Solving of an Anglo-Saxon Boundary Clause

It is appropriate at this point to provide an example of a boundary clause solution in order to illustrate the levels of certainty with which certain features can be placed in the modern landscape. As has been demonstrated by the many scholars who have successively solved boundary clauses, once three or four places in the clause have been located with certainty, the rest tend to fall in to place fairly reliably providing that they fit with local topography and/or later administrative boundaries.

Until recently, the boundary clause for land æt Winterburnan, 949, had remained unsolved.406 Richard Colt-Hoare had tentatively related it to Laverstock on the basis that the boundary ran ‘as the læfer flows’ for much of its course.407 Since, however, G. B.
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Grundy, in failing to find any of the other mentioned landscape features, took a more sceptical view and R. R. Darlington questioned the identification with the modern parish of Laverstock in volume 2 of the *Victoria County History of Wiltshire*. The authors of *The Place-Names of Wiltshire* also thought the association unlikely as the Domesday entry of *Lavvrecestoches* would seem to suggest a derivation from OE *læwerce* [lark] and not *læfer* [rush, iris]. However, by reading the boundary clause as an anti-clockwise perambulation (rare, but not unknown), through detailed analysis on the ground and by reference to contiguous Anglo-Saxon charters, it is possible to demonstrate that the following boundary clause can actually be related very closely with the later parish of Laverstock and furthermore, can enable the conjectural identification of since lost early medieval landscape features (8.1 SU13SE and in more detail, 8.2).

Ærest of byrhtferþes hlæwe 7lang burhweges to beornyne stane  . of þam stane 7lang burh weges to þære stan hypan . þonne niper 7lang burnan swa seo læfer scæt to healdan hlince . þonen swa seo læfer scæt on þæs deopan fordes ende . of þam forda swa seo læfer scæt on chympanna ford . of þam forda swa seo læfer scæt on hors wylle . þonen swa seo læfer scæt . eft on byrhtferþes hlæw

First from Byrhtferth’s mound along the fort way to Beornwin’s stone. From the stone along the fort way to the stone heap. Then down along the bourne as the *læfer* flows to the ?old/holding/retaining lynch. Then as the *læfer* flows to the end of the deep ford. From the ford as the *læfer* flows to traders’ ford. From the ford as the *læfer* flows to the horse spring. Then as the *læfer* flows, back to Byrhtferth’s mound.

In the first instance, the river now known as the Bourne was referred to in a contiguous charter for land at Little Durnford dated to 972 as the *winter burnan*. The first point in the clause however, Byrhtferth’s Mound, is considered to have been named so because of the proximity of Byrhtferth, the beneficiary of a grant of land at Odstock, the next estate but one to the south. Only three other Byrhtferth’s appear in pre-
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410 E.g. S 861; S 348.
412 S 400.
Conquest documentary sources and these are a prior of Abingdon healed by St Swithun’s intercession, a brother of the New Minster Winchester (964-1030) and the author of the Life of St Ecgwine.\textsuperscript{413} The proximity in both spatial and temporal terms of the Odstock Byrhtferth (grant dating to 928) and the individual who gave his name to the Laverstock mound (949) make it not inconceivable that this might be one in the same person. The location of the mound itself must remain conjectural although it is most likely stationed on the route that passes from Odstock Church, crosses the Avon at Britford (8.2 SU12NE) and heading north along what the Laverstock charter refers to as the burh way – the ‘fort way’ in Map 8.2. This way would be the route (a bridle path today) that bounds the modern parish along its eastern boundary in the direction of Figsbury Rings, a circular earthwork with exterior ditch and inner ring-ditch yielding finds suggesting occupation in the Neolithic and Iron Age.\textsuperscript{414}

As we shall see from other charter boundary clauses, stones very often sit at crossroad locations in the landscape and this forms much of the justification for placing Beornwin’s Stone at the crossing of the Winchester to Old Sarum Roman road by both the burh way and a SE/NW aligned route.\textsuperscript{415} Equally, sharp turns in the orientation of boundaries can be indicative of ‘point’ features such as stones, trees or posts. Having turned a sharp corner, the boundary now heads due west along a second burh way although in this instance it is the burh of Old Sarum that is being referred to and the route is the Roman road. We then encounter the stone heap at the point where the Roman road hits the River Bourne. This has been interpreted as a possible pier base and remnant of a bridge that would once have served this road – although it could, of course, be a phrase used to describe the same landmark referred to as a stanford/stan bricge in the Ducklington/Witney surveys.\textsuperscript{416} The boundary then passes as the læfer scaet [as the læfer ‘shoots’ or runs] and Grundy takes this to be the name of the river itself – or a parallel channel – whilst the term more literally translates as ‘rush, reed, iris, gladiolus’, foliage that would very likely in the tenth century have bounded the banks of the River Bourne as it does so today.\textsuperscript{417}

\textsuperscript{413} The Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England at www.pace.ac.uk (23/03/2013).
The deep ford is proposed as the next best crossing point of the River Bourne, after the collapse of the Roman bridge, and represents a deviation away from the course of the Roman road to the current crossing of the river now served by St Thomas’s bridge. A similar scenario occurs at Deptford (Kent) where Watling Street crosses the River Ravenbourne en route to London. This serves as another example of when a not altogether ideal ford (by virtue of its depth) is located next to or at the crossing of a Roman road over running water. The Harroway (discussed below) is a prehistoric route that is widely accepted to have played an important role in the Romano-British period and it crosses the River Wyle at Deptford (Wilts.).

A Chapmansford place-name exists today where the Harroway crosses the Bourne Rivulet within the parish of St Mary Bourne (1.4, 1.5 SU44NW) and this place, first recorded in 1208 as Chepmannesford, initially suggested an identification of the chypmanna ford in the bounds of the grant for land æt Winterburnan with an internal parcel of land at St Mary Bourne. However the orientation and topography of the remaining features in the boundary clauses could not be reconciled with the landscape and boundary history of that parish. The chypmanna ford has therefore been placed at the crossing point of the River Bourne in the parish of Laverstock with routes coming from the direction of Southampton and Romsey. It is feasible too that a divergent strand of the Harroway that crosses the Bourne Rivulet at Chapmansford, crosses the River Bourne on a course to the South-West, via the chypmanna ford.

This analysis presents a robust case for the boundary clause for land æt Winterburnan to be identified with the modern parish boundary of Laverstock. Reading the perambulation in an anti-clockwise direction, assessing place-name evidence, having reference to other local charters and considering local topography have all helped to overcome the obstacles earlier commentators have placed against the identification. Importantly though, the certainty with which some features have been placed, such as Beornwin’s Stone and the chapmans’ ford, is dependent on characteristics for such features derived from the wider analysis of boundary clause information, (much of which is discussed in more detail in later chapters) and represents an important point in the case for a wider mapping of Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses. The purpose of this exercise though has been to illustrate the degree of probability that can be placed on the location of boundary clause features in the modern landscape and the Laverstock charter.
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is a good example of how a case can be built on the collective probability of a number of features whilst others remain only very roughly located. That said, for our purposes, both burh ways can be seen to have been fossilised in the course of the later parish boundary and can thus be identified in the landscape of today with a high degree of surety. Other charter boundary solutions used in this project have far more certain boundary markers that validate many of the other features listed. At any point however in this project where a landscape feature has been placed only very conjecturally but is yet crucial to an argument, attention will be drawn to it.
Chapter Five: Landscape Archaeology and Horizontal Stratigraphy

A brief review of some of the approaches to the notion of landscape adopted by archaeologists and historians over the past 70 or so years – and their theoretical underpinnings – will be provided here in order to explicitly situate the methodology of this project in a wider theoretical and practical framework. Broadly speaking, ‘landscape archaeology’ can be seen to have been created and colonised by three (at times overlapping) schools of historical and archaeological work, each with their own wider theory-base and varying methodologies in the field. For the purposes of discussion, these can be generalised as the ‘traditional’, ‘processual’ and ‘post-processual’ schools. I am conscious of the influence all three have had in my own approaches to the early medieval landscape of southern England and for my overall methodology, I have taken Matthew Johnson’s recent research agenda for the archaeology of historic landscapes as a framework. Johnson’s agenda was set out in Ideas of Landscape, his extended critique of the practice and theory of landscape archaeology today and seeks to integrate the best elements of the ‘traditional’ school with those of both the processual and post-processual schools.421

The originators of ‘landscape’, or ‘field’ archaeology, are popularly heralded as O. G. S. Crawford and W. G. Hoskins. Their careers and landmark publications of, respectively, 1953 and 1955, are arguably some of the most influential of a generation. Whilst Crawford’s work has passed almost silently and uncritically, through the pages of the Ordnance Survey map, into a mainstream knowledgebase, the same cannot be said of W. G. Hoskins. The Making of the English Landscape has gone on to become one of the most loved and controversial books concerning the subject matter. His relevance here is that many of the debates concerning the theory of landscape archaeology today use Hoskins as a fulcrum upon which to balance their objections to (or approval of) ‘traditional’ landscape approaches. He is also relevant because Hoskins himself was a keen exponent of tracing Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses in the landscape:

This exercise gives one a truer and more detailed knowledge of the English countryside than any other pursuit, not excluding fox-hunting. By the time one has scrambled over hedges, leapt across boggy streams in deep woods, traversed narrow green lanes all but blocked with brambles and the luxuriant vegetation of wet summers, not to mention walked along airy ridges on a day of tumultuous blue-and-white skies with magnificent views of deep country all round – by the time one has done this, armed with a copy of a Saxon charter and the 2½-inch maps, the topography of some few miles of the English landscape is indelibly printed on the mind and heart.422

The above paragraph encapsulates what some have seen as both the strengths and weaknesses of the man’s method: the underlying theoretical discontents of the Romantic movement.423 Recent commentaries have put the ‘lukewarm’ reception to his work by professional historians down, in part, to ‘the emotional tenor of the writing’ and increasingly, W. G. Hoskins is being seen as a product of his times, writing within a very specific post-War social and economic context.424 On a factual level, Hoskins’s The Making of the English Landscape has garnered heated debate – involving at times some quite invidious remarks – and on the ‘origins’ of the English landscape, open-field systems and village nucleation, it has proven to be both factually incorrect and over-simplified.425 Hoskins’s approach was one where extended narratives depended upon ‘argument by example’, where the personal and individual meaning of the ‘local’ was of importance and where ‘shallow-brained’ theory had little role to play.426 The approach has maintained its appeal427 but its ‘inductive’ and ‘historicist’ nature meant that, like the study of archaeology more generally in the 1950s and 60s, it became subject to the criticisms of the ‘processual’ school of archaeologists characterised in British archaeology by the work of David Clarke and in a landscape or ‘spatial’ context by Ian Hodder and Clive Orton’s Spatial

423 Johnson, Ideas of Landscape, 36-40.
427 See Maurice Beresford’s ‘Preface’ to M. Aston and C. Lewis (eds.), The Medieval Landscape of Wessex (Oxbow Monographs; Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1994), vii-viii. When describing his annual ‘escape’ from the Midlands to the ‘hills of the holiday counties’, his mind responded more to Belloc’s sentiments rather than the ‘now-forgotten Keats, Shelley and Wordsworth’. Also, in the same preface, his assertion that it was the nature of landscape history to be comprised of ‘an accumulated record of single and small observations’.
Analysis in Archaeology. Such texts inveighed against empiricism, implored all archaeologists to adopt the rigorous scientific framework of hypothesis and deduction to test ideas and theories.

At this juncture, traditional landscape history/archaeology and theoretical archaeology seemed to have gone their separate ways. A second generation of traditionalists took the lead of Hoskins and the themes of field systems, village origins and historical landscapes in general continued to be debated in the particularistic vein. In landscape archaeology more generally discomfort with the ‘processual’ school began to surface with many of the criticisms levied at the ‘New Archaeology’ equally applicable to the method of ‘traditional’ landscape archaeology. In essence, the statistical, quantitative and scientific approach to landscapes were seen to have removed people from the analysis and the ‘top-down’ approach of the traditional school was seen as constraining human action via a series of ‘titanic’ forces (such as population growth, climate, land use patterns and settlement patterns/foci) over which the society being studied had no concept.

Whilst these methods were all ways in which to generate data-sets or ‘evidence’, ‘post-processualists’ as they came to be known, implored landscape archaeologists to be both conscious of their subjectivity and to ‘go beyond the evidence’ in our interpretations of the past. The link between the concept of landscape and the rise of capitalism as observed in approaches used in cultural geography exposed traditional landscape archaeology as an extension of the preserve of the privileged. In place of the landscape painting, an articulation of the Western ‘new politics of vision’, field archaeologists had the aerial photo, satellite imagery and Geographic Information System, as a means with which to control, monitor and discipline the past, reflecting the ‘sectional interests of the powerful’ as Andrew Fleming puts it.

---


433 A. Fleming, ‘Post-Processual Landscape Archaeology: A Critique’, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 16 (3), (2006), 267-80 at 269, but later (p. 272) refutes this accusation on the grounds that those with ‘muddy boots’ who undertook the early field archaeology could not have been more removed from the ‘empowered’ capitalist if they tried.
of hiding behind scientific objectivity,\textsuperscript{434} the most obvious criticism of the ‘traditional’ school was concerned with the flaws of back-projecting contemporary concerns with social hierarchy and territoriality – concerns that may not have existed in pre-Enlightenment cultures. Post-processual landscape archaeologists expressed a concerted desire to explore the worlds of past societies from the ‘dwelling perspective’ and to adopt an ‘archaeology of inhabitation’ as an antidote to approaches wholly dependent on the constraints of positivist, top-down and distinctly Cartesian analytical tools – such as the Ordnance Survey map.\textsuperscript{435}

Out of these criticisms arose new ways of looking at landscape and drawing on the ideas of Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty amongst others,\textsuperscript{436} post-processualists, with Christopher Tilley chief amongst the proponents, began to apply to their subject matter the branch of philosophy known as phenomenology.\textsuperscript{437} Phenomenologists wanted to see human action and agency as central to the understanding of past landscapes and set out to describe the character of human experience via our own apprehension of the material world. In breaking down the subject-object divide that characterised post-Enlightenment thought, phenomenology was seen to provide an antidote to the abstract models generated through both traditional and positivist approaches to landscape.

For the most part, these approaches have found themselves to have had the greatest impact on the study of the remoter periods of British prehistory and, in particular, in approaches to the Neolithic. Yet, their findings and the accusations they make of traditional ‘investigative’ approaches to landscapes have not themselves been without criticism. In the first instance it has been questioned whether at all it is possible to apply the character of human experience specific to the Western world to conceptions of the world by past societies.\textsuperscript{438} In one of the most sustained critiques of post-processual approaches to landscape, Andrew Fleming has also concluded that these new approaches are more problematic than their proponents have allowed themselves to accept. Furthermore, in a

\textsuperscript{434} M. Pearson and M. Shanks, Theatre/Archaeology (London: Routledge, 2001) at 158, 162.
defence of ‘conventional’ landscape archaeology, Fleming suggests that the priorities for the landscape archaeologist lie not in ‘hyper-interpretative’ writing or ‘experiential treatments’ but on grounded arguments and in weighing evidence dispassionately.439

As already stated, one of the key aspects of these theoretical and conceptual shifts is that much of the debate surrounded the study of prehistoric landscapes. The archaeology of historic and proto-historic landscapes seems to have either been ignored by the theoreticians or its proponents have carried on oblivious of these wider theoretical debates.440 Recently, it has been accepted that the discipline of medieval archaeology has been slow to embrace archaeological theory but it has been argued that this should be set against the major contribution that practitioners of the discipline have made to the advancement of methodology.441 It is as well to focus on a further criticism of the ‘traditional’ school of landscape archaeology and this has always been that it suffers from the ‘disciplinary subordination’ that characterised archaeology of the 1960s and 1970s.442 The main criticism from a landscape perspective was that archaeologists were going out to create an uncritical link between historical terms, such as ‘manor’, ‘village’ and ‘open-field system’ and their objects of study, without first setting out to describe in physical terms the entities they were reporting on, that is, characterising them archaeologically. It was clear by the late-1980s that medieval archaeology had to set out its own agenda, one with its own archaeological discourse founded on its own epistemology and data and one wherein the written record forms part of a wider suite of evidence.443 In some ways then this interdisciplinary doctrine set the study of prehistoric landscapes apart from the study of historic landscapes. Fleming draws attention to the fact that re-peopling the landscape – i.e. putting the humans that scientific methods had removed, back into the landscape – was enabled through ‘Text-aided’ horizons. Documents allow us to write, in his words, ‘imaginatively about named individuals’ without having recourse to ‘hyper-interpretive’ methods.444 David Austin, in his “Proper Study” of medieval archaeology also drew

439 Fleming, ‘Post-Processual Landscape Archaeology; A Critique’, at 279.
440 For the study of the Wessex landscape, M. Aston and C. Lewis (eds.), The Medieval Landscape of Wessex (Oxbow Monographs; Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1994) appears unacquainted with the debates concerning theory and practice taking place in contemporary approaches to archaeological landscapes.
442 Johnson, Ideas of Landscape, 59.
444 Fleming, ‘Post-Processual Landscape Archaeology; A Critique’, at 277.
attention to the fact that documents had the capacity to provide ‘insights into the past’s own self-awareness’.445

Drawing from this necessarily brief review then, it can be concluded that the examination of the early medieval landscape of Wessex can dispense with some of the more extreme elements of phenomenology – embodying the self within the landscape as a means to understanding past attitudes to the surrounding world.446 From the perspective of this project, this is essentially because the historical source material being dealt with reflects a very real perception on the part of people of the world they lived and worked in.447 In fact, the very local nature of certain boundary marks suggests that these were documents that, although primarily serving the aristocracy, were designed from the outset to speak to the people on the ground. ‘The cunning pig’s place’ [litegan hlos stede] (S 910) and ‘to where the ceorl was killed on account of the he-goat’ [oð dat hit cymd þar mon þane chiorl sloh for þan buccan] (S 582) are likely to have been locations of only the mildest interest to the Anglo-Saxon king, but to the people who drew up the boundary clauses within which these places featured, these were events of a most intrinsically local nature containing stories that embedded the world around them with meaning. To walk up Woden’s dene (S 499), through Woden’s gate (S 272) in Woden’s dyke (S 368, 424, 449, 647, 685, 694) and to arrive at Woden’s barrow (S 272) and peer out on the Vale of Pewsey and the heartlands of the West Saxon kingdom is to encounter a series of earthworks that have been assigned names that, from reference to other sources, allows us to create a meaningful understanding of a conceptual space – without recourse necessarily to ‘going beyond the evidence’. So charter boundary clauses place the early medieval landscape archaeologist in a privileged position from which to construct a model for how pre-Enlightenment societies perceived their landscape, to model some of the understandings, such as the applications of deities (pagan or Christian) to landscape features and to consider, for example, practical reactions to environmental and geological conditions. Furthermore, by putting aside the chronological distinctions we place upon the study of the past, we can create a critical link between pre-Enlightenment human reactions to landscape over a much longer time frame. Elsewhere, this notion of ‘duration’ or the long durée, adopted from Fernand Braudel’s model of time expressed in his incredibly detailed The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II (1949), has proven an increasingly useful paradigm with which to study an
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445 Austin, ‘The “Proper Study” of Medieval Archaeology’, at 12.
446 See Brück, ‘Experiencing the Past? The Development of a Phenomenological Archaeology in British Prehistory’, at 46-50 for a detailed review of this method.
array of themes and locales across the late prehistoric and into the medieval period. There is space here only for a handful of examples of where the *long durée* has been employed as a useful interpretative backdrop to the study of early medieval cultural phenomena. It is a key theme in Barry Cunliffe’s *Facing the Ocean* wherein it is illustrated that a range of social and economic processes can be seen to transcend our traditional periodic division of the past.\footnote{B. W. Cunliffe, *Facing the Ocean: The Atlantic and Its Peoples* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) esp. chapter 13, ‘The Longue Durée’, 554-67.}

Concerning the same part of the early medieval world, David Griffiths’s analysis of ‘productive’ sites in Western Britain identifies patterns of trade and external contacts that can be seen to extend from prehistory through to the sixth to seventh centuries.\footnote{D. Griffiths, ‘Markets and Productive Sites: A View from Western Britain’, in K. Ulmschneider and T. Pestell (eds.), *Markets in Medieval Europe: Trading and ‘Productive’ Sites*, 650-850 (Macclesfield: Windgather, 2003), 62-72 at 72.}

We have already seen (Chapter One) how the navigable riverine geography of early medieval England may have as much in common with that of the late Iron Age as it does with the later medieval period, but in attitudes to landscapes and, in particular, in the articulation of beliefs and ritual practices, the changing theoretical scene in early medieval archaeology has been stimulated by prehistoric researches in which scholars have come to view the landscape in terms of the *long durée*.\footnote{J. Blair, ‘Introduction’, in J. Blair (ed.), *Waterways and Canal-Building in Medieval England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007a), 1-18 at 13; A. Sherratt, ‘Why Wessex? The Avon River Route and River Transport in Later British Prehistory’, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology*, 15/2 (1996), 211-34 at 212-3; S. J. Semple, ‘In the Open Air’, in M. Carver, A. Sanmark, and S. Semple (eds.), *Signals of Belief in Early England* (Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2010), 21-48 at 23.}

Much of this review is covered in Johnson’s *Ideas of Landscape* and in reconciling ‘traditional’ landscape archaeology with the theoretical perspectives of wider archaeological and anthropological researches, Johnson maps out a research agenda for the archaeology of historic landscapes.\footnote{Johnson, *Ideas of Landscape*, 149-152.}

In attempting to meet with some of the pointers given in this agenda I have explored the ‘typical’ and sought to illustrate how ‘typical’ my documentary evidence is of a wider tradition. I am conscious of the fact that much of what is presented in the discussion of PART 4 is argument from example – but I argue later that broadening the study, characterising the landscape so that we might read off the early medieval landscape in places where we don’t have charter boundary clauses – will enable a more comprehensive mapping and thus one that can take account of variability. In the same way that the archaeological record emerges as a product and mediator of social action, so do the documentary records and none more so than these boundary clauses in their clear functional and specific contexts.

Although ‘reconstruction’ is a big part of what I do, I am also conscious of the above statement and also see the routes that are set out as the results of social action and decision
making. The choice to tread a path is in itself a cognitive process of which the ‘way’ is a direct result.

I have also, as much as is feasible, considered ‘context’ and to achieve this, I have mapped all of the features in the charter boundary clauses and where this wider context is relevant, it is alluded to. This takes place in PART 3 but discussion in PART 4 moves outwards to address some of the wider questions paraphrased in the conclusion to PART 1. I have retreated from ‘absolute-chronology’ even though, at times, I am dealing with evidence from very specific data sets and time frames (i.e. exact dates). I have done this in order to favour the analysis of overlapping phases and longer-term processes of change (for example, see Tables 2 and 14). In terms of understanding the locales of power and memory in landscape (e.g. Thomas 1991; 1993; Bender, 1998), I have selected, from a wide range of possible boundary clause landmarks that I have term ‘markers’. In accordance with the over-riding theme of this thesis (travel and communication), these features are seen as the best vehicles with which to explore aspects of people and perception in the landscape. They are monuments best placed to explore ideas of monumentalising, messages of power, mentalities, memory and knowledge and thus the best means by which to understand humans within a landscape.

As a critical assessment, in this chapter, the notion of the ‘palimpsest’, the fundamentals of ‘horizontal stratigraphy’ and the role of the Ordnance Survey will come under scrutiny with a view to setting out the principles that this project will adopt in its approach to ten study areas in four counties: two in Hampshire, two in Devon, two in Dorset and four in Wiltshire. A key objective of this chapter is to demonstrate the reliability of nineteenth-century Ordnance Survey data for the identification of early medieval estate boundaries and the routes that can subsequently be reconstructed from them. The resulting project methodology will be conducted on two scales referred to as ‘Method A’ and ‘Method B’ where the first is applied to one study area in Hampshire and the second to the remaining nine study areas.

Method A is essentially a methodology for a feasibility study, the purpose of which was to ascertain the level of detail that it would be feasible for Method B to apply over a given area and consequently the number of Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses that could be incorporated in the overall study. In the kind of analysis adopted by Method A the stratigraphic relationships between routes, boundaries, field systems and other linear monuments are examined in order that a relative chronology between landscape features can in theory be deduced. This approach has come to be known as ‘horizontal stratigraphy’
and it will be demonstrated that it is a method that can yield positive results and can help to provide a relative sequence of ‘events’ – in this case routes – to which very general timescales can be applied.

Method B involved taking a sample number of Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses from Hampshire, Wiltshire, Dorset and Devon and locating in the landscape depicted in nineteenth-century Ordnance Survey maps, the various topographic features that make up the boundaries of early medieval estates. To do this, a range of studies has been consulted (as discussed in Chapter Four) and key amongst these are the works of G. G. Grundy and Della Hooke. However, I have also undertaken a considerable amount of fieldwork within these landscapes, fieldwalking and photographing each study area on at least two occasions. The ‘muddy boots’ metaphor is one used by Matthew Johnson (at times ironically) and Andrew Fleming alike to describe the traditional and investigative approach to landscapes undertaken in the field and is ultimately a playful response to Richard Muir’s assertion that ‘The real work [in the study of landscape] is accomplished by the men and women with the muddy boots and the aching joints, even if the credit flies off in a different direction.’ My own boots have been muddied not just because I have spent endless days walking ridgeways, photographing landscapes, on archaeological excavations, undertaking earthwork and geophysical survey and chasing Anglo-Saxon boundaries in the style of Hoskins. My boots are also muddy because I have experimented with past and present methods of farming. I have grown crops and managed livestock in a landscape – with all the many yearly tasks that come with these feats. So added to my archaeological and historical perspectives on landscapes, I have also the experience of living in and working a landscape. This background has almost certainly helped me over the last ten years in my exploration and understanding of the early medieval landscape.

Each feature that I have located from the charter boundary clause material has been plotted and mapped and a Geographic Information System (GIS) has been employed in the storing and presentation of data. The use of GIS comes with its own set of interpretative and theoretical problems. Whilst it holds the capacity to deal with the manipulation and visual display of unprecedented quantities of spatial data, the underlying theoretical assumptions of using this data to inform our understanding of human action has attracted critique and evaluation. It should be stated here though that the use of a
Geographic Information System in this project is limited to the management of a vast corpus of spatial data and the visualisation of this evidence in cartographic form. So, whilst the GIS is not being used as an interpretative tool, it is hoped that in the long run, the database constructed for this project can be subjected to various forms of spatial analysis. As an example of what could be attempted; the clear indication in Study Area 9 is that ‘roods’ – crucifixes – are being sited on visible rises alongside major thoroughfares to monastic houses. This provides a hypothesis that can be tested by a GIS through predictive modelling of the landscape, in this case, inter-visibility between sites set on along identified thoroughfares. Also, the distribution of coins of the middle Saxon period in relation to the routes identified by this project (see Figure 21) may present us with a working hypothesis for predicting other routes of the period as well as the likely locations for other ‘productive’ sites.454

For two reasons, the decision was made at an early stage to plot every feature in the boundary clauses rather than just those seemingly relating to travel and communication. Firstly, it was deemed presumptive to approach the evidence with a preconceived notion of what types of features should be sought out and cross-examined. Streets, ways, paths, bridges and fords were felt to be obvious choices of terms but in searching only for these, other features such as the ‘ladder beam’ [hleadreadan beam] (a possible wayfarer’s look-out - S 756), the ‘stone posts’ (a series of three Roman milestones - S 492, S 766, S 789) and the ‘stone heap’ in the Laverstock charter (S 543) above would have gone unnoticed and these are undoubtedly landmarks that relate to the theme of travel and communication. Secondly, the other various features mentioned in charter boundary clauses often help to give contextual landscape information concerning the nature of the terrain through which a route might be passing. References to open downland, field systems or woodland in charter boundary clauses therefore help, when plotted, to gain a greater understanding of the kind of landscape that movement is taking place through and the likely influence this will have had on both the character and survival of a route way. As well as being plotted, each feature in the boundary clauses employed in this study will be catalogued, a translation will be offered and categories applied. Each term, and any descriptive terminology, will be categorised so that group types of feature can be displayed through distribution maps. The adoption of Method A in Study Area 1 will illustrate that the detailed analysis of all cartographic source materials for landscape

454 I am grateful to Helen Geake for this suggested use of my data.
reconstruction is not necessarily required to draw sound conclusions on the courses of probable early medieval routes. The final phase therefore of Method B involved reconstructing the ways, paths and streets referred to in Anglo-Saxon charters, literally sketching in the lines of routes on early edition Ordnance Survey base-maps. Method B will be applied to areas of differing size and employ differing numbers of charters. Across all areas, Method B will employ 75 charters, producing a database of 2,452 features (each with its own translation, category attributes, grid references and notes). For translations, a wide variety of sources have been used ranging from the English place-name volumes, previous studies of individual charters, the *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary*, the *Thesaurus of Old English* and the *Dictionary of Old English electronic corpus*.\(^{455}\) Where available, *langscape* was consulted and some original translations and interpretations are also offered.\(^{456}\)

The aims of Method B are to reconstruct aspects of the Anglo-Saxon landscape that relate to the themes of travel and communication and to sketch in, where possible, the network of routes, markers, gates and other relevant features that served the people as they moved through the landscape. All ten study areas will be used to address the research questions raised at the end of PART 1. Whilst the analysis and results from the application of Method A will be provided in PART 2, the analysis and results from the application of Method B will feature in PART 3.

**The ‘Palimpsest’, Horizontal Stratigraphy and the Ordnance Survey**

To justify the conclusions drawn from the results of Method A, there must exist an analytical process by which the landscape is understood and interpreted. Since the early part of the last century a range of techniques have been developed to place in some kind of order the various physical phenomena that make up our landscape. What is provided here is not an exhaustive review of these approaches but rather a brief summary of two specific paradigms that landscape historians and archaeologists have found to be of particular use, along with a consideration of the role that Ordnance Survey map data has played in both. The objective of this section is to review the methodological frameworks upon which are based the approach to landscape adopted by this research project.
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\(^{456}\) [www.langscape.org.uk](http://www.langscape.org.uk) (23/03/2013).
Ever since Frederic W. Maitland likened the Ordnance Survey map to a palimpsest, the metaphor has proven a popular vehicle through which to conceptualise change in archaeological and historical approaches to landscapes. In particular, the notion that a landscape could be read, especially through the maps of the OS, has gained popular currency amongst archaeologists, historians and historical geographers. W. G. Hoskins, writing of Maitland’s comments on the OS, implored us to ‘decipher’ the OS map, and to see the landscape as ‘an equally revealing document, equally full of significant detail, and equally difficult to interpret aight’. The idea then of seeing landscape as a ‘document’ and something that can be ‘read’ has been popular amongst commentators and analysts of the British landscape for well over half a century. O. G. S. Crawford also made use of the metaphor describing the ‘surface of England’ as a ‘document that has been written on and erased over and over again’. The parallel between such a parchment or tablet and the man-made landscape is, remarked David Wilson, ‘so evident that it scarcely needs to be spelled out in detail’. Crawford’s rationale for its use undoubtedly lies in the vision of the British landscape he gained from undertaking aerial photography. What he saw so clearly from above was not just landscape phenomena that made up the content of the OS, but the shadow, frost and crop marks of whole field systems and settlements that had been literally wiped from the surface by centuries of arable agriculture. This is where the palimpsest paradigm and its relationship to the OS warrants reconsideration because so much has not been wiped from the tablet but has actually influenced later formations. Wilson admits that under scrutiny the parallel between palimpsest and landscape begins to break down and more recently, the application of the metaphor has been questioned on the grounds that it sometimes fails to take into account temporality or the ‘time dynamic’. For example, Gavin Lucas, whilst not entirely dispensing with the idea, prefers rather to see a ‘messier affair’ of temporality, multiple events and multiple timescales.
overlaying each other, rather than a simple reduction to chronological sequence. The palimpsest therefore becomes an ongoing process where different time-scales and their constituent landscape phenomena co-exist.

Perhaps then, rather than seeing the landscape as something that is recurrently wiped clean and re-inscribed, we should, sticking with the notion of something that can be read, see it as a document that requires ‘editing’ if it is to be truly understood chronologically and with all the complexities of various time-scales. In such a scenario, we might envisage some text being entirely removed whilst other text is re-worked into new passages. Extending the metaphor, meaning within the text could be lost or re-interpreted and some text could be interpolated with new text. The issue arises though about how exactly this document can be ‘edited’ and how the landscape historian and archaeologist can draw out meaning from the various phases of writing and rewriting. Put literally, how exactly can we separate out the chronological relationships between various landscape features, establish the level of continuity and change and identify re-use and redundancy?

As an approach, horizontal stratigraphy has yet to earn formal recognition of its validity in the same way vertical stratigraphy and, for example, the Harris matrix have. Yet, in many ways, the principles of stratigraphy as applied to the relationships between discrete archaeological features in open area excavations are the same as those that can be applied to the relationships between topographical phenomena over much larger areas. By analysing the stratigraphic relationships therefore between various landscape features, theoretically, we can draw out a relative chronology between the earliest and latest elements. It is perhaps best to begin with the exact object of study in all of the enquiries that employ horizontal stratigraphy as a method. These are ‘lines’ in the landscape. As Peter Fowler remarked, ‘the skein of complexity on the ground seems to be held together by linear features’. He identifies three types of linear as: field boundaries, tracks and ditches. To these should be added the various administrative boundaries that we have good evidence for by the late Anglo-Saxon period. Certain sites in the landscape can also be employed in the elucidation of relative chronologies between these linears. For example, execution cemeteries appear to be have been located on or close to boundaries and the location of high status barrow burials seems dependent on proximity to major arterial
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route ways. It is logical, therefore, that in both situations the linear had to be already in existence to serve as the focus for the burial practices. Thus a relative chronology exists between linear and site and this, in essence, is the method of horizontal stratigraphy. In theory the interrelationships between the various lines that create the ‘skein’ of the landscape can be mapped and ordered in such a way as to enable retrogressive analysis of the landscape. Clearly later layers of lines can be peeled away to reveal progressively earlier time slices wherein the earliest network of lines can be explored for the influence they may have had on the structure of the later landscape.

The method of horizontal stratigraphy is most regularly applied in the analysis of field systems and in Eastern England in particular it has lead to suggestions that patterns of field boundaries mapped in the nineteenth century can be projected back into prehistory. In one of the first studies to propose the survival of early relict field systems, Warwick Rodwell and Paul Drury identified an alignment of linear field boundaries in Essex that appeared to extend beyond the limits of manorial estates. They were thus deemed to be earlier than the medieval manorial boundaries and earlier too than the course of a Roman road that appeared to slice through them. A similar situation was observed in the Scole-Dickleborough area of East Anglia where Tom Williamson drew attention to the manner in which a Roman road appeared to cut through an earlier field system identified through the drawing out of landscape linears from nineteenth-century editions of the OS (Figure 11).

Parts of the field system that Williamson had identified were still in modern use and were thus seen as a ‘relict’ or survival from pre-Roman times. The term now widely used to describe these field systems is ‘co-axial’ and in plan form they tend to take the appearance of, in Williamson’s words, ‘slightly wavy brickwork’. Successive studies in Norfolk, Cambridgeshire and Hertfordshire (Figure 12) have found similar evidence for the
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apparent survival of these ‘co-axial’ field systems existing as part of later medieval and present day field systems. Co-axial fields seem not to be restricted to the east of England though. Examples have turned up in Herefordshire,\textsuperscript{474} and on Dartmoor, they survive as an archaeological entity rather than a ‘relict’ system.\textsuperscript{475} In Wessex, we not only have Fowler’s Fyfield and Overton research area but also a number of examples identified by Simon Draper particularly in north-Wiltshire where co-axial systems appear overlain by Roman roads. In the parish of Crudwell, landscape features on a north-south axis underlie the Fosse Way where it forms the county boundary between Wiltshire and Gloucestershire and at Calcutt near Cricklade, the Roman Ermine Street is seen to slice obliquely across a north-south field system.\textsuperscript{476} Echoing the descriptive terminology of Williamson, he describes ‘the somewhat wobbly outlines of a sort of grid’, the major arterial axes of which he believed were already old in the Romano-British countryside.\textsuperscript{477}

The wholesale survival of such field systems has at times been met with a degree of scepticism which warns against the tendency to overstate the case through a selective use of landscape linears and an over-reliance on OS map data.\textsuperscript{478} However, under closer scrutiny and with a more critical approach it appears that whilst such field systems are not entirely comprised of prehistoric and/or Romano-British ditches and that some axes are of more recent dating, the main lines of the systems can be traced back to prehistory.\textsuperscript{479} Stephen Rippon, for example, re-examined the evidence from Essex and established that whilst not all elements of the field system could be pushed back into prehistory, some elements were potentially very early in date.\textsuperscript{480} Williamson also returned to the Scole-Dickleborough case study of 1987 (Figure 11) and cited a number of examples in Hertfordshire (Figure 12), Shropshire and Norfolk where archaeological evidence has also confirmed only partial rather than comprehensive survival of prehistoric field systems.\textsuperscript{481} As a consequence, he now opts for a process of continuous development, and the infilling over time of what was originally a much sparser pattern of parallel boundaries.

\textsuperscript{472} Williamson, ‘Co-Axial Landscapes: Time and Topography’, 126-27.
\textsuperscript{475} S. Draper, Landscape, Settlement and Society in Roman and Early Medieval Wiltshire (BAR British Series, 419; Oxford: Archaeopress, 2006) 91-93.
\textsuperscript{476} Fowler, ‘Moving through the Landscape’, 28.
In all of these studies, the main subject of analysis has been the various linears as they are configured in cartographic form and these have been used to propose the identification, essentially through a form of morphology, of an early field system type. It is primarily the horizontally stratigraphic relationship with Roman roads and the shared characteristics (i.e. co-axial) of the field systems that have enabled their projection back into prehistory. Studies employing horizontal stratigraphy in the analysis of another type of linear – routes – are less prevalent (although as we saw in the Chapter One section on Prehistoric Trackways, they are a concomitant, along with field systems, of valley settlement). John Baker and Stuart Brookes set out a methodology, in their study of the communications network of the Kennet Valley, to examine the topology of routes (although they pull short of referring to it explicitly as horizontal stratigraphy). In their view analysis should be attempted on two levels prior to the integration of evidence from documentary sources. The first stage is the retrogressive analysis of cartographic sources; peeling off the known recent additions to a landscape to reveal a network of communications of some antiquity. Next, they advocate assessing the stratigraphic relationships between the remaining routes identifying where routes overlay, abut or cut each other as indications of their relative date. By doing this, they argue, a matrix of route-way relationships can be arrived at where it is possible ‘to determine the relative chronology of road construction’. Elsewhere, the importance of identifying routes, their primacy in the landscape and their subsequent influence has been commented on but with little further attempt to refine an approach. Christopher Taylor has observed more generally that the pre-village layout of tracks in an area very often conditioned the form of villages when they finally appeared. Fowler’s study area demonstrates how ‘the presence and use of tracks at different times have influenced the formation of the historical landscape and, arguably, at least some strands of the tenurial framework within which it developed’. So route ways are clearly important in the formation of a landscape and in many cases, may represent the primary linears.

A word of caution though is required at this stage. Rarely can the chronological relationships between features be given an absolute date and more often than not the sequences of linears as they relate to each other float within a fairly long time scale. On occasion archaeological data or historical references can be used to provide either a

484 Fowler, ‘Moving through the Landscape’, 27.
terminus post quem or terminus ante quem and this information can help to bracket the sequence chronologically. Pinning down the exact period of transition or change however, is often difficult making the drawing of solid conclusions problematic. Take, for example, Desmond Bonney’s study of early estate boundaries in Wessex wherein he analyses the relationship between parish boundaries (ergo early Anglo-Saxon estate boundaries) and East Wansdyke – a linear earthwork that traverses the chalk downland to the north of the Vale of Pewsey, Wiltshire. Bonney’s observation was that the course of the dyke seemingly ignores the line of the estates by cutting across their boundaries in such a way as to truncate small parcels of land from the main body of the estate. Charter boundary clauses confirm that this relationship existed in the late tenth century and the implication of this is that the estate boundaries pre-date the dyke. Elsewhere in Wiltshire Bonney observed that parish boundaries adhere to the lines of Roman roads and from both of these relationships, a relative chronology can be suggested. The boundaries adopted the course of an existing linear in the Roman road and then Wansdyke was constructed (i.e. Roman road > boundary > Wansdyke). The problem arises when we consider the lack of any secure dating for Wansdyke. Bonney, in line with contemporary thinking, placed the earthwork in a ‘sub-Roman’ context therefore suggesting the estate boundaries to be of Romano-British origin. However, more recent considerations of Wansdyke suggest a date possibly as late as the eighth century. The estate boundaries in this instance do not necessarily need to be Roman. They could just as well have been laid out in the early to middle Saxon period thus diminishing the ‘continuity’ argument that has been a recurrent theme in studies of parish and estate boundary origins.

Despite the temporal vagaries that can afflict such landscape studies, the method of horizontal stratigraphy allows for a landscape that can be both ‘read’ and ‘edited’ in much the same way Williamson and Fowler have done to produce the complex, multi-temporal chronologies of linears in their respective study areas. Whilst the basic principles of horizontal stratigraphy hold true, it is only through detailed analysis that sequences can be refined and a tighter relative chronology applied. As Fowler states: ‘the crucial
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perceptual development is for that [landscape] context to become stratified (my italics), through detailed fieldwork, detailed documentary work, and through melding of the two in interpretation minimally at two scales, local and sub-regional.489

Of all the studies discussed as part of this chapter, it is difficult to overstate the role early editions of OS maps have played, if not in just the provision of contextual spatial data, then in underpinning entire studies. Brian Roberts and Stuart Wrathmell’s *Atlas of Rural Settlement*, for example, took as its starting point the pattern of settlement as identified in the first-edition, one inch-to-the-mile maps of Great Britain and their subjective grading of type-sites allowed them to divide England into three zones of settlement believed to be of great antiquity.490 Whilst Method A considers all the cartographic data available for Study Area 1, the studies discussed above provide the justification for using OS maps of the nineteenth century (six- and nine-inch-to-the-mile) across the remaining study areas and having recourse to earlier cartographic data only where necessary and available. Whilst estate and other miscellaneous early maps might provide earlier insights into the network of routes through a landscape (and in particular the pre-turnpike landscape), the mapping of the OS of the nineteenth century was concerned with topography rather than property and represents, certainly in the second-edition series, the first attempt to provide accurate topographical data for the requirements of a fast industrialising nation. Through the ‘primary levelling of Great Britain’, a campaign to measure all altitudes from a standard position, the demands of railway engineers were met and the adoption of a finer scale (in some places 25 inches to a mile) meant that the rapidly expanding industrial centres could be mapped and socially catered for.491 In both these requirements, the OS was essentially to come of age and to produce, in scientific terms, a level of recording comprehensive in its detail. The accuracy, and crucially, the uniformity of nineteenth-century OS maps across the entire nation is in part the attraction for their use amongst landscape historians and archaeologists but the studies discussed above, and those undertaken abroad (Figure 13),492 illustrate that the information recorded by the surveying techniques of late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century European cartographers can be used, as any accurately measured topographic survey can, to be studied for what it can reliably say about a much earlier state of affairs.

489 Fowler, ‘Moving through the Landscape’, 32.
492 F. Vermeulen and M. Antrop (eds.), *Ancient Lines in the Landscape: A Geo-Archaeological Study of Protohistoric and Roman Roads and Field Systems in Northwestern Gaul* (Leeven: Peters, 2001) 27-76, as an example see 134, Figure 90.
We have seen how Maitland was first to draw attention to the notion that the OS was a palimpsest that could be read and he eulogised how ‘two little fragments of the original one-inch OS Map will be more eloquent than would be many paragraphs of written discourse’. But he was also prophetic in his suggestion that, ‘A century hence the student’s materials will not be in the shape he finds them in now ... instead of a few photographed village maps, there will be many; the history of land measures and the field systems will have been elaborated’.  

The OS has played no small part in these advances and it is hoped it will be demonstrated here that it will serve as an appropriate and sufficient back-drop to explore the lines of communication of early medieval Wessex and the detailed topographical information found in Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses.

Study Area 1: The Harroway

The area selected for detailed analysis (Method A) is in north Hampshire in the modern parishes of St Mary Bourne, Hurstbourne Priors and Whitchurch. Both the medieval settlements of St Mary Bourne and Hurstbourne Priors lie on the Bourne Rivulet whilst Whitchurch lies on the River Test (Map 1.1). This area was selected both because of the charter evidence available and also because here a Roman Road and the Harroway, a thoroughfare of purported prehistoric origin, both pass through the region and cross the Bourne Rivulet. Thus the study area provides an opportunity to assess the relative fates of Roman and prehistoric routes in an early medieval landscape. The Hurstbourne Valley is first mentioned as Hissaburnam in 786 x 793 in an exchange of land between King Beorhtric and his princeps Hemele. It appears again in King Alfred’s will, as Hysseburnan and nyðeran Hysseburnan, although it is not clear which refers to Hurstbourne Tarrant (further upstream) and which to Hurstbourne Priors. Both sites have mother church characteristics with the latter certainly seeming the more likely candidate for the original minster foundation, on the basis of the topographic criteria spelt out by Patrick Hase. It has been suggested that a division may have happened at an earlier date with the two parochia following the original tenurial boundaries. However, St Mary Bourne is also a candidate for an early manorial centre with an associated early church of some
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493 Johnson, Ideas of Landscape at 54; Maitland, Domesday Book and Beyond: Three Essays in the Early History of England 39, 596.
494 § 296.
495 § 1507.
Although regarded as a chapel of ease in the eighteenth century for the mother church of Hurstbourne, it sits on the Roman road, is in close proximity to an extensive early field system and has some early fabric in the structure of the south isle.\textsuperscript{499} Whitchurch is first recorded in a charter dated to 909, suggesting an important early church of likely minster status.\textsuperscript{500} Its topographical location at the fording place of the Test for a projected north-south route and the survival of a grave stone dated to the ninth century imply importance as a central place in the Anglo-Saxon period.\textsuperscript{501} The exact meaning of the harro- element in Harroway is uncertain. Leslie Grinsell suggested that it could have derived from any of har [hoary (with age)], hereweg [military road], and hearg weg [the way to the shrine or holy place].\textsuperscript{502} Of the latter he suggests ‘doubtfully’ that it applies to Stonehenge, yet elsewhere it has been argued that because the course of the Harroway passes this unique henge monument en route to the west of England, it is inconceivable that it did not play a role in the mental geography of Old English speakers.\textsuperscript{503} In such a scenario, its nomenclature is likely to have followed the same etymological rules that governed the formation of Harrow-on-the-Hill (Middx.) and Harrow Hill (Suss.) and is therefore likely to have derived from hearg [shrine, temple].\textsuperscript{504} Recently, the archaeological and topographic context of the term hearg has been examined in relation to a number of sites and it seems likely that the traditional definition applied to the term as a place of pagan worship of the fifth to seventh centuries should be eschewed in favour of a longer-lived, localised cult practice peaking in the late Iron Age and Romano-British periods.\textsuperscript{505} Such a definition certainly fits with the recorded archaeological activity at Stonehenge where many sherds of third- to fourth-century pottery indicate a high point of activity in the late Roman period prior to a lull in the fifth century and onwards.\textsuperscript{506} Thus, it seems reasonable to assume that a route widely accepted to be of prehistoric origin was

\textsuperscript{499} W. Page, \textit{A History of the County of Hampshire: Volume 4} (Victoria County History; London: Constable, 1911) 295-99.
\textsuperscript{500} Hase, ‘The Mother Churches of Hampshire’, 64 footnote 33.
\textsuperscript{502} L. V. Grinsell, \textit{The Archaeology of Wessex} (London: Methuen, 1958) 298.
functioning at the point it was assigned an Old English name and it most probably represents a major east-west ‘Romanised’ road.\textsuperscript{507}

Throughout the project, a geographic information system (GIS) was employed in the management of digital OS map data. This data included parish boundaries, modern roads, woodland, and watercourse and surface water along with relief data. Digital copies of early edition OS maps were also incorporated as a layer to create a base-map from which to begin retrogressive analysis of the landscape. Various editions of eighteenth-century Hampshire county maps were consulted to ascertain the trajectories of the major routes that run through the study area but this process was immediately confronted with a considerable bias. Whilst the Harroway is depicted in, for example, John Rocque’s \textit{England Displayed} (1769), Thomas Kitchin’s map of Hampshire in the \textit{London Magazine} (1751) and Samuel Simpson’s \textit{The Complete English Traveller} (1746), it does not feature in R. Dodsley’s earlier \textit{The Geography of Britain} (1744). Most worryingly however, the Winchester to Oxford road features in none of the above and illustrates clearly that such maps were very much London-centric in their portrayal of county routes and concerned mainly with the network of turnpikes that had reached its zenith in around 1770.\textsuperscript{508}

For each parish, the earliest estate and tithe maps were acquired (as digital photographs) and the information they contained concerning routes was sketched into the GIS using OS maps as a guide (Map 1.1).\textsuperscript{509} To develop the ‘skein of complexity’, the digital photographs of cartographic evidence were again consulted to sketch in the main lines of field boundaries, again using early edition OS maps as a guide (Map 1.2). Amalgamating both these sets of data and also incorporating woodland cover and parish boundaries from the OS digital data archive produced Map 1.3. At this stage, horizontal stratigraphic analysis was undertaken and the various lines in the form of routes, field, woodland and parish boundaries could be considered collectively for their value in reconstructing earlier route ways. Hard lines were drawn wherever a route was felt to have passed at some point. These hard lines may incorporate sections of field boundary, route way or parish and woodland boundaries and where no clear linear exists in the landscape, an interpretive dashed line of the same colour has been projected (Map 1.4). For discursive purposes certain key features have been labelled and numbered.


\textsuperscript{508} J. Armstrong, ‘Transport and Trade’, in R. Pope [ed.], \textit{Atlas of British Social and Economic History since c.1700} (London: Routledge, 1989), 96-133 at 100, Figure 5.6.

\textsuperscript{509} Map of the estate of Enham, Eaststanton, Finkley and Doles, 1785, H.R.O. cat. no. 9M84/1; Whitchurch tithe map, 1841, H.R.O. cat. no. 21M65/F7/253/2; Tracing of St Mary Bourne tithe map, original 1841, H. R. O. cat. no. 54M98/E/P5; Copy of Hurstbourne Priors tithe map, 1842, H. R. O. cat. no. 15M84/MP15.
Attention should first be drawn to the routes marked [1], [2], [3], [17], [18], [19] and [20]. These appear to represent the types of route identified by Tom Williamson and Peter Fowler in their respective study areas (discussed in Chapter One, Prehistoric Tracks). Such routes are believed to represent some of the earliest linears in the landscape, running at right angles to the parallel bands of resources that valley occupants would have exploited.\textsuperscript{510} Two field systems in the study area relating to these routes are suggested by the morphology of linears in areas to the north of St Mary Bourne and to the north of Laverstoke.

In the study area, the course of the Harroway recorded in both the early cartographic evidence, and on the nineteenth-century OS, clearly takes an obscure ‘dog-leg’ (see Map 1.1). That both sections of the Harroway abut route [8] connecting Oxford and Winchester might suggest that they are later than this north-south route. However, when we look at the pattern of nineteenth-century field boundaries due north of Whitchurch, a continuation of the Harroway’s original course from the east becomes apparent. Where the Harrow Way [HW1] passes through the relic medieval field systems north of Laverstoke, its course is fixed. The implication here is that it pre-dates the field system. And yet, over the open downland, its course is less certain and its survival variable so that only a remnant of it survives as a series of stepped field boundaries. At the point of enclosure,\textsuperscript{511} field boundaries were drawn up against the outer limits of what was likely to have been a fairly wide thoroughfare thus creating the ‘stepped’ nature of the field boundaries but also fossilising the operating north-south routes of the nineteenth-century landscape as they converge on Whitchurch (strands of [4], [6], [7] and [8]).

It is suggested here that the original course of the Harroway followed the line of these stepped field boundaries and passed through what became Hurstbourne Park. The course of [HW3] may have been adopted as early as the 1330s when the prior and convent of St Swithun’s was granted licence to impark their woods of Hurstbourne and Whitchurch, or it may have been a result of later landscaping.\textsuperscript{512} Either way, the course through Hurstbourne Park was said, in the early twentieth century, to be preserved only as a row of ancient Yew trees.\textsuperscript{513} This is [HW2] so that [HW1/2] represents the hypothetical original course of the Harrow Way. [HW3] occurred perhaps immediately after [HW1] exits the field system or at the point where a dashed line running east-west leaves [HW2] (due north of

\textsuperscript{510} Fowler, ‘Moving through the Landscape’, 26-32; Williamson, ‘Co-Axial Landscapes: Time and Topography’, 130-32.
\textsuperscript{511} Copy of Whitchurch Enclosure Act, 1797, H.R.O. cat. No. 10M57/A30.
\textsuperscript{513} Page, A History of the County of Hampshire: Volume 4 287.
Whitchurch) and hits [HW3] at Hogdigging Cottages. [HW3] continues its course westwards to cross the Bourne Rivulet at Chapmansford.

[RR1/2] represents the course of the Roman road that passes between Silchester and Old Sarum. Whilst [RR1] survives as a parish, woodland and field boundary, it is no longer an active route in the landscape of the nineteenth century. This does not, of course, discount it as an early medieval route but the almost complete lack of a linear in early maps from a point in Bradley Wood to the Bourne Rivulet arouses suspicion. The line of this section of Roman road is depicted on the second edition OS but it is difficult to see it as anything other than the conjectural drawing of an enthusiastic draughtsman keen to link up the two surviving stretches of road (i.e. [RR1] and [RR2]). The implications of this complete discontinuation of the line of the road are important to consider. One view would be that the course of the road never existed along this line and that in its setting out, a pre-existing fording point up or down stream was made use of. Having crossed the Bourne Rivulet, the road would then have returned immediately on to the trajectory of the intended line surveyed in from Silchester to Old Sarum. Alternatively, the road could have taken the more direct course favoured by the OS draughtsman but fell out of use so soon after its construction, again in favour of superior crossing points up or down stream, that it had no impact on the later pattern of boundaries between Bradley Wood and the Bourne Rivulet. [RR4] and [RR5] represent deviations that may have occurred from the projected course of [RR1/2]. That they both spring from [RR1] suggests they are later than its construction and the fact that [RR4] is used almost entirely along its course as a parish boundary provides a terminus ante quem for its construction. [RR5] is a much more speculative deviation and it seems likely that if [RR2] was to be rejoined, this would have happened immediately after the crossing of the Bourne Rivulet at the site of the church of St Mary Bourne.

Both [RR3] and [RR4] drop away south from [RR1] in Bradley Wood for crossing points on the Bourne Rivulet further downstream. The course of [RR4], as mentioned above, is preserved as the parish boundary between St Mary Bourne and Hurstbourne Priors for most of its length from Bradley wood to its junction with [HW3] and [HW2] as they cross Devil’s Ditch. If this parish boundary represents the course of an earlier medieval boundary and perhaps even the course of an Anglo-Saxon estate then the deviation of [RR4] from [RR1/2] could feasibly have happened in the late Roman to early medieval periods. By the nineteenth century however, [RR4] has fallen out of use as a route although exactly when this happened is unclear. It may be as a consequence of [RR3], a deviation from [RR1] that carries the road down to the junction with [HW3] at Hogdigging Cottages.
This route also seems to have fallen out of use although, like [RR4], it is preserved in the line of field, woodland and parish boundaries.

Whilst pinning down an exact chronology between the various phases of use, redundancy and re-use between the alternative courses of the Harrow Way and the Roman road is necessarily subject to the vagaries of relative dating, some key observations can be made. Firstly, it seems clear that there is a general coalescing of routes at the point where they cross the Devil’s Ditch. [RR4], [HW2] and [HW3] all appear to converge on this point and it looks likely that [3] and [16] are being made to pass through the same break in the dyke. Because of [RR4]’s relationship with the parish boundary we can suggest that this configuration of routes existed before the laying out of the parish boundary.

Secondly, a similar event can be suggested by the coalescing of routes at the junction of Hogdigging Cottages. Here, a spur off of [HW2] at the stepped field boundary joins [HW3] and [RR3] before crossing the Bourne Rivulet at Chapmansford. Interestingly, a potential four crossing points of the Bourne Rivulet (perhaps at Pickford, [RR4], [RR1/2] and Chapmansford) are being reduced to a single crossing point at Chapmansford by the drawing together of routes at Hogdigging Cottages. It might also be suggested that [14] offers a redirection of [15] and [16] to make use of this new, improved or, perhaps, designated ford. Again, exactly when this shift took place it is difficult to be certain of but it seems probable that it occurred in a period after the coalescing of routes into the Devil’s Ditch and, as we shall see from the charter boundary clause evidence, before [RR3] is referred to in a charter dated to 909.\textsuperscript{514}

\textsuperscript{514} S 378.
PART 2: Methodological Conclusions

In the introduction to this part, a review of some of the developments in the thinking and ideas about landscape archaeology and history was provided as a means with which to contextualise the methodology of this project within a wider theoretical framework. Aspects of the approaches adopted here are very much in the mould of ‘traditional’, ‘investigative’ landscape archaeology, the strengths of which, according to Andrew Fleming, have been its ‘immense heuristic potential and its preference for sustained argument’. At the same time though, when arguing from examples, this project is conscious of how typical its historical source material is and clearly sets its locales of investigation within ten defined study areas. The author’s own engagement with the ‘landscape’ through field work, recreation and other experiential and experimental activities over the years has generated a range of ideas concerning a landscape over which a certain affection has developed. I am therefore conscious of the subjectivity of my stance on the landscape that I live in and, in Hoskins’s words, it is ‘indelibly printed on the mind and heart’. At times these thoughts surface in the analysis and discussion of data but, for the most part, the back-projection of these observations (or feelings) has been resisted – certainly in an interpretative sense – in view of the fact that the primary historical source material (Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses) contains descriptions, perceptions and attitudes to the landscape that enable insights into the human elements deemed so lacking in ‘traditional’ and processual approaches.

Early editions of Ordnance Survey maps have played an important role in the building of spatial datasets in this project. Where OS maps impress over the use of even earlier cartographic evidence is in the uniformity of the record and in the level of technical application used in their production. OS surveyors built, like their counterparts in Europe (e.g. see the Cadastral plan in Figure 13), on the intellectual – and in particular, mathematical – advances of the eighteenth century and the Age of Enlightenment. These mapping techniques were first used in Britain to map the Highlands of Scotland to aid in the subjugation of rebellious clansmen and this strategy of surveillance and intelligence was at its most oppressive in Ireland in nineteenth century. So the genesis of the OS is intimately bound up with the control and subjugation of people and their landscapes and in

this sense it is in danger of eradicating ‘native’ concepts of landscape. The map, therefore, in a post-colonial context, can be seen to be about the oppression of other peoples, an outsider’s perspective, ‘distanced’, ‘geometrical’ and distinctly Foucauldian in its desire to control. To ignore this invaluable source of information on these grounds though is to miss out on a record so informative and revealing in its detail. The instruments of the nineteenth century surveyor’s success were a preoccupation with precision, with newly developed theodolites and with the method of triangulation. Whilst this puts them at a distance from the period that is the object of study for this project, it places their maps closer to the principles and techniques employed by archaeologists today to map and survey topographical phenomena. The added benefit of a survey undertaken in the nineteenth century is, of course, that the surveyors were operating in a landscape that had yet to fall victim to the intensive mechanical cultivation of the twentieth century that altered so significantly the surface of the British landscape.

The application of Method A to Study Area 1 raised the distinct possibility that by the early medieval period the landscape of St Mary Bourne, Hurstbourne Priors and Whitchurch parishes was already served by an almost unlimited number of routes running in all trajectories and channelled through a number of crossing points of the Bourne Rivulet and River Test. The analysis of the horizontal stratigraphic relationships between these routes suggests that by the late Anglo-Saxon period some were favoured as major thoroughfares over others. The Harroway stands out as a route of primacy both in its origins and also in its continued use up to the eleventh century when it is referred to in a charter boundary clause. A N/S axis of movement, suggested by a braiding of routes over the downs north of Whitchurch, was also of clear importance. However, knowing exactly the configuration of routes during the period from the fifth through to the eleventh century will always be blighted by the multi-temporal limitations of cartographic evidence and by a lack of clear dateable archaeological signatures. An endless number of test-pits, trial trenches and cores samples could be taken to explore abandoned sections of road, roadside verges and field boundaries that fossilize earlier routes and it is likely that the limited gains made would be far outweighed by the expense of such a programme of works and the analysis required to date and stratify the various identifiable horizons.

Both Peter Fowler and Tom Williamson make a very forceful case in their respective studies that the pattern of co-axial field systems and the concomitant routes

520 Hewitt, Map of a Nation: A Biography of the Ordnance Survey Chapter 5.
that run at right angles to the parallel bands of resources that the British valley landscape has to offer can be seen to have their origins in distant prehistory.\textsuperscript{521} And why should they not? The distribution and complexity of settlement in the late Iron Age suggests a population density, at a conservative estimate, of between two and a half to three million.\textsuperscript{522} Fowler believes that a peak around 300 AD of five million is possible and then, after a sharp decline in the post-Roman period, a steady increase to a maximum figure of 3 million is speculated for 1000 AD.\textsuperscript{523} We must therefore anticipate the population at the beginning of the first millennium to have had a comparable impact on the pattern of the landscape with that of the population in 1086. Irrespective of the debates of continuity and change in the landscape, the inheritance from the Romano-British period would have been a landscape of rich resources, from meadow grasses to woodland, downland and arable fields, all there to be exploited when the time required and already served by a dense network of tracks.

Michael Costen observed that many boundaries recorded in charters made use of tracks indicating that the boundaries were more recent creations than the routes they follow.\textsuperscript{524} He draws attention to the fact that references to \textit{herepath, lanu} (lane), \textit{path, stræt} and \textit{weg} (way) appear 117 times in Somerset, 178 times in Wiltshire and 64 times in Dorset and that the occasions which bounds follow routes are 29, 53 and 17 respectively. This suggests that the bounds that we see in charters ‘are in large part the result of a process which continued long after the roads had been laid down’.\textsuperscript{525} The density of Romano-British occupation around the area of the upper Test and Andover (i.e. the region of Study Area 1) is best illustrated by a location search on the \textit{Heritage Gateway}, a facility that allows for the searching of all Sites and Monument Records, Historic Environment Records and registered English Heritage sites.\textsuperscript{526} In a 10km (6.2 miles) square drawn around Whitchurch, the database returned ninety-nine entries dating from the specified date range of 43-410 AD. These ranged from single coin finds to burials, buildings and entire field systems. An advanced search on \textit{Pastscape}, English Heritage’s own searchable database, yielded over 200 sites registered for the same period in the Test Valley.\textsuperscript{527}

\textsuperscript{522} T. Darvill, \textit{Prehistoric Britain} (London: Routledge, 1987) 186, Figure 109.
\textsuperscript{523} P. J. Fowler, \textit{Farming in the First Millenium AD: British Agriculture between Julius Caesar and William Conqueror} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) at 17.
\textsuperscript{525} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{526} http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk/gateway/advanced_search.aspx (09/04/2013).
\textsuperscript{527} http://www.pastscape.org (09/04/2013).
When we consider this and the view held by the likes of Christopher Taylor and David Harrison, that the network of later medieval routes was already in place by the end of the Anglo-Saxon period,\(^{528}\) we are drawn towards a pattern of human existence and movement through a landscape that is perhaps better understood through the paradigm of the *longue durée* than it is through the bracketed and historically specific political and socio-cultural horizons of the early, middle and late Anglo-Saxon periods. Archaeologists are warned of the dangers of environmental determinism and seeing economic primacy holding too much sway over our interpretations of societal transition and development.\(^{529}\) But at the same time the resources that served the agrarian economy of late prehistory, Roman Britain and the early medieval period never changed their position and neither is it likely that the routes to these places from the optimum locations for valley settlement spanning two millennia changed all that greatly.

So whilst we are limited in our ability to construct the exact routes that served early medieval populations in any given century, we can at least allude, through map regression (‘reading’ and ‘editing’), to the possibilities that were available. The question should perhaps therefore focus more on the evidence we have for which of these possibilities were chosen and for what purpose. Anglo-Saxon charters are extremely well placed to provide this information and Chapter Four demonstrated that the corpus of boundary clauses contain topographical information of a level of detail and accuracy that means that it is with a degree of confidence that we can set about exploring and drawing conclusions from the relative distributions of boundary marks that are concerned with aspects of travel and communication. In some instances, when we can be certain that a boundary clause is contemporary with the date of the charter within which it features, we can begin to build up chronologies and furthermore, earlier and later charters for the same areas allow commentary on change and development. In the worst-case scenario however, where boundary clauses are clear (undateable) interpolations or features of later forgeries, we can still obtain a more general view of the *status quo* over a period of around two centuries.


PART 3: Data Analysis

The text for the following ten study areas is accompanied by a series of maps and a key (Volume 2). Having located the various landmarks referred to in Anglo-Saxon boundary clauses a set of symbols were applied to features relevant to discussion. In particular, priority was given to routes, river crossings, access points (such as gates and stiles) and markers (such as stones, roods, and posts). Skm grid squares have been applied to the maps and have been labelled with their OS tile data reference number (e.g. SU89SE). The grid provides both scale and directional information whilst also allowing landmarks, routes and places mentioned in the text to be located by the reader with a greater degree of ease.

A number of maps have been reproduced for different study areas. Commentary on each is by no means comprehensive in its discussion of the early medieval contextual data of each area, in the same way that the maps are selective and not comprehensive in their inclusion of early medieval historical and archaeological data. Both the text and study area maps have been targeted to the research questions and in some study areas the focus has been on a particular aspect (such as Study Area 3, where herepaths predominate and Study Area 9, where the ‘roods’ are of most interest).

The selection of some supporting data is intended only as a guide: the woodland coverage is derived from modern OS digital data, as are the parish boundaries and the geography of both running and surface water. It was considered beyond the remit of this research project to attempt to manually digitise early medieval boundaries (such as parish and hundred) and to digitally sketch the possible extent of early medieval woodland and lowland irrigation management. However, it was felt useful to include modern versions of this information to provide at the very least some contextual support. In most cases, an attempt has been made to sketch in the likely routes by which early medieval society moved through the landscape. However, as demonstrated by Method A in PART 2 of the research project, an almost infinite number of possibilities existed for crossing certain landscapes, be they downland or river valley. So other interpretations are possible. It is felt however, that the main lines of communication in the later Anglo-Saxon period, through the various study areas, have been achieved.

The record of the distribution of coins is built around selective use of the data from the Early Medieval Coins register, the Portable Antiquities Scheme and examples recorded in county archaeological journals and other publications. The chronological distribution has been limited to the period 650 – 850 and is intended mainly for discussion in PART 4. Major
and minor places that have been mentioned in the text have also been illustrated and underlying each study area, to help provide even more contextual data, are copies of nineteenth-century OS maps.

Chapter Six: Hampshire

Study Area 1: The Harroway, Whitchurch, and the Bourne Rivulet Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawyer Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Estate Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S 268</td>
<td>Crux Easton</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>Lulla, princeps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 336</td>
<td>Buttermere and Æscmere</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>Wulfhere, princeps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 359</td>
<td>Stoke (St Mary Bourne and Hurstbourne Priors)</td>
<td>900 but composition c. 1050 most likely\textsuperscript{530}</td>
<td>Winchester Cathedral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 378</td>
<td>Whitchurch and Ashmansworth</td>
<td>909 suspicious – possible eleventh-century forgery as above</td>
<td>St Peter’s, Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 416</td>
<td>Ham</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>Wulfgar, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 689</td>
<td>Hurstbourne Tarrant</td>
<td>961 but uncertain authenticity\textsuperscript{531}</td>
<td>Abingdon Abbey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Study Area 1 charter boundary clauses

In the charter for land at Whitchurch, the Harroway is described as \textit{par horo weg} and this form, the first documented reference to the route, suggests a different

\textsuperscript{530} The area is arguably too large to be just 10 hides, so the provenance of the boundary clause may not be the same as the date of the grant. The statement of services rendered at Hurstbourne Priors that appears in the same document is considered so similar to the Rectitudines Singulairm Personarum and the Tidenham survey that a date of composition in the mid-eleventh century seems most likely. D. C. Douglas and G. W. Greenway (eds.), \textit{English Historical Documents, Volume 2, 1042-1189} (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1953) 875-80.

\textsuperscript{531} S. E. Kelly (ed.), \textit{Charters of Abingdon Abbey} (British Academy Series, 2; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) 366.
etymological route from that which is recorded on the nineteenth-century OS and late eighteenth-century estate map for Enham, Eaststanton, Finkley and Doles.532 A similar form can be found in a charter purporting to record the grant in 900, by the king to New Minster, of land at Micheldever some eight miles to the NNE of Winchester.533 That this document is unreliable in its present form is founded on the observation that the script and diplomatic form both derive from the eleventh century.534 So, like S 378, it is an eleventh-century forgery. In this charter it is recorded as horpeges norð ende [the north end of the Harroway]. This first documented reference to the road does little to help in the interpretations of the Harro- element and suggests that by the time of the eleventh-century forgeries, the meaning of the term had become obscure to the forgers and that the name as it survives in later evidence – as Harroway – is as a consequence of a different etymological evolutionary process. This may indicate the relative antiquity of the term, and might even place it in the earliest period of Anglo-Saxon migration and settlement.

The Silchester to Old Sarum Roman road is referred to in the charter perambulations on three occasions and is used as a boundary. Crucially, [RR3] (1.4), a deviation from the course of the Roman road, to a junction with the Harroway at Hogdigging Cottages, is referred to as a ‘way’ (1.5, SU45SW) – thereby bracketing the sequence of [RR1] → [RR2] → [RR4] → [RR3] between the date of first construction (presumably in the late first to early second century) and the possible tenth-century (but more likely eleventh-) dating of the Whitchurch charter.

The boundary to the Stoke estate circumnavigates Harewood (SU44NW) where it makes use of a ‘way’ [16] (1.4), and then crosses another two ways. The continued course of the Harroway is used for a short stretch as the boundary in this location. The perambulation then proceeds NW where it is referred to as the ‘boundary way’. A further reference to a boundary way is made on the course of the conjectural route connecting Winchester with the Upper Thames and via a crossing of the Test at Whitchurch (SU45SE). However no further reference is made to this route or a likely N/S alternative via a crossing at Hurstbourne Priors. Running across the top of the entire study area is a pronounced ridgeway, with a recognised importance in the early medieval period,535 which passes

532 Map of the estate of Enham, Eaststanton, Finkley and Doles, 1785, H.R.O. cat. no. 9M84/1.
533 S 360.
through the hillfort of Walbury (Map 1.7). The charter for Crux Easton provides a rare opportunity to examine the landscape of an earlier period as it is one of the four (mentioned in Chapter Four) where detailed directional terminology in the boundary clause is written in Latin and the landmarks in Old English. In this case, the ridgeway is referred to as a *via publica* in a charter reliably dated to 801. However, in the next reliable charter, dated to 931, it is termed a *herepath*. Finally, in a charter that purports to date to 909, but likely to be a forgery of the late tenth to eleventh century, it is called a ‘way’.

The chapmen’s dell is recorded in three charter boundary clauses (1.5, 1.7, SU45NE). In the study area we are told that the boundary runs *oð ceapmanna del, of ceapmanna dele þæt on portmanne del* [as far as the chapmen’s dell, from the chapmen’s dell then to the portmen’s dell] and illustrates that there was clearly a distinction at this time between a chapman and a portman, both with their respective ‘dells’. What is of further interest is that in a contiguous charter (not covered in the study area and dating to 955) the boundary runs in the reverse order of *scipdelle. on cympamna dell* [from the ?sheep/ship dell to the chapmen’s dell].536 Whilst ‘sheep dell’ might seem the obvious translation, the linking of this place with portmen in the later charter suggests that an association with ‘ship’ as in *scyp-manna* [sailor, one who goes on trading voyages] is more appropriate.537 The significance of this will be discussed in a Chapter Eleven but the importance of this location at the crossroads between the N/S route and an E/W ridgeway is important, at this stage, to draw attention to.

The NW boundary of the Stoke estate is marked by a *haga* [hedge] within which four access points are referred to (1.6, SU35SE/SU45SW). These consist of three gates and a stile and together it is likely that these represent an important division in land use between arable agriculture in the valley bottom and pasture land on the open downland. This division is made explicit in the name of the ‘wheat lea gate’ and this reference suggests that elements of the field system identified on the valley slopes above Stoke and St Mary Bourne (SU45SW) can be pushed back at least to the eleventh century. To the NW of the *haga*, the landscape is characterised by dry open downland from which the headwaters of the Bourne Rivulet spring. A distinctive characteristic of this landscape is the prevalence of dew ponds of which seven have been identified from the charter boundary clause evidence, a further eight are recorded as place-names whilst numerous unnamed lentic systems are recorded in modern OS digital data (1.6). Of significance is the name *Butermere*

---


536 S 565.

given to the area recorded in a grant of 863, which says something of how the stretch of open downland was perceived and used in the ninth century. Another three gates are recorded in boundary clauses on the fringes of this area of downland whilst a ‘horse path gate’ represents an internal division. ‘Ashbert’s gate’ and ‘Æmbriht’s gate’ are likely to indicate responsibility over, and rights to, this managed landscape of upland grazing with all the evidence of dew ponds, *hagas*, gates and the butter place-name suggesting a form of transhumance and dairying of the like described by Harold Fox.\(^{538}\)

---

### Study Area 2: Winchester and the Upper Itchen Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawyer Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Estate Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Alresford (1)</td>
<td>Tenth-century fabrication</td>
<td>Old Minster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Martyr Worthy (1)</td>
<td>825 Genuine but reworked</td>
<td>Old Minster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Alresford (2)</td>
<td>Tenth-century fabrication</td>
<td>Old Minster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Martyr Worthy (3)</td>
<td>854 although eleventh-century forgery</td>
<td>Old Minster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Headbourne Worthy</td>
<td>854 Spurious</td>
<td>Old Minster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>543</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Martyr Worthy (2)</td>
<td>868 authentic drafted by royal scribe</td>
<td>Hunsige, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>544</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Chilland</td>
<td>939 but later forgery</td>
<td>Heahferth, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>545</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Chilcombe</td>
<td>Late tenth forgery</td>
<td>Bishop of Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>Tichbourne</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>Community at Winchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>Beauworth</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>Old Minster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>589</td>
<td>Alresford (3)</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>Ælfric, fidelis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>549</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>New Minster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693</td>
<td>Kilmeston</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>Æthelwulf, minister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

540 Ibid. 146-48, 50-53.
541 Ibid. 148.
543 S. Keynes, ‘The West Saxon Charters of King Æthelwulf and His Sons’, *English Historical Review*, 111 (1994), 1109-49 at 1122.
544 Ibid. 1124, 30.
With the exception of a charter for Martyr Worthy (S 340) dated to 868, until the tenth century the charters for this study area are all apparent forgeries. Attempts therefore to study aspects of change in this landscape from the ninth century onwards are compromised by the difficulty in securely dating the boundary clauses attached to forged documents. This study area, by necessity, is limited to presenting a generic tenth- and eleventh-century landscape within which a total number of 497 boundary features have been recorded (2.1).

Around the Worthy place-names (Headbourne, Kings, Martyr and Abbots) and Easton a number of linear features (dykes and lynchets) imply a worked landscape of subdivision and references to arable features (furrows, furlongs and acres) mentioned on the internal boundary between Headbourne and Kings Worthy suggest cropping (2.1, 2.2, SU43SE/SU53SW). References to headlands and acres in the Ovington and Itchen Stoke area suggest that similar land use extended up the valley as far as Kilmeston where a further ‘six acres’ are referred to (2.3, SU53SE/SU52NE).

The references to three ‘lid gates’ throughout the study area suggest a certain type of gate (2.1, SU42SE, SU52SE and SU53SW). The literal translation of ‘ship gate’ seems obscure but the same mechanism by which a ship’s boom and mast are operated might give some clue as to how these gates were opened and closed. The tyrngeate [turn gate] in the vicinity of Tichbourne has a more obvious mechanism and in all, such gates may have controlled access through a busy agricultural landscape for the many people travelling to and from Winchester. These gates are to be contrasted with the gates recorded in the far east of the study area. They bound an area described by the East Hampshire Survey, through the lack of archaeological finds, as being remote and characterised by scattered

---

Table 4: Study Area 2 charter boundary clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Bishop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>695</td>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>Old Minster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
<td>Avington</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>Old Minster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>942</td>
<td>Hinton Ampner (1)</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>Old Minster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962</td>
<td>Abbots Worthy</td>
<td>1026 but suspicious</td>
<td>Lyfing, Bishop of Crediton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007</td>
<td>Hinton Ampner (2)</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td>Bishop of Winchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

547 Although lida [sailor, traveller] may also have some bearing on the translation, Bosworth and Toller, An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary 638. R. Lavelle has also pointed out that líd may represent a tenth/eleventh-century reference to a Viking force, as in lídsman.
settlement in a landscape dominated by woodland and *hagas*. A further four gates are recorded in the study area charters to the east of Map 2.1 (just outside the area covered by the map) and in each case, they are compounded with –*mere* elements (*grenmeres stigele, lammeres geate, boomeres stigele* and *bealmmeres geate*) suggesting the internal divisions of wood pasture and the controlling of access to watering holes.

On the course of the South Downs Way, the ridgeway that runs due ESE from Winchester, there is a reference to a *herepath* running in the direction of a crossing of the Meon river at Warnford. This *herepath* is intersected by a route running due SW from Cheriton which is also called a *herepath* (2.1, SU52SE). Otherwise, however, where referred to by charter boundary clauses, routes across this area of downland are generally termed ‘ways’. The area to the north of Winchester provides a better opportunity to explore the character of Anglo-Saxon roads as a little more detail is given concerning function (2.2). The Roman road running due NW from Winchester towards Cirencester via Mildenhall is referred to as a ‘street’ in the location of the *fulan flode* and the *heafod stoccan* and as both places survive into the modern period as Fulford and Harestock, these references can be closely located to within a few miles of Winchester. Further out from the city however the terminology used to describe the Roman road changes. The use of the road as a boundary along much of its length in the study area gives justification for placing the two references to *herepaths* on its course, alongside the fact that no other route in the landscape runs on this axis. What is important here is that, in being designated a ‘herepath’, what is being suggested is that it is not merely a physical description that is being alluded to but perhaps one that highlights a certain status. The importance of this route’s status as a *herepath* transcends its appearance as a ‘street’.

Close analysis of the Headbourne Worthy boundary clause in this area allows a previously un-located landmark of considerable importance to be placed in the landscape with a degree of certainty. After the reference to the street at Harestock, the boundary passes a thorn tree and a deep dell before reaching the *kinges stane* (2.2, SU43SE). In the section on Pilgrimages in Chapter Two we learnt of the stone cross that Lantfred, writing in the late tenth century, tells us a blind man and his young guide stopped at, some three miles out of Winchester. However, in a later version of these events, Wulfstan’s *Narratio Metrica de S. Swithuno*, we are told that at this resting place there stood, ‘*uexillum quoniam de rupe uestusto erectus sublime crucis*’ [a replica in ancient stone of the sublime cross]. However, Wulfstan elaborates further and informs us that this was a cross, ‘*quem

---

548 S. Shennan, J. Gardiner, and M. Oake, *Experiments in the Collection and Analysis of Archaeological Survey Data: The East Hampshire Survey* (Sheffield: University of Sheffield, 1985) 89-91, Figure 8.1.
lingua ‘Petram’ uocat Anglia ‘Regis’” [which the English tongue calls the King’s Stone].

The relevant section of the Headbourne Worthy charter boundary clause details:

\[\text{up to kinges stane . from kincges stane . up to holan stane . of holan stane . up to fyrd geate . of fyrd geate . to wic herpaðe . and lang wic herædes . aæt to kynges stane} [up to the king’s stone, from the king’s stone, up to the hollow stone, from the hollow stone, up to the host army gate, from the host army gate to the wic herepath, along the wic herepath, back to the king’s stone]\]

So the boundary clause, in returning to the king’s stone, describes an essentially detached piece of downland and this has been interpreted as the triangle of land bounded by the Roman road to the west, the London Way to the north, the wic herepath to the east and known as Worthy Down today (2.2, SU43NE/SU43SE). This places the king’s stone at the point where the wic herepath parts company with the Roman road heading north out of the city of Winchester, a location that in the nineteenth century was marked by a mile stone indicating a distance of three miles to Winchester. Michael Lapidge, in his discussion of Wulfstan’s ‘king’s stone’, suggested that such a monument may have been a boundary marker on the limits of the territorium of the Roman city and draws attention to the ancient Chilcomb estate which in the tenth century was a suburb of the city. However, he was clearly unaware of the boundary mark in the Headbourne Worthy charter and likewise, G. B. Grundy was unaware that in his analysis of this boundary clause he needed to be looking for a marker, as both Lantfred and Wulfstan inform us, that lay some three miles out from the city. Of course, stones may have announced the intersection of the territorium boundary with all the major roads running in to the Roman city. Yet, crucially, this monument is not simply a stone. It is also a cross and the location at the junction of the wic herepath and the Roman road suggests relevance in an early medieval rather than a Romano-British context. The importance of two near contemporary sources referring to a monument as both a ‘stone’ and a ‘cross’ has implications for how we perceive other stones referred to in both charter boundary clauses and place-names, all of which will be discussed in Chapter Ten.

---

The ‘hollow stone’ has been placed at the NW corner of the Worthy Down triangle on the crossing point of the Roman road with the London Way and the ‘host army gate’ (2.2 SU43NE) has been placed on a route that deviates from the Roman road in a NNW direction. This route, and one deviating in a WNW direction, are likely to have been favoured over the Roman road as routes with which to cross the Rivers Dever and Test. The former can cross the Test at Middleton, the latter at Wherwell whilst no evidence in the form of settlements or place-names exists to suggest a crossing of the Test on the trajectory prescribed by the course of the Roman road. The wic herepath can be seen to pass north, on a course broadly commensurate with that of the modern A34 that connects Winchester to Oxford via a crossing of the Test at Whitchurch. The London Way is referred to twice in the same document (SU43NE) and in being told that at one point the boundary passes along its course, we are able to associate these references to the line of a route that passes across the top of the study area, effectively bypassing Winchester and its environs, on a trajectory from the SW of England to London. East from the charter references, it crosses the Silchester to Winchester Roman road and passes through Micheldever Wood beyond which it appears to divide. A northern course crosses the Candover at Totford and can be traced as an almost continuous line through Bentworth, Long Sutton and Crondall to Farnborough (2.1, SU53NE). The southern variant crosses the Candover below Abbotstone and joins the Alton/Farnham route to London (SU53SE).

At Martyr Worthy (2.2, SU53SW) there is a rare occurrence in the charter boundary clauses of when we are told explicitly the destination of a route. In this instance, a braðan herpað ðer ged to worði ford and to alresforda [a broad herepath that goes to Worthy ford and to Alresford] is described and is likely to make use of the same ford as the ‘street’ referred to in Kings Worthy, Abbots Worthy and at the junction with the London Way.

The street referred to in the southern environs of Alresford may be alluding to the course of a Roman road that connected Winchester directly with London, via Alton and Neatham. Yet, locating this reference with any certainty is problematic. It may also be the same route that is referred to as a herepath and perhaps the same herepath that passes from the SW, up through Cheriton and crosses cuthaenes ford to Alresford (2.3, SU53SE). Finally, attention should be drawn to one other route that is described differently in the boundary for the contiguous estates of Easton and Avington. In the Easton charter, the boundary is recorded as passing of þam æþenan byrigelsan and lang mearce to þære port streit and lang smalan dune [from the heathen burials, along the boundary to the port street and along a small down]. The same features occur in the Avington charter in reverse order:
andlang smalan dune on þone herpað. of þam herpaðe 7lang mearce to ðam hæþænan byrigelsan although in this instance, in place of the port street we are told that the route is a herepath. Whilst there appears to be no reason to doubt the authenticity of the Easton charter, the formulation of the Avington document is thought to derive from Æthelstan’s reign (924 x 939) and the original (and its boundary clause) may therefore date to a generation earlier than the Easton charter of 961. Thus, there is the slightest suggestion that the term herepath predates the use of the term ‘port street’ to describe the route that passes from Winchester on a course to Alresford via Avington and Ovington.

552 Rumble, Property and Piety in Early Medieval Winchester: Documents Relating to the Topography of the Anglo-Saxon and Norman City and Its Minsters no. XXII.
## Chapter Seven: Devon

### Study Area 3: Crediton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawyer Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Estate Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>Crediton</td>
<td>739 but consensus on bounds eleventh century</td>
<td>Bishop Frothhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>Wyke in Shobrooke and Thorveton</td>
<td>924 x 939 but inauthentic – eleventh century&lt;sup&gt;554&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>SS Mary and Peter, Exeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>Stoke Canon</td>
<td>924 x 939 but inauthentic – eleventh century</td>
<td>St Mary’s, Exeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Sandford</td>
<td>924 x 939 but inauthentic – eleventh century</td>
<td>Familia at Crediton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>Topsham</td>
<td>924 x 939 but inauthentic – eleventh century</td>
<td>St Peter’s, Exeter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>Brampford Speke</td>
<td>944 – genuine set of bounds&lt;sup&gt;555&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Athelstan, comes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669</td>
<td>Clyst St Mary</td>
<td>961 – forged in eleventh century</td>
<td>Æthelnoth, faithful man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>795</td>
<td>Nymed</td>
<td>974 – original</td>
<td>Ælfhhere, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>830</td>
<td>Treable</td>
<td>976 – contemporary</td>
<td>Ælfsige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>890</td>
<td>Sandford</td>
<td>997 – original</td>
<td>Ælfwold, bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>971</td>
<td>Stoke Canon</td>
<td>1031 – original</td>
<td>Hunuwine, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1387</td>
<td>Creedy Barton</td>
<td>1016 x 20 – genuine</td>
<td>Beorhtnoth (from Bishop Eadnoth)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>554</sup> P. Chaplais, 'The Authenticity of the Royal Anglo-Saxon Diplomas of Exeter', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 39 (1966), 1-34 at 1, 2, 4-6, 11, 22, for a discussion on S386, S87, S88, S89, S433 and his view that they are the work of the same forger in the eleventh century.

<sup>555</sup> F. Rose-Troup, 'The Anglo-Saxon Charter of Brentford (Bampton), Devon', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, 70 (1938), 253-75.
By comparison to Hampshire and Wiltshire, the landscape of Devon boasts a greater number of streams, streamlets and rivers and this is reflected in the Crediton area in the many fords that feature in boundary perambulations (20 in 3.1 alone). These provide evidence, along with place-names, of a dense network of routes. It is, however, the repeated references to herepaths that is deserving of further analysis for in an area no greater than 20 x 15 km (12.4 x 9.3 miles), there are 20 recorded. Of these, 13 references lie on the course of a path some 19 km (11.8 miles) long allowing the detailed reconstruction of a herepath as it works its way from Stoke Canon in the east, through the estates at Brampford Speke, Shobrooke and Creedy Barton, across the Creedy Bridge, into Crediton, to Copplestone and beyond (3.1). This herepath functioned undoubtedly as a major arterial route and is likely to have played a role in connecting Crediton with settlements to the east and west. In the bounds of Wyke in Shobrooke, there is a mention of þone þeod herpað [the people’s herepath] (3.3, SX89NE). It is possible that this is a reference to a herepath running on a N/S axis and crossing the major E/W herepath. In which case it would connect Exwick/Exeter to the settlements of Stockleigh, Cadbury and Cheriton (Fitzpaine) to the north. However, the language used in the boundary clause makes it difficult to be certain exactly which route is being referred to. The course the major E/W herepath takes east of Creedy Bridge crosses the low ground of the Creedy and Exe flood plain and it is across this type of landscape that any route would be in need of maintenance. The sulhford [?ploughed up/sullied ford] and foulanford [foul ford] give an indication of how difficult the going would be in periods of inclement weather (3.3, SX99NW).

To the west of Creedy Bridge the herepath runs across the top of Crediton along the ridge of high ground and out towards Copplestone which not only takes its name from a highly decorated granite cross-shaft, with evidence of Scandinavian influences, but is also recorded in an original charter of 974 (3.1, 3.2 SS70SE). The crossroads location of this monument has been discussed in detail elsewhere but it is also interesting to note the ambiguity in the terminology used to describe this landmark. Today only the shaft of the cross survives and this situation may have been the case in the tenth century when the

---

name was assigned – perhaps deriving from OE *coppedan* [having the top cut off, polled].\(^5^{58}\) However, as the boundary clause runs *Ærest on copelan stan* [First to the Copplestone], in similar fashion to the ‘king’s stone’ of the Headbourne Worthy charter, the Copplestone cross is referred to only as a stone and not explicitly a cross. This monument is undoubtedly sited at a major junction and clearly played an important role in articulating passage through the landscape of central Devon and the lower ground between the massifs of Dartmoor to the south and Exmoor to the north (3.2). From here, to the west, one could head out in all directions; NW to Bideford and Barnstaple\(^5^{59}\), west to Bude and SW to Okehampton, Tavistock and to Cornwall beyond. In fact, Copplestone sits on the crossing point of the major NE/SW and SE/NW axes of central Devon and these routes connect, respectively, Tiverton and north Somerset to the SW of England and Exeter to Barnstaple.

The remaining seven references to *herepaths* in this study area illustrate how widely and regularly they are adopted as boundary features. It seems reasonable to assume that in areas for which we do not have charter evidence, other routes that share the characteristics of our named *herepaths* would have shared their status too. One *herepath* is recorded as running ENE from Copplestone on a course, via the ‘planked’ bridge, towards Tiverton (3.2, SS70SE). Another heads due north from Crediton, again to the same bridge, on a course towards South Molton. The four priests recorded at South Molton in Domesday Book as holding 1 *virgate* of land in alms (*circa* 30 acres but also a unit for the assignment of obligations), in accordance with the criteria set out by John Blair, suggests the presence of a minster church.\(^5^{60}\) The nucleated settlement pattern and extensive field system, comparable with the topography of Lydford, also suggest an important early central place.\(^5^{61}\) The place-name Thelbridge on the same route but further north than the boundary clause *thel brycge* indicates that this *herepath* was well furnished with bridges of a particular type at river crossings.\(^5^{62}\) To the south, reference is made to a *herepath* on the course of a route from Crediton to Tedburn St Mary whilst a similar path radiates out from Crediton towards Cheriton (3.1, SX89NW, SX79NE). To the SW of Treable, a *herepath* is recorded on the line of the modern A30, a major route connecting west Devon and Cornwall with Exeter and a likely candidate for Margary’s Roman road number

---


\(^5^{60}\) J. Blair, *Secular Minster Churches in Domesday Book*, in P. Sawyer (ed.), *Domesday Book: A Re-Assessment* (London: Edward Arnold, 1985), 104-42 at 105-06; DB Dev. 13a, 1.


It is perhaps logical to assume that similar routes connecting the main centres of administration, finance and settlement would have been described in the same fashion.

Two herepaths are worthy of discussion on the basis that they are described as ‘old’. The first of these appears in a grant of one hide at Topsham (S 433) and may reflect the continuing importance of the Roman road that connected the natural beaching port of Topsham with the Roman walled city of Exeter (3.4). Excavated Roman remains of military and civilian occupation at the site are testament to its importance in the third and fourth centuries and the documentary evidence for well established trading activity of the twelfth century has been argued by Andrew Jackson to reflect an earlier significant coastal trading site.

The second ‘old’ herepath is a route that runs along the higher ground to the east of the Creedy and it is difficult to say exactly which places this herepath is connecting and indeed, why it was, by the eleventh century, being considered ‘old’. The two bridges of the study area charters are here relevant to the discussion, as they may well have had a significant impact on the fate of this route. It is broadly accepted that despite the eighth-century date of the Crediton charter, the bounds attached to it are of later, likely eleventh-century dating. Thus the Creedy Bridge (and the old herepath mentioned above) is only safely placed in a much later landscape. The same rule may apply to the δelbrycghe [planked bridge] as its appearance in a document of dubious integrity might place it more accurately in the eleventh century rather than to the ascribed date of 930 in the charter. Perhaps however the construction of these bridges (and we can postulate that similar bridges served the other main routes into the town) made passing through Crediton and taking the herepath to the north of the town the more attractive option for those travelling on a NNW/SSE alignment. This may have led to the redundancy of the old herepath or at least to it being considered ‘old’. Two further possibilities exist for this nomenclature. In the first instance, as in the case for the Topsham charter, when the phrase ‘old herepath’ is employed by boundary surveyors, it may be deliberately applied to Roman roads. The second is illustrated in Map 3.5. Here the routes referred to in genuine charters of the

563 Margary, Roman Roads in Britain no. 492.
564 Such as the Crediton to Tiverton route for which we have no charter evidence.
tenth century have been highlighted with a red triangle to distinguish them from those recorded in eleventh-century documents. Both ‘old’ herepaths appear in eleventh-century contexts so it may just be that a century later these routes as herepaths are already considered to be of some antiquity.

Whatever the impact of the planked and Creedy bridges, their relationship to the herepaths is of note. Whilst Thelbridge provides passage for the Crediton/South Molton herepath across a fairly minor tributary of the River Dart, the ðel bridge of the charter and the Creedy Bridge sit at key places on the route network of the region. The Creedy Bridge serves Crediton with all traffic from the west and the planked bridge facilitates traffic from Crediton (and presumably Exeter) to South Molton and the North Devon coast beyond whilst also allowing traffic from Tiverton to Copplestone to take a more direct route (without passing through Crediton) (3.1, 3.2).

In no other study area are herepaths quite so numerous and outnumber other types of route. By contrast, a mere ten ‘ways’ are referred to in the same 20 x 15 km (12.4 x 9.3 miles) area. We should perhaps be wary about reading too much into this simply because many of the charters from the Exeter archive purporting to date to the reign of Æthelstan have clearly been forged by the same hand in the eleventh century.\textsuperscript{568} Although it is not necessarily the case that the forger himself favoured the use of herepath to describe major routes, the shared provenance of this group might suggest a preference amongst the church at Exeter for the term over and above ‘way’ or ‘street’. That said, the ubiquity of the term in this area and the regularity with which it features throughout the Crediton and Exeter hinterlands presents a forceful case for herepaths being of greater importance in this part of Wessex.

\textsuperscript{568} Chaplais, ‘The Authenticity of the Royal Anglo-Saxon Diplomas of Exeter’, 1, 2, 4-6, 11, 22.
Study Area 4: South Hams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawyer Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Estate Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>South Hams</td>
<td>846 – original</td>
<td>Æthelwulf to himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>Sorley, Churchstow</td>
<td>962 – apparent original</td>
<td>Æthel...e, minister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Study Area 4 charter boundary clauses

The overlap between charters for the South Hams and Sorley in south Devon provides an insight into the development of the area around Kingsbridge between the mid-ninth and the mid-tenth centuries. The former charter is an important document in that it survives in an original, or at least a near contemporary copy, and contains the earliest detailed vernacular boundary clause in perambulatory form. Because the town or burh of Kingsbridge is mentioned in the later charter and not in the earlier document the implications are that the settlement’s origins as an Anglo-Saxon fortified site derive from this period. However, other observations on the development of this area over a hundred year period can be made by analysis of the landmarks referred to in the two documents.

This study area is also relevant because in the vernacular set of bounds for the South Hams charter appears one of the first references we have in the historical sources to a herepath. It is important therefore to consider the character and function of this route in the landscape. Although Della Hooke is uncertain of the location, where the bounds of both charters are coterminous, certain recorded features can be associated with each other (4.2, SX74NW). The *pealpeg* and *ðone stan* [British way and stone] from the earlier document appears as the *ealdan pege* and *græwan stane* [old way and grey stone] in the later. As we shall see, this way is likely to be a major route by which produce was brought to and from the late- and post-Roman trading site at Bantham, but it means that a likely association can be made between the next landmark in the South Hams charter – the

herepath – and the route running due north out of Kingsbridge where it crosses the parish boundary.

This route would go on to become the High Street of what Jeremy Haslam believes to be a burh and bridge fortification constructed in the reign of Edward the Elder.573 Two further references in the Sorley charter dated to 962 suggest that an urban topography was emerging during the tenth century. Firstly, another ford, likely to be downstream of the wealdene ford but upstream from the king’s bridge, is referred to as manning ford. Whilst this may relate to the personal name Manna, it could feasibly have derived from the Old English verb mannian, to garrison. Secondly, the single reference we have in all study areas to a ‘lane’ features as the boundary rises up from the ford op eorðburg [as far as the earth burh]. It is useful to consider here the use of the qualifier ‘earth’ to describe the burh.

When used in conjunction with landes (as in e.g. S 492, S 767) and with the suffix for-, as in fore yrðe (S 586) and foryrðe (S 664), it suggests arable ground and tillable earth. Equally, the enigmatic term ‘earth burst’, as in eorð briste (S 509) eorþe byrst (S 1327) and eorð geberst (S 255), would seem to imply a form of subsidence, unstable ground and the presence of freshly cast soil. If this meaning can be extended to the numerous burhs with which the qualifier is regularly associated (S 389, S 463, S 688, S 756, S 971, S 1003), it may be indicative of a rather more recent undertaking (i.e. naked earth is still visible) and, in the case of Kingsbridge, the burh’s earthen appearance may suggest construction closer to the date of the charter than the reign of Edward the Elder.

If herepaths represent one element of a coherent strategy of civil defence (including bridges, beacons and burhs),574 this mid-ninth-century reference to a herepath on a course to a location whose strategic qualities are clearly in evidence, would seem to suggest co-ordinated defensive steps carried out a generation before those implemented by King Alfred and his heirs. Map 4.3 presents the relationship between the early herepath and Kingsbridge and the location of Halwell – a fort recorded in the Burghal Hidage. Halwell’s location is clearly commanding in both its centrality to the region but also through the inter-visibility it enjoys with other Iron Age forts.575 Whether or not the site had a similar role as a sanctuary in a prehistoric and Romano-British landscape as part of a strategy of coastal defence must remain speculative, but in a comparison of its scale and location with other Burghal Hidage forts, Baker and Brookes suggest that it is more

573 Haslam, 'The Towns of Devon', 273-75.
574 Argued below but also see J. Baker and S. Brookes, Beyond the Burghal Hidage: Anglo-Saxon Civil Defence in the Viking Age (in prep.) 176.
correctly interpreted as a temporary refuge for the surrounding countryside and as a consequence, it may hark back to an older system of civil defence.\textsuperscript{576} In any event it was replaced (or perhaps surpassed) in the Late-Saxon scheme by a \textit{de novo} site at Totnes – a location with far better commercial benefits – in the first quarter of the tenth century.\textsuperscript{577}

In no other study area is the pattern of routes through the landscape so determined by natural topography and geological relief (4.3). The many streams and rivulets that have carved through the fertile Devonian sandstones of the South Hams coast have created steep-sided valleys that have in turn dictated that travel of any distance must utilise the numerous ridgeways and water-sheds throughout the region. A character emerges to some of these ridgeways as they clearly serve the inlets and natural harbours of the coastline with access to and from the inland areas and presumably the moors beyond. One route in particular is picked up in both the ninth- and the tenth-century charter and differences in the way it is described in each document shed some light on its relationship with the important Romano-British coastal site of Bantham and its apparent demise in the sixth century.\textsuperscript{578} Mentioned above, the \textit{peal/peg} [British way] of the South Hams charter is described in the later Sorley charter as the \textit{ealdan pege} [old way]. The \textit{pealh}- element appears in two other landmarks as \textit{wealdenes ford} and \textit{wealding ford} (the same location). Della Hooke has offered ‘wall’ as the first element in ‘wall-way’ but suggests that \textit{wealdene} is a personal name.\textsuperscript{579} In such close proximity both in spatial and documentary terms it seems more likely that the \textit{weal-} elements in both phrases are consistent with each other and refer to the ‘British dene’ (a type of valley) and their ‘way’. The term \textit{wealweg} or \textit{walweg} appears not infrequently in charter bounds and its application to strands of the great Wessex Ridgeway in the Burbage and Bedwyn charters (S 688 and S 756, Study Area 10) and Alton Priors charter (S 272) suggest a perception on the part of Anglo-Saxon surveyors of a route of antiquity trodden by the native British people. In the case of this Devonian example, the association may be less generic and its use in the South Hams charter may imply a recognition of the once vibrant trade that passed along this road to and from Bantham, a trade that had long since declined, by the date of the Sorley charter, where the way is twice referred to as being ‘old’. A route, constrained by valleys and ridgeways can be identified running on a similar axis from Mothecombe where another

\textsuperscript{576} Baker and Brookes, \textit{Beyond the Burghal Hidage: Anglo-Saxon Civil Defence in the Viking Age} 89.
\textsuperscript{579} Hooke, \textit{Pre-Conquest Charter-Bounds of Devon and Cornwall} 105-12.
coastal trading site with an archaeological date range from the fifth to eighth centuries has been identified. S80

One landmark in the charter boundary evidence for this study area is of particular interest to this research project as it represents one of only two references in the Anglo-Saxon documentary sources to work being undertaken on roads. S81 In the mid-ninth century charter for South Hams, we are informed that the boundary runs on ðone torr æt mercecumbes æwelime ðonne on dene paldes stan ðonne on ðone dic ðær Esne ðone weg fordealf [to the tor at the boundary combe spring, then to Denewald’s stone, then to the dyke where the serfs dug the way]. The boundary combe is clearly the valley within which the present parish boundary follows the course of the stream (4.1, SX64NW). Denewald’s stone may sit at the junction of the parish boundary with a route running NW but may equally mark the crossroads at the highest point of this ridge. Either way, the ‘dyke where the serfs dug the way’ is undoubtedly to be associated with a route that passes round the NE ditch of a univallate hillfort of possible Iron Age date (4.1, SX64NE). S82 This route connects the manorial centres of Kingston and Bigbury with a Modbury/Halwell route (4.3). The place-name Kingston is likely to have arisen as a result of the grant of South Hams by king Æthelwulf to himself and Bigbury may represent a settlement of similar size and function and one perhaps even fortified with a burh. S83 Some analysis of the term esne is required here as it impacts, to a certain extent, on how this route is perceived. It first appears in the laws of Æthelberht of Kent (circa. 602-3) and whilst mannæ esne [a man’s serf] suggests that the status is one that is owned, that an esne enjoys some marriage rights and was subject to fines suggests a status above that of a slave and one that had financial means. S84 This is in part the justification for the translation of ‘serf’ rather than ‘slave’ however, closer to the period of the South Hams charter is the phrase in Alfred’s lawcode of esnewyrhtan, directly translated as ‘unfree workers’, ‘hired labourers’ or ‘servile workers’. S85 This reference, along with the evidence for status derived from Æthelberht’s


S82 SMR Monument Number 440954.


laws, led David Pelteret to speculate that the term was used to refer to someone, ‘whose legal position somewhat blurred the formerly clear legal distinctions between slaves and ceorlas’. The work being undertaken by the esne on the South Hams way was evidently in a bid to improve communications between these manorial centres and the fort at Halwell. Although not termed a herepath, this route bears the hallmarks of one, being set out to connect significant manorial centres with a strategically placed fort. Coming as it does in a reference of mid-ninth century date, it further helps to push back to an earlier date a strategy of coastal defense of which the fort at Halwell and the Kingsbridge herepath were early facets, and one which involved the coercion or ‘hiring’ of a certain type of labour to undertake the task.

Finally, in this coastal area of Devon, there is a reference to a ‘street’ (4.1, SX64NE). No Roman roads are recorded in southern Devon on the British Ordnance Survey Map of Roman Britain and in Ivan Margery’s Roman Roads in Britain, those known routes penetrate little further SW than Exeter. This ‘street’ is referring to a route that broadly conforms with the modern A379 passing from Elburton (south of Plympton and Plymouth) to Churchstow (immediately NW of Kingsbridge), running parallel to the coastline, crossing the Yealm, Erme and Avon rivers just above their tidal reaches. Eastwards beyond Kingsbridge it is likely that this route, where it is used by a parish boundary, runs towards Stokenham and beyond to Slapton Sands along whose course access to the village of Strete is provided. First recorded in 1194 as Streta, this may represent further evidence of a route used during the Romano-British period to convey mineral-rich ores along the coastline between various harbouring points before trans-shipment. Modbury, which is first recorded in Domesday Book as Motberia, deriving from the OE gemōt burg [meeting place burh], sits in a strategic location that connects Halwell and Oldaport, but crucially defends this ‘street’, the major E/W route through the region. An Accelerator Mass Spectrometry (AMS) date derived from the mortar of a cross-spur wall on the promontory site of Oldaport yielded a date range from between the late ninth and the early eleventh century, and is thought to suggest a construction designed to repel Viking attacks during

---

586 Pelteret Slavery in Early Medieval England 85.
587 http://www.bibliographics.com/MAPS/BRITAIN/BRIT-MAP-FRAME-25.htm (23/03/2013); Margary, Roman Roads in Britain nos. 491-93.
589 Ibid. 313.
the reign of Æthelred II.⁵⁹⁰ Although Oldaport is not referred to in the bounds of the South Hams charter, the AMS date was taken from the most recent phase of defensive ditch (Farley and Little’s Phase 2)⁵⁹¹, and the earlier phase may be contemporary with a mid-ninth-century plan of strategic defence in the region suggested by the South Hams herepath and the way dug by the serfs.

Chapter Eight: Dorset

Study Area 5: Isle of Purbeck

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawyer Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Estate Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>534</td>
<td>Isle of Purbeck</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>Ælfthryth, a religious woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>573</td>
<td>Corfe and Blashenwell (1)</td>
<td>956 – spurious conflation of S 534 and S 632</td>
<td>Wihtsige, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Corfe and Blashenwell (2)</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>Wihtsige, minister</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Study Area 5 charter boundary clauses

The Isle of Purbeck provides a further opportunity to explore the network of routes in a coastal zone. Parallels can be drawn with this study area and the South Hams. In the first instance, the link between the referenced *herepath* and the Kingston place-name illustrates the desire to see a significant manorial centre interconnected with warning stations, beaches and a central refuge (5.1, SY97NE). A *herepath* is mentioned to the immediate west of Kingston where it leads to Swyre Head, a promontory that takes its name from OE *sweora* [neck]. Although there is no place-name record of a look-out at this location (as in Worbarrow Tout and Houns-Tout, both on the same coastline) the location commands a 360-degree viewshed and almost certainly provided early warning – perhaps via relay messages – to the settlements on the peninsular and to the *Burghal Hidage* fort at Wareham beyond (5.2). From such a vantage point it is easy to see how the *thegn* and the *cottar* in the *Rectitudines Singularum Personarum* might have carried out their duty to guard and watch the coast, an obligation also recorded in a genuine charter of 977 for St Keverne for which a 360-degree viewshed is provided from Keverne Beacon.593

Kingston first appears in the documentary sources as *Chingestone* in Domesday Book wherein an exchange between King William and Shaftesbury Abbey is recorded. In

---

return for one hide of land in the manor, (upon which to build Corfe Castle), the King makes a gift of the church of Gillingham.\textsuperscript{594} The \textit{king}- element is very likely however to have derived from when the land was in the ownership of the Anglo-Saxon kings before King Eadred’s grant to Ælfthryth. There is some evidence to suggest Kingston’s early importance and David Hinton has made the case for a possible ‘minster’ site.\textsuperscript{595} It is also thought to be the site of the church founded, according to William of Malmesbury, by Aldhelm in the seventh century.\textsuperscript{596} To the east, the \textit{herepath} connects Kingston along a High Street that passes through Langton Matravers, to the High Street of Swanage and the site of the parish church of St Mary’s. In 877 the \textit{Anglo-Saxon Chronicle} informs us that 120 Danish ships were washed up somewhere on the shores of \textit{Swanawic} [the \textit{wic} of the herds]\textsuperscript{597} and it is possible that the sheltered harbour provided by the bay and the surrounding peninsula made for an attractive \textit{wic} site in the middle Anglo-Saxon period. Radio-carbon dating of burials from an inhumation cemetery of fifty-eight graves at nearby Ulwell yielded a date range in the seventh century and it may be that these individuals represented members of this coastal \textit{wic} community of herdsmen.\textsuperscript{598}

References in the charters to lynchets, walls, hedges, dykes and rows suggest an enclosed landscape suited to the management of livestock. The place-name Studland, [the land where horses were kept]\textsuperscript{599} and \textit{bon ealdan stodfald} (to the immediate north of Kingston) indicate that horse breeding may well have formed an important part of the economy here. On the nineteenth-century OS maps a system of parallel field boundaries (most strikingly in the parish of Langton Matravers) divides up the downland landscape. No charter references are available for this area of the peninsular so it is not feasible on documentary evidence alone to project this arrangement back into the early medieval period. However, the system was clearly laid out in respect of ‘The Priest’s Way’, a route that runs E/W between Swanage, Worth Matravers and St Aldhelm’s Chapel suggesting that at the time it was in use, it made its way over open downland.

With its square floor plan, irregular orientation and lack of \textit{piscina} and altar, it has been questioned whether St Aldhelm’s Chapel represents a religious structure at all.\textsuperscript{600} The

\textsuperscript{594} DB Dors. 19,10.
\textsuperscript{597} Ekwall, \textit{The Concise Oxford English Dictionary of English Place-Names} 434.
\textsuperscript{599} Ekwall, \textit{The Concise Oxford English Dictionary of English Place-Names} 430.
doorway is Norman and the remaining stonework can be reliably dated to the twelfth century with the structure sitting in what is thought to be an earlier ‘Christian’ sub-circular enclosure defined by a bank.\textsuperscript{601} In considering the landscape location of the structure, it seems likely that its role as a chapel is only a part of its overall function as it is inconceivable that this hill-top site did not serve some function in aiding navigation either around the promontory on which it is situated or into the safe haven of Chapman’s Pool. Excavation alone might confirm its role as a lighthouse or beacon in earlier periods but some chance finds in and around the location of Chapman’s Pool go some way to confirming the location’s importance to maritime trade. Shale, a substitute for jet, was important to cross-channel trade in the Iron Age and Romano-British period and a significant shale-working site on the shores of Chapman’s Pool attest to its earlier viability as a coastal trading site.\textsuperscript{602} A Durotrigian ‘stater’ and a coin of Theodosius found at locations along the combe that runs down to the bay indicate further commercial activity.\textsuperscript{603} Such trade would almost certainly have needed guidance into the pool and it is therefore highly likely that St Aldhelm’s Head was once the location of a signalling station.

The current place-name of Chapman’s Pool, like chapmen’s dell and chapmen’s ford, implies a continued trade into the Anglo-Saxon period. However, the references to it in the charter boundary clauses are confusingly enigmatic. In the earlier (and more reliable) charter, it is referred to as the schort mannes pol and the later rendering of seortmannes pol seems a likely scribal error in the copying of this document to produce a conflated charter.\textsuperscript{604} A literal translation of ‘Sc(e)ortmann’s pool’ is offered by the English Place-Names volume with the ‘Sc(e)ort-’ element representing a personal name. It is also pointed out though that the use of the definite article ðe might mean that mannes reflects OE ge-mænnes [community] and that the boundary effectively divides the pool might suggest a translation of ‘the small pool in common ownership’\textsuperscript{605} It is next recorded as Shortmanpole in 1489 and then Shipman(’s) Pool(e) in 1575 but interestingly the surname Chapman is recorded in the parish as early as 1321.\textsuperscript{606} A further interpretation, without flexing the rules of etymological best practice beyond the acceptable, can be offered where scot, sceot or scyte, as in ‘tax’ or ‘tribute’, can be inferred as the first element.\textsuperscript{607} With the restriction

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item RCHME, An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Dorset (2, South-East; London: HMSO, 1970) 411-12.
\item www.landscape.org.uk/descriptions/editorial/L_573_000.html (23/03/2013).
\item A. D. Mills, The Place-names of Dorset (Part 1; Nottingham: English Place-name Society, 1977), 64.
\item Ibid.
\item Bosworth and Toller, An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary 839.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
of trading in the mid-tenth century to inland defended sites (discussed later but see the laws of Edward the Elder and Æthelstan)\textsuperscript{608} this translation might make sense when seen in conjunction with the mint founded by Æthelstan (924 x 939) at Wareham (5.2, SY98NW) and the current name for the site. The pool in this situation would have served as a likely place where the ‘tax man’ or port-reeve could have had a vested interest in ensuring a share of the profits made from any maritime trade. The ‘Chapman’ designation can be seen as either a product of a later name-change or, in view of the fact that \textit{ciepemonna} feature in the law codes of Kings Ine and Alfred, an earlier place-name that has survived via a separate etymological route (i.e. the Chapman surname) from the term employed by the scribes of the Shaftesbury charters.\textsuperscript{609}

Routes radiate south from the ‘gate’ in the Purbeck Hills within which Corfe is located and strip plots associated with the later borough, in respecting the courses of these ways, indicate their primacy. It is possible that the current site of Corfe Castle was the location described at the \textit{Corfègeat} where King Edward was murdered in 978 and evidence for a high-status residence – either a \textit{hospitum} belonging to Shaftesbury Abbey or a royal residence – was recovered in archaeological excavations.\textsuperscript{610} That the flow of traffic funnelled through this break in the natural geology created the need for an improved thoroughfare is suggested by the presence of a \textit{stanene bregge} (5.1, SY98SE). It is tempting to speculate that this bridge is a relict of the Romano-British landscape and served the land to the south of the Purbeck Hills with assured passage over the Wych stream to the \textit{civitas} at Dorchester. The numerous Romano-British inhumations and cist burials around the Swanage area and a coin of Constantine I point to substantial occupation and perhaps a beaching port in the late Roman period.\textsuperscript{611} Furthermore, the stones mentioned on the valley bottom \textit{en route} between Swanage and Corfe may also represent stone relicts of the same period marking the route from harbour to \textit{civitas}. However, the form of \textit{bregge} is late, it appears only in the conflated charter of 956 and, if Susan Kelly is correct in her analysis, this document may well have been devised at the point of William I’s exchange with the church at Shaftesbury.\textsuperscript{612} In the two other charters relating to this study area a \textit{Wican forde} is described in the same location suggesting that the bridge was a construction of the eleventh century.

\textsuperscript{608} I Ew. 1; II As. 13, 13.1.
\textsuperscript{609} Ine. 25; Af. 34.
\textsuperscript{610} ASC 978; K. J. Penn, \textit{Historic Towns in Dorset} (Dorset Archaeological and Natural History Society Monograph Series, 1; Dorchester; Dorset Archaeological Committee 1982), 44-5.
\textsuperscript{611} Historic Environment Record Monument Numbers 457451; 457630; 457471; 457463; 457433; R. A. H. Farrar, ‘Miscellaneous Discoveries and Accessions’, \textit{Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeology Society}, 84 (1962), 111-16 at 116.
\textsuperscript{612} Kelly (ed.), \textit{Charters of Shaftesbury Abbey} 82.
Study Area 6: Shaftesbury’s Southern Hinterland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawyer Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Estate Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Fontmell</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>Shaftesbury Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>West Orchard</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>Ælfric or Alfred, bishop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>Hinton St Mary</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>Wulfgar, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>630</td>
<td>Compton Abbas, Iwerne Minster</td>
<td>956 – uncertain, ?eleventh-century fabrication⁶¹³</td>
<td>Shaftesbury Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>656</td>
<td>Iwerne Courtney, Thornton</td>
<td>958</td>
<td>Wulfgar, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>East Orchard</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>Ælfsige, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764</td>
<td>Sturminster Newton</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>Glastonbury Abbey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Study Area 6 charter boundary clauses

Susan Kelly’s rejection of the charter within which Iwerne Minster and Compton Abbas are recorded as the property of Shaftesbury Abbey is based on the fact that in a contiguous perambulation for lands at East Orchard dated to 963, the boundary is recorded as running oð kinghes imare [as far as the king’s boundary] at precisely the point it hits the boundary of Iwerne Minster (6.3, ST81NW). Thus, if the boundary surveyors and scribe of the East Orchard charter are to be believed, Iwerne Minster cannot have been in Shaftesbury’s hands in 956. In its present form Kelly argues that it belongs to a period rather later than the purported date and has been reworked to include property that came to the nuns at a later date.⁶¹⁴ It is interesting then to consider the use of the term hereweg that appears in only one other instance in the charter boundary clauses of the entire corpus of Anglo-Saxon charters. This is in the grant by Æthelred II of a cenobium at Bradford-on-Avon dated to 1001, also to be found in the Shaftesbury cartulary (Study Area 9).⁶¹⁵ In the location of the hereweg of the Compton Abbas bounds, a snelles hamme weghe is recorded in the Fontmell charter but it is difficult to reconcile a way constructed to deal with the here with what appears to be a local route by which Snell gained access to his

⁶¹³ Ibid. 86-92.
⁶¹⁴ Ibid. 87-8.
⁶¹⁵ S 899 and discussed later.
'hemmed meadow land' (6.3, ST81NE). Snell’s *hamme* way may be referring to another local way and the term *Hereweg* may genuinely be referring to a route running south, from Shaftesbury, *via* Okeford (6.1, ST81SW) on a course To Okeford Hill where it connects with what is today known as the Wessex Ridgeway, a route which takes a direct course to Dorchester. Elsewhere (ST81NW), the Fontmell charter boundary clause refers to an ‘old’ *herepath* which further along its course to the SW, is described simply as a *herepath*. On the same trajectory of this route there is a mention of a *hegen pað* (6.2, ST81NW). This translates directly as the ‘hedge (or enclosure) path’ and coming immediately after the landmark *panne on be hegen* would appear to make sense. However, in a different context, Susan Kelly argues that it is unwise to rely too heavily on the orthography of a late manuscript where the vernacular elements have clearly been corrupted by heavy modernisation.\(^616\) Thus, it may be that the late copyist has erroneously placed the *hegen* of the previous landmark in place of the *here-* element. The fact that the term ‘hedge path’ does not feature in any other boundary clause from the entire corpus of Anglo-Saxon charters does not necessarily stand against the veracity of this unique usage. However, the course of this route goes some way to supporting the suggestion of a later copyist error. Not only does it connect Sturminster Newton with the *burh* at Shaftesbury, but beyond this likely minster site,\(^617\) it continues to Kingston in the parish of Hazelbury Bryant. Thus, it bears the hallmarks of a *herepath*, connecting the major centres of the Shaftesbury hinterland with a fortified refuge.

This *herepath* and the *hereway* are two of a number of routes that visibly radiate out from Shaftesbury illustrating the central importance of this place during the early medieval period. Whilst it might be expected that at least some of these routes have their origins in an earlier period (linked to a likely early minster site),\(^618\) evidence of previous occupation on the hill-top site of Shaftesbury is extremely limited. Prehistoric activity is suggested from the recovery, to the immediate east of the medieval town, of multi-phase pits yielding early Bronze to late Iron Age finds.\(^619\) Surface pottery found in the location of the abbey fishponds indicates a Romano-British presence and a settlement of the same

---

\(^616\) Kelly (ed.), *Charters of Shaftesbury Abbey* 35.


\(^618\) Hase, ‘The Church in the Wessex Heartlands’, 53.

\(^619\) N. Teulon-Porter, ‘Further Discoveries at Mampits Lane near Shaftesbury’, *Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeology Society*, 72 (1950), 94.
period is suggested by the presence of coins and architectural fragments recovered from a site on Barton Hill, again to the immediate east of the town.\footnote{RCHME, \textit{An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in Dorset} (4, North; London: HMSO, 1974) 76; N. Teulon-Porter, ‘Shaftesbury (St. Peter), Layton House’, \textit{Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeology Society}, 71 (1949), 67.}

Whatever the earlier occupation on the site, Shaftesbury was likely to have been the location of a minster community that perhaps served as the focus for Alfred’s foundation of a nunnery for his daughter Æthelgifu.\footnote{Hase, ‘The Church in the Wessex Heartlands’, 53; Keen, ‘The Towns of Dorset’, 230, 241; Keynes and Lapidge, \textit{Alfred the Great: Asser’s ‘Life of King Alfred’ and Other Contemporary Sources} 105, 107.} If William of Malmesbury’s account of a fragment of inscribed stone carved in the late tenth to early eleventh century is to be believed, a \textit{burh} was established at the site in 880, and the fort is recorded in the \textit{Burghal Hidage} has having a 700-hide hinterland from which to draw provisions and labour for the upkeep of its walls.\footnote{Cramp, \textit{Corpus of Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture: Volume VII: South-West England} 111-12; D. Hill, ‘The Burghal Hidage: The Establishment of a Text’, \textit{Medieval Archaeology}, 13 (1969), 84-92.} So for much of the early medieval period, Shaftesbury’s status rose as both a focus for religious activity and as a defensive stronghold for the region. This central importance may well have generated the pattern of routes that radiate out from the site and these in turn are likely to have experienced a heightened level of traffic with the establishment of a mint in the reign of Æthelstan.\footnote{Keen, ‘The Towns of Dorset’, 241.}

References to these routes, other than the \textit{herepath} and \textit{hereway}, are few in the charter boundary clauses for the area. The seven references to ways in the eastern part of the study area indicate how the term is favoured to describe routes over open downland. ‘Hollow’ ways and ‘boundary’ ways attest to the already ancient appearance of some of these routes as they served as primary features against which to draw up estate boundaries. A ‘green way’ suggests a lack of use and can be associated with the route that runs SSE out of Shaftesbury heading due south over the higher ground \textit{en route} to Blandford Forum. It is possible that this lack of use is as a consequence of the route than runs parallel through the valley bottom and passes through all the manorial settlements at the foot of the scarp slope. This is a route of undoubted importance during the late-Saxon period but the boundary clauses remain frustratingly silent over its function.

Another radiating route is marked by a \textit{wigheardes stapele} [Wigheard’s post] in the Fontmell charter (6.3, ST81NW/ST82SW). This landmark is referred to again in the charter for land at Thornton but the distance between the two estate centres and the order of the landmarks in their respective perambulations makes it difficult to place the landmark in the same place (6.1, 6.2, ST71NE). Either the surveyors of the Thornton or Fontmell bounds are mistaken or there are two posts belonging to Wigheard. In support of the latter suggestion,
they both sit on a route that runs between Shaftesbury and Sherborne via the
Stapulbreicege ['post bridge' known today as Stalbridge] recorded in a charter of 998.624 In a
later study area (8, The Salisbury Basin), we shall see that the use of the term stan stapol
[stone post] is suggestive of Roman milestones but here it is pertinent to draw attention to
the fact that a ‘post’ can equally be construed as a ‘column’. Thus Wigheard’s columns
could feasibly be stone markers (perhaps reusing earlier milestones) on what would have
been an important route between two major ecclesiastical centres. It is possible that the
fragment of late tenth-century stone block incorporated into a later churchyard cross at
Todber, sitting on another route radiating out of Shaftesbury, has its origins in a similar
monument (6.1, ST82SW).625 Equally, another fragment of a cross shaft dated to the
ninth/tenth century was recovered during the demolition of a house in East Stour.626

The ‘old ford’ is located at the point where what is today referred to as the Wessex
Ridgeway crosses the Iwerne river before rising up to pass between Hod Hill and
Hambledon hillfort, crossing the Stour at Hanford and continuing on a more or less direct
course to Dorchester (6.4, ST81SW/SE). In close proximity to this ford, numerous finds of
Saxon sceattas, an early seventh-century forged tremissis and a silver penny of Offa attest
to the location’s importance in respect of both national and international trade.627 In total,
these finds, the hillforts (one of which is referred to as cing hille in S 630) and the location
on a major ridgeway all suggest the presence of a trading site, perhaps a ‘productive’ site,
and a significant trade route. It may be that the demolished church of St Andrew’s at
Lazarnton and the deserted settlement that once occupied the valley bottom aside the old
ford was a relict of an earlier geography of settlement dependent on this trade route. That
the location of Shaftesbury fits within this early geography is suggested by finds of a Series
C sceatta from Compton Abbas dated to c.700 – 710 and a Series H from Iwerne Minster.628

Whilst the former of these coins suggests a link with the vibrant trade of the Thames

---

624 S 895.


Commemoration of the Millennium of the Council of Winchester and Regularis Concordia (Chichester: Phillimore, 1975), 184-

627 C. E. Challis and B. J. Cook, ‘Coin Register’, British Numismatic Journal, 57 (1987), 122-52 at no. 36; L. Keen, ‘Hanford,
Anglo-Saxon Coins’, Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeology Society, 101 (1979b), 138; L. Keen,
‘Stourpaine, Saxons Coins’, Proceedings of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeology Society, 101 (1979a), 140; L. Keen,
Continent (BAR British Series, 128; Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1984a), 193-205 at no. 5.

(20/02/2013); C. Hayward Trevarthen, (2011) DOR-44CB47 A EARLY MEDIEVAL COIN:
Estuary, Series H were almost certainly minted in *Hamwic* and indicate a regional or ‘kingdom’ level of commerce.\(^{629}\)

Two further observations are of note from this study area. Firstly, the character of the two bridges that are referred to, their function and locations. The *oxene bricge* is likely to have allowed traffic coming from Sherborne via Stalbridge in the west to access Hinton St Mary without having to loop down via a crossing of the Stour at Sturminster Newton (6.2, ST71NE). The *W(u)de bricge* will have allowed the estate centre of Fontmell access, through the deserted settlement of Bedchester,\(^{630}\) to its resources in the more remote parts of its estate where *wigheardes stapele* represents one of its most western boundary marks (6.1, 6.3, ST81NW). Woodbridge, after its mention in boundary clauses of tenth-century date, does not appear in the place-name record again until the seventeenth century.\(^{631}\) Both bridges are associated with local access and if resources could be found for structures of such mundane purpose, it seems highly likely that other bridges, especially on important routes, may very well have existed at crossing points not covered by charter boundary clauses (i.e. at much more central locations). We are warned therefore of the value of constructing meaningful commentary on bridge-building in the late Saxon period from place-name and charter boundary clause evidence alone.

Finally, the mention of a *higweges* in the bounds of West Orchard is deserving of mention (6.3, ST81NW). In an earlier section entitled Driving Droves and Leading Loads (Chapter Two), attention was drawn to the term in the bounds of land at Meavy, Devon.\(^{632}\) H. P. R. Finberg’s translation of the *hig*-element, in accordance with the views of the *Place-Names of Devon* was ‘high’ as in ‘high way’.\(^{633}\) Della Hooke however opted for ‘hay’ as the translation and associated the way with access to summer grazing on Dartmoor.\(^{634}\) In the case of the West Orchard example it would appear that ‘hay way’ is the more appropriate interpretation. The route seems to be fairly minor in its course and it runs, via a *lipgete* [leap gate], into what the Anglo-Saxons usually refer to as a *hamme* – an area of ‘hemmed in’ meadow land and perhaps the *hamm* in *Archethamm*, the name of West Orchard in the title of the charter. On the nineteenth-century OS map a road sweeping through the spine of the *hamme* is referred to as the Mower’s Lane, reflecting its suitability for haymaking.


\(^{631}\) Mills, *The Place-Names of Dorset* 105.

\(^{632}\) S 963.


\(^{634}\) Hooke, *Pre-Conquest Charter-Bounds of Devon and Cornwall* 199.
This interpretation has important implications however for the origins of the ubiquitous later medieval term ‘highway’. The accepted origins of ‘highway’ in the Oxford English Dictionary are to be found in an original charter of 859 and Alan Cooper suggests that both higweg and heahstræt are indicative of ‘exalted status’, as in ‘high king’. Cooper notes the term’s first appearance in the West Orchard bounds (evidently unaware of the 859 document) and informs us that it is referred to on a further fourteen occasions. In view of both the Meavy and West Orchard examples however, it may be that higweg needs separating from heahweg (or stræt) in its meaning, with the origins of the later legalised term ‘highway’ being sought in the instances where the heah- element prevails.

Chapter Nine: Wiltshire

Study Area 7: The Ebble Valley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawyer Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Estate Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Odstock</td>
<td>928</td>
<td>Byrhtferth, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Bishopstone (north part)</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>Ælfsige, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>582</td>
<td>Chalke</td>
<td>955–uncertain, ?eleventh-century fabrication⁶³⁶</td>
<td>The nuns of Wilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>Homington</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>Wulfric, proceres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>Bishopstone (north part)</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>Ælfric, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696</td>
<td>Coombe Bissett</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>Byrnsige, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>861</td>
<td>Stratford Tony</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>Ælfgar, his minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891</td>
<td>Bishopstone</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>Old Minster, Winchester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Study Area 7 charter boundary clauses

A group of eight charters describe land granted in the Ebble Valley from its upper reaches on the border with Dorset in the west down to the confluence of the Ebble with the Avon (7.1). The final charter in the table above (S 891) is preceded by four forged charters which have been largely ignored in this study as a consequence of the similarities in the boundary clauses.⁶³⁷ The 997 charter is a 100 hide grant of land at ‘Downton and Ebblesbourne’ and the 30 hides at Ebblesbourne have been identified with the modern parish of Bishopstone.⁶³⁸ The northern half of Bishopstone parish (i.e. the part north of the river Ebble) is also represented by two further charters (S 522, S 640) where again they are described as land ‘at Ebblesbourne’. Three further grants of land also titled ‘Ebblesbourne’

⁶³⁶ Kelly (ed.), Charters of Shaftesbury Abbey 86-92.
⁶³⁷ S 299; S 275; S 393; S 540.
are represented by the parishes of Stratford Tony (S 861), Coombe Bissett (S 696) and Homington (S 635). These last five charters are widely accepted as authentic documents and, dating from between 928 and 986, they go on to form the Domesday hundred of Cawdon. The grant of a 100 hides at Chalke includes the manors of Broad Chalke, Bower Chalke, Ebbesborne Wake, Alvediston, Berwick St John and Tollard Royal, which all go on to form the later hundred of Chalke. Like the Shaftesbury charter for Compton Abbas and Iwerne Minster (S 630 – which also covers land at Donhead, Easton Bassett and Sixpenny Handley), the authenticity of this charter is suspect and the nature of both documents, the fact that they describe two large contiguous blocks of land each interspersed with each other’s outlying manors, suggests some collusion between the draftsmen (or perhaps, draftswomen) of each document. Like the Shaftesbury Abbey charter therefore, the grant of Chalke to the nuns of Wilton possibly represents an eleventh-century fabrication.⁶³⁹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S 630</th>
<th>S 582</th>
<th>Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arest on offen weg</td>
<td>Ærest of þare stræte</td>
<td>First to Offa’s way/from the street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æt þare ende hit gæþ up on one furh</td>
<td>at the end it goes up on a furrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oð þat hit cymð to þæs hlinches orde</td>
<td>as far as it comes to the lynch end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banen on þone ellen stub</td>
<td>to þan ellen stybbe</td>
<td>then on the elder tree stump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banen on miclen dices get</td>
<td>þannon to winterburge gate</td>
<td>then on the great dyke’s gate/to the winter burh gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banen on esnes dices get</td>
<td>þannon to esnadiche geate</td>
<td>then on the serfs’ dyke gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banen on stan scylien</td>
<td>þonne to þan stane</td>
<td>then on the stone ?shaling/the stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be ligð on þære stræte</td>
<td>that lies on the street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 swa on þane cistel</td>
<td>and so to the cist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banen on elchene seað</td>
<td>þonne to ealcan seað</td>
<td>then to the chalk pit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banen on mapeldere cumb</td>
<td>of ðam seaðe up on mapuldor cumb</td>
<td>then to maple tree combe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þonne 7læng cumbes</td>
<td>then along the combe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to þæs cumbes heafde</td>
<td>to the combe’s head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁶³⁹ Kelly (ed.), Charters of Shaftesbury Abbey 88.
The manor of Easton Bassett, by virtue of the fact that it was held by Shaftesbury but sits entirely surrounded in the Ebble Valley by the Chalke manors, is perambulated in both charters and the bounds as recorded in each document have been included here. It is possible that the respective surveys were conducted on separate occasions and that this explains the differences between the two. The number of variations, both in the relative number of features mentioned and the alternative spellings would suggest that the level of collusion alluded to by Kelly between the houses of Shaftesbury and Wilton was not so close that they both shared access to the same boundary survey. The directional terminology S 582 takes through Maple tree combe and the repeated mention in the overall boundary clause for Chalke of the head stakes as a landmark that is being returned to, suggests a text that is rather more closer to a physical perambulation than the list-like landmarks of S 630. This might suggest that the boundary marks in the latter document have been verbally relayed which in turn may have caused the confusion over the *elchene seað* and the *miclen díc.* However, the inclusion of a *bican pet* in S 630 suggests a separate provenance and the *empenbeorch* is less obscure as ‘imps’ barrow’ than it is as *ippan beorge.* The ‘stone that lies on the street’ in S 582 is important because, as we shall see from Study Area 8, the occurrence of stones on Roman roads may suggest survival into the early medieval period of Roman milestones. However, frustratingly, the bounds of S 630 refer to a stone *scylien,* an enigmatic phrase that, translated literally, means ‘stone shaling/shaley’.640 The phrase appears in only one other text, the *Gospel of St Mark,* where

---

it is glossed as *super petrosa*, the literal translation of which might read, ‘on stony’ but, factoring the OE meaning, with a sense of ‘the lying down stoniness’. Perhaps then the ‘stone that lies on the street’ is quite literally lying over; a monument that once stood erect now lying fractured on the ground.

Most frustratingly, the references to the various routes in each charter conflict to a degree that either the exact status and names of routes mattered little to surveyors of boundary clauses or, more likely, that the survey of S 603 really is a garbled second-hand account of S 582, with erroneous interpolations. Fieldwalking can find no trace of a Bica’s pit between the imps’ barrow and the head of the thorn spring. It may even be that a *bican settle* [Bica’s settlement or seat] mentioned much earlier in the Chalke perambulation has caused further confusion. So the discrepancies between the two surveys seem likely to be as a consequence of S 630’s dubiousness and the boundary clause for Chalke is otherwise in a charter that other commentators are content to grade as authentic. Analysis of charter boundary clauses on this level – *i.e.* studying the spatial relationships between landmarks and how the same marks are described in different charters – can only help to contribute to the assessment of a charter’s authenticity and can furthermore help us to understand the processes by which the custom of perambulating boundaries in the landscape comes to be articulated textually as a clause in a legal document.

Taking the references to routes in the Chalke charter, we can identify a *herepath* that runs E/W through the valley through the parish of Alvediston. It may be that the course of this route passed north of Windmill Hill as *sceattas* of Series H, N, and B recovered from the fields to the west of Norrington manor have been recently registered through the *Portable Antiquities Scheme*. A further Series D has been recovered in close proximity to the ridgeway to the south (the street on which the fallen stone lies) and these coin finds may be a further indication of a middle-Saxon trade route (as in Study Area 6) making use of the ridges that bound the Ebble valley to the north and south.

There are numerous linears, drove roads and ditches that run perpendicular to the axis of the valley and the *sceat* coin finds at these locations may well reflect a NS route passing through the

---

643 A custom that may have a Germanic basis separate from the introduction of the Late Roman private deed. Support for this comes primarily from the text of S 8, the earliest known original charter in which land is held *iuxta notissimos terminus a me demonstratus et proacuratoribus meis* [according to the well-known boundaries demonstrated by myself and my officers].
644 Both Series H and N are the only groups with a determinable southern origin, with *Hamwic* the likely minting place of Series H. I. Stewart, ‘The Early English Denarial Coinage, c. 680-750’, 13-14.
645 Both Series H and N are the only groups with a determinable southern origin, with *Hamwic* the likely minting place of Series H. I. Stewart, ‘The Early English Denarial Coinage, c. 680-750’, 13-14.
parish *en route* to Tisbury where an abbot and *familia* is recorded in a mid-eighth century charter.646

The ‘street’ of S 582 referred to as Offa’s way in S 630 would appear to be the deep hollow way that runs up the east side of Winklebury Hill. A translation derived from *offian* [to bear off] might suggest that this route did not continue to the north of the *herepath* and was spurred off at this point but in any case, the boundary then passes through the gate in what is referred to as the *winterburge* before continuing through the *esnadiche geate* [serfs’ dyke gate]647 Winklebury hillfort was excavated in 1881 by General Pitt-Rivers and the ceramics, worked metals and several phases of construction have been dated to the Iron Age, so the serf’s construction of a dyke/ditch was certainly not for the purposes of a *de novo burh*.648 It may be however that the serfs’ dyke is actually an undated cross dyke, first observed by Richard Colt-Hoare, and blocking access to the Winklebury promontory.649 Similar undated dykes can be seen serving the same purpose on the downs to the north and south of the valley with a marked cluster on the ridgeway to the north of Alvediston and on White Sheet Hill. Such dykes, if also built (or amended) by serfs in living memory of the Chalke charter date, may reflect a desire to control and monitor movement along these ridgeways.

At the very western end of the study area, the *herepath* passes through the *heafod stoccan*, a phrase that Andrew Reynolds has signified represents the location of stakes set up for the display of the heads of executed criminals.650 As has been noted (Chapter Two), both a boundary location and proximity to a major thoroughfare are important factors in the siting of Anglo-Saxon execution cemeteries.651 It may be too that the significance of this location is as a result of the crossing of the *herepath* that runs through the Ebble Valley with the major ridgeway that to the SW connects (*via* Study Area 6) with the Wessex Ridgeway which heads to Dorchester. This crossroads location is then likely to be communicating to both a local and regional level of traffic using the *herepath* to connect the valley manors with Shaftesbury to the west and Wilton to the east and a national and international level of traffic using a major trade route connecting the shire capital of Dorset with its counterpart in Wiltshire.

---

646 S 1256.
Further east along the valley, the E/W herepath can be picked up in the bounds for Bishopstone and numerous other herepaths are referred to on both north and south ridgeways and along the course of the Roman road (7.3, SU02NE, SU02SE). Above, mention was made of the fact that the grouping of estates at Bishopstone, Stratford Tony, Coombe Bissett, Homington and Odstock all go on to form, along with Britford (for which no charter survives), the hundred of Cawdon. They are all (except the king’s property at Britford) recorded as being in the hands of secular individuals in the tenth century. Chapter Eleven will discuss the fact that the references to herepaths in this area are replaced with references to ‘ways’ and ‘ridgeways’ in later charters where the church is the beneficiary. References to the Roman road where it runs through the valley of this hundred, survive only in conjunction with a ‘ford’ and it is difficult to know whether what is being referred to here is a ‘ford where the Roman road crosses’ or the settlement of Stratford Tony as both sites sit over 500m apart (7.3, SU02NE). The issue is confused by a reference to streit ford in the Coombe Bissett charter on the eastern boundary of Stratford Tony – the opposite side of the estate from where the Roman road crosses the Ebble. In the immediate vicinity of the settlement of Stratford Tony (at the centre of the strip estate) a deep holloway passes around the back of the church, heading west to Bishopstone, and a further hollow way runs SW up on to the spur of downland to the south upon which a witan weg is recorded. A literal translation of this term would read ‘white way’ but the route is picked up in a charter for Damerham to the south where it is referred to as the piltenepeie [Wilton Way].652 This may reflect the fact that the crossing of the Ebble of the Roman road was rejected in favour of a more suitable crossing at the location that went on to become the site of the parish church of Stratford Tony.653 Much depends however on the survival of the Roman road crossing of the Nadder to the NE, and in this study area alone further insights can only be provided by the reference to a bican bricge [Bica’s Bridge] in Bishopstone which is very likely to have provided access for traffic coming from the SW (including that using the Roman road) to Wilton. This may further have impacted upon the popularity of a crossing of the Ebble on the trajectory of the Roman road.

Finally, attention shall be drawn to the wic herepath that is referred to in the bounds of Odstock and the herepaths that are mentioned in the north and south of the estate at Downton. Tracing the course of the wic herepath to the south (SU12SE), it can either run due south with the Avon valley or cross the river at Downton and head in a SW

652 § 513.
653 It may, of course, represent a reversion to a crossing used by a N/S prehistoric route that the Anglo-Saxons have termed the ‘white’ or ‘Wilton’ way.
direction. At Downton archaeological evidence of substantial Roman occupation has been recovered with villa remains, a corn dryer and bath house all part of a significant settlement to the immediate south of the current town. To the west of this site, on Castle Meadow, two intersecting Roman roads were also observed in excavations. Pottery dated to the seventh/eighth centuries was recovered from the base of a large gravel-extraction pit in the Castle Meadow excavations. The up-cast gravel was believed by Philip Rahtz to have been required for a hard building surface for construction on the soft alluvium of the Avon flood plain. It may be however that the gravel was required for the construction (or repair) of a causeway across the Avon. The parish (and Anglo-Saxon estate) of Downton straddles the river, with significant territory on both sides. This suggests that at the time this boundary was laid out, access across the river was not only possible but unproblematic. Some 2km (1.2 miles) south of the reference to the *wic herepath* (now the A338 from Salisbury to Bournemouth) a significant fork off of the main road and running down towards the Avon in the direction of Downton is encountered opposite Barford. This suggests an alternative, more direct route, by which traffic crossing the Avon at Downton would have travelled north to crossings further upstream at Ayleswade (*en route* to Old Sarum) or Wilton.

In a later discussion, the significance of the *wic herepaths* will be covered in more depth but the possible destinations of the routes that are passing through this *wic herepath* should be highlighted here. Firstly, heading due SSE and crossing the Avon at Barford/Downton, a further two references to a *herepath* are picked up in the southern bounds of Downton (7.3, SU21NW). A *stenenan stapul* [stone post] is mentioned on the course of this route and, as will be demonstrated in Study Area 8, this term in particular is likely to be indicative of a Roman milestone. In which case, this route may well be making its way to the SE corner of the New Forest and likely candidates for its destination could be either Hythe (perhaps the *Portmonna Hyðe* of S 701), Lepe or a site known as ‘South Hampshire’ in the list of ‘productive’ sites which Katharina Ulmschneider places in the New Forest Area. Whether crossing the Avon at Barford/Downton or staying on the west bank of the river, a route taken directly south runs to the harbour of Christchurch. So in both options, the continuation of the *wic herepath* takes the traveller in the direction of middle-Saxon trading sites. A second *herepath* is mentioned in the Downton perambulation on the

---

line of what has gone on to become the A36, the main Salisbury to Southampton road. In
the early medieval period this would have been the likely route by which traffic travelled
between Wilton/Old Sarum and Hamwic/Southampton and a number of coin finds
including a possible penny of Alfred, a penny of Ecgbert, two Series H and two Series J
Study Area 8: The Salisbury Basin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawyer Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Estate Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>492</td>
<td>South Newton</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>Wulfgar, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>Laverstock</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>Ælfsige, gold- and silversmith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>766</td>
<td>South Newton</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>Wilton Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>767</td>
<td>Bemerton</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>Wilton Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>789</td>
<td>Avon (Little Durnford)</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>Wynstan, cubicarius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Study Area 8 charter boundary clauses

The *herepath* mentioned on the northern boundary of the Downton perambulation, on the course of the Salisbury to Southampton road, can be seen to continue to a crossing of the Bourne River at the *cypmanna ford* of the Laverstock charter (8.1, 8.2 SU12NE). Prior to this river-crossing however, this *herepath* crosses a N/S route that passes from Britford to the south. On the origins of Britford, the exceptionally fine carvings of plant-scrolls on the archway to the north *porticus* are seen to share characteristics and demonstrate influences from contemporary Italian work and these architectural fragments have therefore been assigned an early ninth-century date.658 Thus it is likely that this church sat at a ford on an important early route. The presence of *byrhtferþes hlæwe* [Byrtferth’s mound] to the north of Britford and Byrtferth’s estate in Odstock to the south (7.3, SU12NE, discussed in Chapter 4), suggest a level of connectivity in the tenth century. It may have been the crossing of the A36 *herepath* and this N/S route that provided the focus for an extensive early Saxon inhumation cemetery recovered at this location and trial trenches cut at Milford farm between this crossroads and the *cypmanna ford* yielded pottery with a fifth- to seventh-century date range.659

Having crossed the Bourne at the *cypmanna ford*, the *herepath* splits to take a course to either Old Sarum or Wilton. Jeremy Haslam has stressed that these two sites


cannot be studied independently of each other as they appear to share urban functions in the early medieval period. For example, the apparently inadequate defences and exposed location of the Wilton site led Haslam to speculate that the fort of Wilton mentioned in the *Burghal Hidage*, with its attached 1400 hides, actually had its defences in the site of Old Sarum. Recent archaeological evaluations conducted in the area of St John’s Hospital at Wilton have, however, established that the *burghal* defences of Wilton consisted of a substantial bank and ditch upon which at a later date a stonewall was constructed. There is clear evidence then that attempts were made in the early medieval period to fortify the valley bottom site, to control the crossing of the Nadder and Wylaye rivers and to protect the major nunnery that had been established there by the tenth century. Furthermore, despite the defensive qualities of the Old Sarum site, archaeological evidence for occupation during the Anglo-Saxon period is limited and David Hill’s case for the *burgh* church and ‘town’ actually lying outside the walls of the hillfort, although yet to be substantiated on archaeological grounds, remains a viable proposition.

Referred to as the *Æþelware byrig* [The Noble People’s *burgh*] in the charter for Avon (Little Durnford) in the tenth century, it is likely that the hill-top site of Old Sarum at least fulfilled the functions of an ‘emergency *burgh*’ with coins of *Æthelstan* and *Edgar* attesting to commercial activity at this time, along with the relocation of the Wilton moneyers in the eleventh century. The ‘emergency *burgh*’ status is perhaps supported by the survival in the charter boundary evidence of a *þeod herepath* interconnecting Wilton with Old Sarum (8.1, SU13SW). Analysis of this route in the field suggests that, having made use of the Avon river crossing at Stratford-sub-Castle, it turned due south and climbed the scarp slope where, at the point it coincides with the parish boundary, a purpose-built causeway levelling the steep hill slope can be observed. Having crossed the ridge it then skirts the NW edge of Bemerton Heath where it is referred to in the charter for Bemerton (surviving today as a public footpath), before dropping down on to the valley road to Wilton. Using the crossing of the Avon at Stratford-Sub-Castle, this path takes the most direct route possible between the two settlements and almost certainly represents a path laid out to connect the two centres. That it existed in the mid-tenth century suggests that

661 Ibid. 124.
Old Sarum played some role in the protection and refuge-provision for the community based at Wilton and is another supporting factor in the case made by Haslam for Old Sarum serving, in part, as Wilton’s fortifications. Indeed, it may very well have gone on to serve its purpose as the route by which the þeod [people] fled the ravaging and burning of Wilton by King Swein in 1003.\textsuperscript{666}

The existence of a ‘Kingsbridge Meadow’, referred to in a map of 1793 detailing the freehold burgages of Stratford-sub-Castle, at exactly the place where the Roman road crosses the Avon to the SW of Old Sarum complicates the issue somewhat in that, if of early medieval date, a bridge here would have provided even quicker access between Old Sarum and Wilton (B 119 on Figure 19).\textsuperscript{667} Relating more to the geography of the hill-top site and associated settlements than to the later city of the valley floor, it seems likely to predate the purported shift of urban functions to the cathedral city of the early thirteenth century. If parallels were to be drawn with the nomenclature of South Hams’ Kingsbridge then it might be seen to fit in a mid-tenth-century context. In providing a more direct passage between Old Sarum and Wilton (than the þeod herepath), it may have been constructed to further improve access between the two sites.

Both the charter boundary clause and place-name evidence for routes and river-crossings in this study area creates a configuration of thoroughfares that allows for the topography of the alluvial plain, on to which the later city of Salisbury was placed, to be tentatively projected. The chapmen’s ford allows a crossing of the Bourne for two major routes from the east and SE. The route from the east, known today as the Clarendon Way, connects Winchester, via Romsey, to the Salisbury Basin.\textsuperscript{668} That it survives as the only public right of way through the forest of Clarendon tentatively suggests that it was in existence as a major thoroughfare before the establishment of the royal hunting ground, first recorded in Domesday. The route from the SE, as we have seen in Study Area 7, comes from the Southampton area. Having combined to cross the Bourne at the cypmanna ford, a route heading north takes the traveller to the gates of Old Sarum whilst a route west takes the traveller across the floodplain towards Wilton. This E/W route is crossed by a N/S route that crosses the Avon at the location of a fording place indicated by the later street name ‘Ayleswade’, and then continuing north along the High Street before becoming Minster Street (SU13SW/SU12NW).\textsuperscript{669} From then on, it splits to go either side of Old Sarum but it is

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{666} ASC 1003.
\footnote{667} Wiltshire Records Office cc/chapter/14/2; cc/chapter/14/6.
\end{footnotes}
at the point where it intersects the E/W route that is of interest here. The crossroads is marked by St Thomas’s church, a building whose earliest architectural fragments date to the thirteenth century (Figure 15). However, circumstantial evidence suggests that this site may have been the focus for earlier activity. In the first instance, the topographical location bears all the hallmarks of those sites that we know other Wessex minster churches occupy: low ground, proximity to running water, alongside good communications and a mile or two from a hillfort. The 'Minster Street' to the immediate east of St Thomas’s church and the name that used to apply to the route running north from this location (before it became Castle Street), may well refer to the later cathedral site to the immediate south, but ‘minster’ is a term that, certainly by the early thirteenth century (i.e. the date of the cathedral foundation), had slipped from common usage with the minster system of parochial care already well subsumed into a local parochial system based on the parish church by the late twelfth century. John Blair has demonstrated that minsters founded in the late seventh century were the focus of ‘commercial activity’ and the likely settings for markets and this crossroads location, the site of the later church of St Thomas (and the likely location for one of Salisbury’s Domesday mills), also goes on to become the medieval market place for the cathedral city. From the only excavations to date made within a 100m radius of this crossroads, at the site of the Old George Mall immediately to the south, pottery of the fifth to eighth century was recovered from pre-structural horizons.

To the immediate west of St Thomas’s church, and the market place, Bridge Street carries traffic across the Avon to Wilton but also in a NW direction by a ridgeway route presumably of some antiquity. Support for this comes from the references to a bradan herepah [broad] and, on two occasions, an ealdan herpaðe [old]. Elsewhere (Study Area 3), we saw how the use of the term ‘old’ herepath was applied to the course of a Roman road and it may be that this was the route by which Old Sarum was connected with the Romano-British town of Verlucio. Along the course of this route, three stænan stapo [stone posts] are recorded and although each stone can be placed only very approximately, they do

670 Best seen in Figure 12 in H. Cave-Penney 2004 The Archaeology of Wiltshire’s Towns: An Extensive Urban Survey: Salisbury Trowbridge: Wiltshire County Archaeology Service 15 at http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/catalogue/adsdata/arch-906-1/dissemination/pdf/EUS_Figure_Scans/Salisbury/fig12.pdf (20/03/2013).
672 Hase, 'The Church in the Wessex Heartlands', 54-60.
674 DB Wilts. 3, 4.
seem to sit apart at a distance that suggests their function as milestones, further supporting the assumption that this ‘old’ herepath is also a Roman or Romanised road.

Beornwin’s stone sits again on the trajectory of a Roman road and is perhaps marking a significant crossroads to the immediate SW of Figsbury (8.1, SU13SE). A stone is also recorded on the ridgeway to the south of Burcombe (SU02NE) and it seems likely that this landmark is the stone being referred to as beornolfes stan [Beornwulf’s stone] in a charter for land at Pyrigean, identified as an estate to the immediate SW of Wilton. 677

Finally, from this study area, attention should be drawn to the wic herepath to the immediate east of Stapleford, the ‘ford marked by a post’ (SU03NE). 678 Heading east, this route dips to the south and crosses the Avon at the ealdan wuduforda that Desmond Bonney has placed at the site of Lower Woodford. 679 From here it can either head off towards Beornwin’s stone in the direction of Romsey or due south to Old Sarum. From Old Sarum, those travelling further south could cross the Avon at Ayleswade and join the wic herepath mentioned in the Odstock boundary on a course towards Christchurch or the New Forest (discussed in Study Area 7). Or, a crossing of the Bourne at the chapmen’s ford could be chosen in the direction of Southampton/Hamwic. To the west of Stapleford, this route continues up the Wylye valley in the direction of Warminster, the likely site of a villa regalis and minster church. 680 The wic herepaths in Study Areas 7 and 8 seem, therefore, to be connecting the coastal trading sites in the Solent area with a Hamwic hinterland that Michael Metcalf has identified through the employment of geographical regression analysis to single finds of Hamwic’s Series H sceattas. 681 In this model money is clearly being diffused westwards from the middle-Saxon trading emporium and it may be that the wic herepaths in this area served the purpose of carrying the trade that is archaeologically articulated in Metcalf’s distribution (Figure 10).

**Study Area 9: Bradford-on-Avon and its hinterland**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawyer Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Estate Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>727</td>
<td>Steeple Ashton</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>King Edgar to himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>765</td>
<td>Edington</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>Romsey Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>867</td>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>Leofwine, venator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>899</td>
<td>Bradford-on-Avon</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>Shaftesbury Abbey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 12: Study Area 9 charter boundary clauses*

Topographically, Bradford-on-Avon represents an important crossing point of a major river and as a consequence, routes radiate out from the ford in all directions. It is likely to be the site of the battle of Bradford recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for the year 652 and an Elbridge Lane, derived from OE þel [planked] bridge, suggest that a timber bridge existed from an early medieval date.682 Bradford-on-Avon’s centrality may have played a role in the founding, according to William of Malmesbury, of a minster church and a community on the site as early as the late seventh century.683 The ‘cenobium’ of Bradford-on-Avon and its appurtenant lands were granted by Æthelred in 1001 to the nuns of Shaftesbury as a refuge (*confugium*) for the community and its relics presumably after some kind of catastrophe – perhaps Viking related – forced their temporary relocation (S 899).684 The other three charters in the group describe land to the south of Bradford-on-Avon at Steeple Ashton (S 727), Edington (S 765) and Westwood (S 867). All of the charters are believed to be authentic although the choice of the term *greatan hlywan* [great refuge] in the boundary clause of the Westwood charter of 987 to describe the church at Bradford-on-Avon may be alluding to the church’s role after Æthelred’s grant in 1001 and so could suggest that the Westwood boundary clause was updated, added to or amended after this date.

Despite the numerous routes that radiate out from the ‘broad ford’ in all directions to contemporary regional centres (such as Bath, Frome, Shepton Mallet, Westbury, Warminster, Melksham, Malmesbury and Chippenham) there are few references to routes in the boundary clauses of the charters for grants in this area (9.1). The boundary clause for Æthelred’s grant in 1001 to the nuns of Shaftesbury seems mainly to refer to well-known

---

684 Kelly (ed.), *Charters of Shaftesbury Abbey* 114-22.
boundaries belonging to local dignitaries in the immediate vicinity. For example, along its northern extent the perambulation goes swa be þes abbotes imare to alfghares imare at Farnleghe, forð be is imare oð þat it cumet to þe kinges imare at Heselberi, forð be þes kinges imare þat it cumet to alfghares imare at Attenwrthe [so by the Abbot’s boundary to Alfgar’s boundary at Farnleigh, forth by his boundary until it comes to the King’s boundary at Hazlebury, forth by the King’s boundary till it comes to Alfgar’s boundary at Attworth].

This marks this boundary clause out as unusual and because little mention is made of the types of landscape features that characterize most boundary clauses, only three routes are referred to in the entire study area. The first of these is mentioned twice in the opening lines of the 1001 boundary clause where the term herewai is used to describe the route that makes its way from Bradford-on-Avon to Melksham to the ENE. As we have seen, the only other use of this term comes from a document of similar provenance and corresponds to land at Compton Abbas (S 630). A hegweige (hay-way) is recorded in King Edgar’s grant to Romsey Abbey of land at Edington in the SE of the study area but it is difficult to ascertain exactly which routes it is referring to. It may be one that skirts the upper edge of the chalk downland in contrast to a ‘summer way’ along the foot of the scarp slopes but it may also, like the boc sætena hig wege [the people of Buckland’s high/hay way] on the fringes of Dartmoor, be referring to the route by which hay was seasonally carted from the upland areas down to the valley settlements.

Finally, a street is referred to in an apparently authentic grant of three hides made in 987 by King Æthelred to Leofwine at Westwood. The exact phrase from the boundary clause reads suð to ðære stræt on ða greatan hlywan [south to the street to the great refuge] which heads in a SW direction to cross the river Frome at Stanford. Three other fords are recorded crossing the Frome. From Stanford, the perambulation for Westwood goes andlang streamæs on lafdorð [along the stream to islan ford] which survives as modern-day Iford. Fersefordem survives as a modern place-name Freshford and is the point at which the Frome joins the Avon. Routes west and SW from Bradford would use this ford before then crossing the Midford Brook at Mitford (also mentioned in the charter of 1001). Finally, further upstream towards Frome, the boundary is recorded as passing ‘inne Tefleforde’ [to ?game ford] which again survives in the modern place-name Tellisford. This last ford, like the fegerhilde [fair battle] forde (S 891) and hildes [battles] ford (S 1547) may be indicative of a folk tradition of sport-like combat held at fords. The prevalence of fords in this study area indicate that passage over this ground required negotiating the many
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685 It is regrettable that it has not been possible to explore in this project the recurrence of ‘stone fords’ with Roman roads.
streamlets that fed the headwaters of the Frome and Avon. A particular landmark that helped travellers to pick their way through this low-lying ground is also in evidence from the boundary clauses of this study area.

In a grant King Edgar makes out to himself of land at Steeple Ashton, a rodestan (rood stone) is referred to and by reference to Rood Ashton Farm, which appears on the nineteenth-century OS maps, this feature can be placed with a fair degree of certainty on a low rise on the alluvial plain. The rood stone is in a prominent position, visible especially to those approaching from the downlands to the SE. There is good evidence for other possible roods in this study area but we are conscious of the caution that must be exercised in the interpretation of this place-name element. As Alexander Rumble has pointed out, the OE hrēod [reed], rōd [a ‘rod of land’] and rod [clearing] all look and sound similar.686

The landscape characteristics of the rodestan (i.e. highly visible and on a significant route) are shared by burgredes rode [Burgred’s rood] which features later in the same boundary clause and appears to have given its name to Rode Hill, recorded as Rodehethe in 1491.687 Here traffic crossing the upper reaches of the Frome might be guided by a monument, perhaps made of stone, to the safest passage onwards to the refuge at Bradford-on-Avon. In this instance it seems unlikely that a ‘rod of land’ is being referred to in a landscape that is otherwise characterized by open country (i.e. heath), evidenced by the reference in the previous line of the boundary clause to the wuntfeld and the place-name Wingfield to the north. Equally, over such terrain, the interpretation of ‘clearing’ seems ill-fitting and as has been demonstrated from previous study areas, personal names are commonly associated with markers such as posts and stones. Rodæ [roods] are referred to in a particular location in Æthelred’s grant to Leofwine at Westwood. In the rubric of the same charter Æthelred gives also three gyrla æt Fearnlege (across the river Frome in Farleigh) and here a different spelling for ‘rod’, in this case inferring a measurement, would suggest that the ‘roods’ imply an altogether different feature. Again, the Rodæ feature in a prominent location and may be directing traffic to Bradford-on-Avon along the earlier mentioned stræt on ða greatan hlywan on which they are located. Two further markers deserve mention. The first of these is on a continuation of the route out of Bradford-on-Avon, over Tibba’s ford, past the Rood stone mentioned earlier and up on to the downs where on redestan is recorded in the boundary for Edgar’s grant at Edington. Here the form

of the term is so similar to rodestan that a simple scribal or copyist’s error could be suggested. On chalk downland it is highly unlikely that residual outcrops of natural red stone would be found.688 The padecanstan [?cloaked stone] occupies a similar position on the downland to the redestan in that it too sits on a high point alongside a significant route traversing the chalk downland and both these stones, along with the various roods above, all seem to be marking routes.

The rodestan, redestan and padecanstan all sit on a route radiating out from Bradford-on-Avon to the SE, a route that other circumstantial evidence suggests is of some importance both in the middle and late Saxon periods. In the first instance, the place-name Trowbridge (‘tree’ or ‘wooden’ bridge) suggests that another timber bridge served traffic travelling to and from Bradford-Avon.689 The site is not described in the boundary clauses but archaeological evidence for middle-Saxon occupation and a late Saxon settlement supporting a Saxo-Norman church suggest a location of some importance in the early medieval period and a possible thegny residence.690 Proximity of the ditched and banked enclosure of the later Anglo-Saxon phases to the major thoroughfare that passes through the settlement suggests that control of this route, as well as one that passes EW through the site, was important. Finds in the parish of West Ashton of a sceatta Series H and continental Series E, dating from the early to mid-eighth century, indicate a possible trade route connecting this area with the SE.691 To the SE of this study area, this route can be traced across Salisbury Plain ultimately as far as Stapleford and the wic herepath of Study Area 8, further illustrating the physical corollary by which Series H sceattas penetrated the Hamwic hinterland.

688 However, it may be that a red coloration is a deliberate, perhaps painted, feature of this marker stone as a readan rode [red rood] is referred to in a grant covering land on chalk downland in Hampshire ($376) along with a red stan [red stone] on the chalk downland at Liddington ($459).


Study Area 10: Kinwardstone Hundred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sawyer Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Estate Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Little Bedwyn</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>Bica, comes and minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Collingbourne Kingston</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>Wulfgar, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Ham</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>Wulfgar, minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688</td>
<td>Burbage</td>
<td>961 (forged 975 x 1150)</td>
<td>Abingdon Abbey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>756</td>
<td>Great Bedwyn</td>
<td>958 or 968</td>
<td>Abingdon Abbey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Study Area 10 charter boundary clauses

This area represents a large geographically coherent group of parishes situated on the eastern edge of mid-Wiltshire bordering both Berkshire and Hampshire. Assessed at 196¼ hides in 1086, Kinwardstone Hundred was one of the largest hundreds in Wiltshire and it is likely that this is owed to its former status as a large royal estate based on a *Villa Regalis* at Great Bedwyn, then its largest and most central settlement. The importance of this estate is evident from its role in the late ninth-century defences of Wessex as the iron-age hillfort of Chisbury is believed to be the location of the place *Cissanbryrig* referred to in the *Burghal Hidage* list of forts. This importance continues into the tenth and eleventh centuries as the survival of guild statutes of the early to mid-tenth century testify to its urban status. By the mid-eleventh century it was in possession of a mint and had 25 burgesses at the time of the Domesday survey but it seems, like Avebury, to have been ultimately outstripped by Marlborough and Hungerford as an urban focus in the region.

There are five Anglo-Saxon charters with boundary clauses describing land in Kinwardstone Hundred. These are at Little Bedwyn (S 264), Collingbourne Kingston (S 379), Ham (S 416), Burbage (S 688) and Great Bedwyn (S 756). With the exception of the charter for Burbage, over whose authenticity there is some uncertainty, this group of charters

---

represents a reliable collection of documents. The latter four, including the suspected forgery for Burbage, all date from the tenth century whilst the charter for Little Bedwyn is believed to be a reliable tenth-century copy of what was originally an eighth-century grant.

The two mentions of ‘streets’, *stræt gætes* (1.6, SU25NE) and *stratæ* (10.1, SU26NE) are consistent with the Roman roads in this area; one connecting *Cunetio* to Winchester to the SE and the other running due east in the direction of Silchester, *via Spinis* (Thatcham). A *weall weg* or *wælweg* is referred to towards the SW corner of the study area and it seems likely that this is referring to a Romano-British route running N/S across the valley (10.3, SU25NW). Peter Fowler has observed how the major ridgeway known further north as the Icknield Way divides up into a series of braided routes as it crosses the valley. This explains, he believes, the numerous gates observed in the standing bank and ditch of Wansdyke as it bounds the southern tips of Fyfield and West Overton parishes through West Woods. It may be that this ‘British’ way is one of many, surviving as parish boundaries and existing N/S routes (such as the ‘boundary way’) that once formed part of a much wider corridor of movement and as with the case of the Devonian example (4.1 SX74NW), the association with the ‘British’ implies a recognition of its antiquity on the part of Anglo-Saxon boundary surveyors. Elsewhere, the evidence for the continuation of Wansdyke east beyond the chalk downland to the north of the Vale of Pewsey and through Savernake Forest has been reviewed in detail. The context of this vast linear earthwork as both a defensive and political boundary has been revised, a seventh- to eighth-century date and a much more extensive political boundary (bounding the northern extent of Wessex at this time) has been put forward. The distribution of gates recorded in the Burbage, Great Bedwyn and Little Bedwyn charters along the course of the estate boundaries through Savernake Forest would seem to suggest that some kind of linear boundary persisted from the terminus of Wansdyke, through the forest and connecting with the Bedwyn Dykes. Whilst O. G. S. Crawford was of the opinion that these gates represented gaps in hedges, the regularity with which these seven gates feature along a five-mile stretch of boundary
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697 Dumville, *Wessex and England from Alfred to Edgar: Six Essays in Political, Cultural and Ecclesiastical Revival* 109-10, 12, Kelly (ed.), *Charters of Abingdon Abbey* 361-64.
699 O. G. S. Crawford, *Archaeology in the Field* (London: Phoenix House, 1953) 69; Margary, *Roman Roads in Britain* nos. 43 and 53 although of the latter, there is little to suggest its course in the later landscape.
echo the Roman mile-castle theory put forward by Fowler.\textsuperscript{702} The charter for Ham describes an area slightly larger than the present day parish and in 1926 it was suggested that this too could represent a continuation of the Wansdyke frontier (10.4).\textsuperscript{703} In all, the gates in this area, and those seen bounding the chalk downland to the SE (covered in Study Area 1) give an impression of a landscape within which movement was heavily monitored and controlled. A similar element that may provide a further insight into how the control and organization of movement was maintained for people on a local level, is referred to in three separate charters in the region of Ham. A \textit{Peadan stigele} (10.4, SU36SW), \textit{pyddes geate} (SU36SE) and \textit{pædes pæde} (SU36SW) may represent the stile, gate and path of the personal name Peada\textsuperscript{704} but the association with such similar entities might also suggest an anglicised version of the Latin \textit{pedes} [foot-traveller, walker]. Of the six references to the OE \textit{anstigo} [footpath], from the entire corpus of charters used by this project, four appear in this study area (e.g. SU36SW) and this further reflects a desire on the part of boundary surveyors to distinguish between those routes viable for cart travel and those suited for (or at least more frequently used by) pedestrians.

Five of the seven Savernake Forest gates appear in the early charter for Little Bedwyn dated to 788. In being referred to a mere nine years after Offa’s defeat of the West Saxon king Cynewulf at Bensington, a campaign that saw the Mercian king take overlordship of Berkshire, north Wiltshire and north Somerset,\textsuperscript{705} they must surely represent elements of an active political boundary. The remaining two gates are recorded only in later charters but the most western of these, the \textit{sæl gæte} [hall gate] clearly suggests an association with a functioning structure (10.2, SU26NW). The selection of Chisbury in Alfred’s wider scheme of defence is understandable as the Wessex heartlands at this point could be penetrated from the north via the Icknield Way, the NE via the Thames and Kennet rivers and from the east along the ridgeway that skirts the downland into Berkshire (referred to as a \textit{herpoðes, weg} and \textit{via publica} and discussed in Study Area 1).

Finally, attention should be drawn to the locations of two important stones in the hundred. One, Wylbert’s stone (10.3, SU25NW), is recorded in the boundary clause for Collingbourne Kingston and lies on the course of the ‘British Way’, a route that can be

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item A. F. Major and E. J. Burrows, \textit{The Mystery of Wansdyke} (Cheltenham: Privately Published, 1926) 341-43.
\item \url{http://www.langscape.org.uk/descriptions/glossed/L_264_000.html} (21/03/2013)
\item F. M. Stenton, \textit{The Early History of the Abbey of Abingdon} (Reading: University College, 1913) 50.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
traced to the south in an unbroken line, via Amesbury, to Old Sarum. To the north, this route runs through Burbage and Savernake Forest to the site of the Roman town of Cunetio and is likely to represent the course of Margary’s Roman road number 44. The location of the Cyneward’s stone, the stone that gave its name to the Hundred and the likely assembly place, is unknown although the presence of Kinwardstone Farm led the authors of the Place-Name volume for the county to give a likely position on the boundary between Burbage and Grafton (10.3, SU26SW).⁷⁰⁶ Another possible position is to the immediate west of the farm where the N/S aligned ‘British way’ is crossed by an E/W herepath, preserved in the name of Harepath Farm, and continuing west along the valley up to and beyond Swanborough Tump, the meeting place of Swanborough Hundred.⁷⁰⁷

⁷⁰⁶ Gover, Mawer, and Stenton, The Place-Names of Wiltshire at end map.
PART 4: Discussion

The methodological question of whether early medieval routes can be reconstructed and if so, to what extent, was answered in the conclusion to PART 2. In this final part of the research project, the remaining key research questions raised at the end of PART 1 will be addressed. So, the questions of what happened to the Roman roads, how the route network was inscribed and how access was monitored through the landscape, whilst all discrete themes in their own right, have been grouped together for convenience to form Chapter Ten. The issue of bridge building in the early medieval period was seen as inextricable from the broader subject of the development of the route network and, having grouped these together, it is logical to then seek to explore aspects of trade networks and the evidence for the designated legal status of certain routes in the later Anglo-Saxon landscape. These subjects will therefore comprise Chapter Eleven. Each chapter will address aspects of change as and when they arise in discussion. The key findings of this research project will be summarised, along with recommendations for future research, in a conclusion to the overall thesis at the end of PART 4.

Chapter Ten: Roman Roads, Markers and Gates

The Roman Road Question

The legacy of Ivan Margary and the Viatores – his band of fellow Roman road hunters – is a linear template of Roman roads that has become embedded in landscape folklore, reprinted and regurgitated in studies of the early medieval period.\(^\text{708}\) It has served not only to furnish the distribution maps of our archaeological, historical and etymological source material but at times, proximity to this network of routes has been seen by some studies to provide spatial context and meaning. Chapter One reviewed the implications of unconditionally projecting on to the early medieval landscape the network of straight Roman roads and the problems inherent in then attempting to identify their impact on distributions of archaeological and place-name data as if, (a) they were all, including their river-crossings, in serviceable and viable condition and (b) they were the only routes

---

available to the long-distance Anglo-Saxon traveller. In this section we shall review some of the evidence for the fate of the Roman roads depicted by Margary and others whilst at the same time exploring some of the evidence for ‘Romanised’ roads – i.e. those roads which are not characteristically straight but may nonetheless have played an important role in the Romano-British and later landscapes.

What is clear from the project study areas is that when Anglo-Saxon boundary surveyors referred to ‘streets’ there seems to be a recognition of the fact that these routes are of Roman origin (see Figure 16). In the project study areas the key Roman roads leading north out of Winchester (2), through St Mary Bourne (1), SW out of Old Sarum (8) and east out of Exeter (3) are all referred to as ‘streets’. However, we are instantly drawn to consider whether, in naming these routes so, the boundary surveyors were alluding to routes that were in active operation or whether it was a phrase used in recognition of their antiquity. What is interesting is that in some places, these Roman roads are referred to as *herepaths* and this suggests a status or functionality that transcends in importance, in the minds of Anglo-Saxon boundary surveyors, their character as ancient edifices. This is most obvious where the Roman road leaves Winchester in a NW direction (2.2 SU43NW, SU43SE), in the Ebble Valley (7.3 SU02NE) and on the Exeter to Topsham stretch of Roman road (3.4 SX99SW).

With the failure of Silchester as a central place in the post-Roman period, it must be envisaged that the routes radiating from the *civitas* will have fallen redundant. We have seen how the section to Winchester through Stratton Park was overlain by occupational deposits dating to the middle-Saxon period. Equally, in Study Area 1, from an early period it seems that deviations from the course of the first road [RR1] were made both to the north and south for preferred crossings of the Bourne Rivulet (1.4). The survival of the Roman road running SW from Old Sarum depends very much on the fortunes of the crossings of the Avon and Nadder Rivers (8.1 SU13SW). The presence of a ‘Kingsbridge Meadow’ on the crossing of the Avon suggests an Anglo-Saxon (or Anglo-Norman) crossing and one, because of its location, that predates the purported shift of urban focus from the Old Sarum area to the Salisbury City site. Yet how far back this can be projected is uncertain. The author is inclined to see this bridge as a re-instated river crossing and a product of late Anglo-Saxon urban development (discussed later). On the continued course of this Roman road through the Ebble Valley it is referred to twice as a street as it forms the boundary between the estates of Stratford Tony and Bishopstone. It is also, however,
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referred to as a herepath suggesting active use in the Anglo-Saxon period, but the realignment of movement through Stratford Tony on the ‘White’ or ‘Wilton’ Way and via Bica’s Bridge (7.3 SU02NE) on a course to Wilton suggests that crossings of the Nadder were favoured at Ayleswade and at Bulbridge (8.1 SU12NW, SU03SE).

It is at the crossing of rivers that the case for Roman road continuity is at its weakest. In every study area the course of a Roman road is obliged to deviate at the point where it is required to negotiate a river crossing and this prompts the obvious question of whether this deviation was carried out at the point of construction, to make use of an existing crossing point, or whether this occurred later, with the collapse and ruin of the Roman bridges. In only one instance does the charter boundary clause evidence for Wessex suggest the survival of a Roman bridge into the Anglo-Saxon period and this is the weala brucge [British bridge] mentioned in a charter for Brimpton, Berkshire, where the Roman road from Silchester to Spinae crossed the River Kennet.710 Otherwise, the ‘stone heap’ of the Laverstock charter (8.1 SU13SE), if we take this to mean a ruinous stone pier, provides an insight as to the fate of Romano-British bridges. Three sceattas found to the immediate west of this crossing suggest that it may still have been a functioning bridge until the mid-ninth century.711 The various ‘deep fords’ that are found in close proximity to Roman road crossing places suggest that not altogether ideal fording points had to be used by traffic still using these roads.712 As Christopher Taylor observed, once the crossing of the River Welland on the trajectory prescribed by the course of Ermine Street had been rejected, the road itself fell out of use for much of its course.713 Only at the very northern extent of Ermine Street in Lincolnshire, in proximity to the Humber, do any metalwork find-spots appear on the line of the Roman road in Kevin Leahy’s distribution maps of fifth- to tenth-century finds of Anglo-Saxon metalwork.714

Figure 16 therefore takes a critical look at the Roman road network in Wessex and on the basis of the evidence from the study areas and more general observations, a ‘worst case scenario’ is projected for the survival of the Roman road network throughout the early medieval period. The section between Old Sarum and Winchester and the relationship this road has with the Lower Test represents a particularly fruitful avenue of future enquiry in that it appears that over a long time frame, crossing points of the Roman roads at Nursling
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710 S 500.
711 Wiltshire SMR numbers: SU13SE405; SU13SE406 (although series type not given).
712 S 534; Deptford on Watling Street; Deptford over the River Wylye where the purported course of the Harroway crosses.
713 Taylor, Roads and Tracks of Britain 97-101.
and Horsebridge were rejected in favour of crossing points at Redbridge, Romsey (risbrigge – discussed below) and Stockbridge. It is clear that only by further detailed analysis and ultimately through archaeological excavation can a much clearer picture be gained of exactly how these routes fell out of use and crucially, when.

In Figure 16 other suggested Roman or ‘Romanised’ roads have also been included on the basis of certain terms used in the boundary clause evidence. If we accept the fact that the use of the term ‘street’ reflects a consciousness of a strāt on the part of Anglo-Saxons, its application to routes not previously thought to be of Roman origin may help us to further improve our understanding of the network of Roman roads. In the study areas, further ‘streets’ occur in the upper reaches of the Ebble Valley (7), to the north of St Mary Bourne (1), running SW from Bradford-on-Avon (9) and parallel to the coastline of the South Hams (4). In the case of the first two, these can clearly be identified with major ridgeways and it seems likely that such thoroughfares were incorporated into the network of routes that served Fowler’s population of five million Roman Britons.715 Outside of the study areas a similar situation can be observed on a stretch of the Gloucestershire ridgeway and on the course of the Icknield Way.716 It seems likely too that the crossing point of the Avon at Bradford was of such importance that it found employment in the Romano-British period and the reference here to a street may represent a road spurred off a conjectural route, of which only the most ephemeral remains have been identified, running from Badbury Rings in Dorset to Bath.717 In the South Hams, it may very well be that a route along this course allowed for Cornwall and Devon’s rich tin and copper ores and/or the final smelted product to be transported east as either an alternative to, or integrated part of, coastal shipping. Elsewhere it has been observed that the layout of the Roman road network bears a strong relationship in places to the key mining districts of Britain, such as iron in the Weald, lead in Yorkshire, Derbyshire and the Mendips and tin in Cornwall.718 In the name of Strete, at the northern extent of Slapton Sands (4.3 SX84NW), parallels can be drawn with Street in Somerset where excavation recovered a causeway comprised of wooden sleepers, vertical piles and timbers supporting a road surface of stone, embanked on either side by brushwood and stones – all on the course of the Fosse Way.719 Justifiably then, the straight alignments running into Strete from the north and SSW along Slapton

716 S 467; S 1208.
717 Margary, Roman Roads in Britain nos. 46 and 52.
718 Margary, Roman Ways in the Weald; Margary, Roman Roads in Britain nos. 492a and 492b; R. Shepherd, Ancient Mining (London and New York: For The Institution of Mining and Metallurgy by Elsevier Applied Science, 1993) 274-76.
719 Margary, Roman Roads in Britain no. 511.
Sands, might be presumed to indicate the courses of Roman roads. A more general analysis in this part of South-western Britain of the relationship between route ways and rich mining areas will only serve better to augment our understanding of the control of mining industries throughout the region in the early medieval period. It may be that the density of herepath references in this period reflect a desire to control a hugely profitable industry as much as the need to protect the relatively exposed peninsular of Dumnonia.\textsuperscript{720}

It is the references to ‘old’ herepaths and stapulas [posts or columns] that offer the most conjectural support for further Roman roads. As we saw most clearly in the Salisbury Basin study area (8), the row of three stone posts on the line of a route running north in the direction of Verlucio is the clearest indication from the study areas of the survival of Roman milestones. The route they are on is referred to as an ‘old’ herepath and the use of this term to describe the Exeter to Topsham Roman road (3.4) presents us with the slightest evidence that Anglo-Saxon boundary surveyors identified the antiquity of such routes and perhaps even an ancient obligation for their upkeep. Further ‘old’ herepaths have therefore been sketched into Figure 16 but the issue of late-Roman legislation for the upkeep of roads and its continuation into the Anglo-Saxon period is discussed in more detail below.

Returning to the ‘stone posts’ of Study Area 8, a further example is recorded in the Downton bounds on the course of a herepath (7.4 SU21NW). The trajectory of this herepath due SSW joins up with a very short stretch of Roman road identified by Margary and together, the evidence presents us with a route of Roman origin that either crossed the Avon at Downton or continued up the east bank to join with another herepath running through Alderbury. This latter route is itself likely to represent the continuation of another Roman road identified by Margary in the New Forest.\textsuperscript{721}

Stones, posts and the ambiguity in the terminology used to describe such monuments are discussed in much more detail below but it should be considered that the various references to such edifices in the Anglo-Saxon landscape may very well represent the remnants of a widespread tradition in the Roman Empire to furnish major thoroughfares with stone waymarkers. The references to ‘stone posts’ arguably represent the most explicit descriptions of Roman milestones in the form of the Stinsford example where a worked stone column survives in a location thought to be on or very near its original situation.\textsuperscript{722} However, we know that many milestones did not necessarily take a

\textsuperscript{720} Niall Finneran, pers. comm. (2013).
\textsuperscript{721} Ibid nos. 423 and 424.
cylindrical form and some of the closest surviving examples to Study Area 8 were recovered, not in situ, from excavations at Rockbourne Roman villa and were rectangular in form.\footnote{Sedgley, \textit{The Roman Milestones of Britain} 21.} It is therefore possible that alongside the generic term ‘post’, the generic term ‘stone’ may also be referring to such monuments and it is for this reason that they have been included in Figure 16. Only further mapping of such stones and their relationship with Roman roads, Romanised roads and Anglo-Saxon \textit{herepaths} would allow further commentary.

In all, Figure 16 paints a very different picture of the extent of the Roman road network in the early medieval period, from the depiction of the network in Figure 1 and of course, neither figure has any of the known Anglo-Saxon routes and other ridgeways projected on to it. What this study has demonstrated is that in many ways the projection of Margary’s map of Roman roads on to distribution maps of early medieval phenomena does not do justice to the vast complexity of the issue of survival and furthermore, we can only consider the correlation of archaeological and toponymic distributions in relation to the Roman road network with an awareness of this complexity. One final point needs to be made here that is a further illustration of just how complex the issue of Roman road survival is. It revolves around the notion of ‘rebirth’, a notion that has been alluded to before in the context of urban development in the early medieval period.\footnote{R. Hodges and B. Hobley (eds.), \textit{The Rebirth of Towns in the West AD 700-1050} (London: Council for British Archaeology, 1988).} Essentially, there is a distinct possibility that aspects of the Roman road network were brought back into operation, in the same way that Roman city walls and quaysides were, to play a part in the urban ambitions of late Saxon society. Archaeological evidence of this comes from the excavations at East Stratton where middle Saxon occupation layers overlying a Roman road were in turn overlain by flint cobbles believed to correspond to a phase of ‘late Saxon road building’.\footnote{Fasham, ‘Fieldwork and Excavations at East Stratton Along the Roman Road from Winchester to Silchester’, 171-72.} Tim Tatton-Brown’s study of Watling Street identifies a similar sequence – albeit from a different evidence base. In the early and middle Saxon periods, he believes that the course of the Roman road fell out of use and that it was not until the resettlement of the Roman walled towns of Canterbury and Rochester during the Viking Ages and more specifically during the peace brought about by Cnut’s reign that Watling Street found itself back in service connecting the main urban centres of northern Kent to London.\footnote{T. Tatton-Brown, ‘The Evolution of ‘Watling Street’ in Kent’, \textit{Archaeologia Cantiana}, 121 (2001), 121-33 at 124-25.} It is possible that the king’s bridge in Study Area 8 (surviving as Kingsbridge meadow in Figure 19 at B 119) is a reinstatement of a Roman crossing for the purposes of a planned trading
centre in the immediate vicinity of Old Sarum. The Portway recorded on the course of the Old Sarum to Silchester road may also represent a reinstatement of a route that connected the emerging markets at Old Sarum and Andover in the late Saxon period. This will all be addressed in more detail below but it is important to state here that where we have apparent evidence from the later medieval period for Roman road survival, we must entertain the possibility of phases of redundancy and ‘rebirth’. For now, we shall move on to explore the manner in which the landscape was monumentally inscribed by markers for the benefit of those travelling and communicating in early medieval Wessex.

Markers

The concept of ‘landscape’ in the social sciences is increasingly linked to notions of experience and engagement and recent landscape-based studies have moved beyond quantitative and statistical approaches to collective human action in an attempt to tease out the individual human perception of, and interaction with, the surrounding world. 727 Such an approach requires an intellectual positioning that is receptive to the notion that a landscape can be both a physical entity and a form of tablet on to which conceptions of the world can be expressed. 728 For the early medieval period we must perceive a profoundly different concept of time and space from that of our own, and on a practical level, in a world largely devoid of the aerial perspective (i.e. cartography), 729 we must envisage a cosmology for the Anglo-Saxon world that understands space via a ‘mental map’. At ground level, mental maps would have been structured around a ‘horizontal’ perspective wherein a series of vistas would have comprised an understanding of what lay beyond the immediate view-shed. These in turn would have been layered with meaning – for the purposes of memory and identity – and elsewhere for early medieval England it has been argued that the authors of landscapes, through symbolism, monumentalism and place-names with associative meaning can convey a series of messages to those passing through. 730 Nowhere is this more clearly illustrated than in the Icelandic sagas where the narrated journeys of the protagonists are woven with set pieces in such a way that they read almost like sailing.


directions. Here, memory and storytelling overlaps with knowledge, and the land- and seascape provide the tablet on which to secure the necessary information for the early medieval traveller. This form of mythologizing of landscape has been recognised in other parts of early medieval Scandinavia and in Britain too where the evidence suggests that these conceptual frameworks played a role in the formation of both a sense of place and identity in the medieval mind.

For the early medieval traveller, to travel along the dragon’s back (S 496), to encounter Weland’s smithy (S 564), to step tentatively past Grendel’s pit (S 255), to cross the goblin brook (S 387) and to peer down on the Vale of Pewsey from the summit of Woden’s barrow (S 272) is to move through a world imbued with the supernatural, with mythological meaning prompting reactions of fear and familiarity. Charter boundary clauses provide us with this type of information and, as Nicholas Howe observed, they can give us insights into the very local sense of place, telling us what those who worked the land thought of the landscape in which they resided. This section will explore some of the practical aspects to wayside marking – signposting and route-marking – and whilst it will not be tackling the issue of what it meant to move from one place to the other, conceptually from one ‘mythical’ realm into another, it will explore how many of the edifices that can be seen to have pragmatically marked ways through the landscape carried meaning too. It will explore how these monuments fit into a geography reflecting contemporary views but also one that incorporated earlier articulations of space. It will illustrate that whilst certain markers retain continued functions in the landscape, emphasis of meaning can be seen to shift whilst at the same time, new markers can illustrate new methods, for new audiences, of inscribing the landscape.

**Stones**

The presence of ‘stones’ in boundary clauses and the -stone element in place-names is a good illustration of the problems of accurately interpreting markers in the landscape. Attention has already been drawn to the boundary for land granted to the west of Crediton (3.2) that begins *on copelan stan* where today the site is marked by a sculpted granite cross-shaft. Believed to be on or near its original situation, the shaft is decorated
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with panels of geometric interlace, ring-knotting and a rider figure that are thought to be indicative of Scandinavian influences. The important thing here is that this cross is not referred to as a ‘cross’ but as a ‘stone’. We are thus left pondering what might actually have existed at other sites where reference to stones is made. A more explicit incidence of how clearly the term stone and cross were interchangeable comes, as we saw in the Winchester study, from the miracles of St Swithun, as recorded by Lantfred and Wulfstan. To recapitulate, Lantfred tells us, ‘There is a large, tall, shining stone cross here, put up to the glory of Christ’ some three miles out of the city of Winchester and it is likely he was writing within living memory of the translation of St Swithun’s bones from outside the west door to a central location in the minster. Wulfstan, writing a generation later when *ibi uexillum quoniam de rupe uestusto erectus sublime crucis* [a replica in ancient stone of the sublime cross] stood in the same location, provides us with the crucial extra information; *quem lingua ‘Petram’ uocat Anglia ‘Regis’* [which the English tongue calls the King’s Stone]. There can be little doubt, from the analysis of boundary clauses in Study Area 2, that this monument is the same *kinges stane* recorded in the boundary clause of a charter for land at *Worðige*, but even if it is not, the information from both Lantfred and Wulfstan’s account is enough to prove that when the Anglo-Saxons speak of stones in the landscape they may very well be referring to sculpted stone crosses and monuments of considerable importance. A similar situation is recorded by William of Malmesbury who tells us that following the death of Bishop Aldhelm, in 709, in the village of Doulting, Somerset, the procession of his funeral cortège was marked at seven-mile intervals by crosses on its journey back (presumably along the course of the Fosse Way) to Malmesbury. Although William was writing some time after the events, he is at pains to stress the authenticity of his account and its basis on original documentation. In any case, he is explicit when he writes that the stones survived into the landscape of his own time where they were referred to as *biscepstanes*. These examples, and the ambiguity in the terminology used to describe such monuments, force us to consider that in many places it may not be that simple boundary stones are being referred to in charter boundary clauses and that actually a complex variety of monuments, including highly decorated crosses, were in existence throughout the early medieval landscape of Wessex. We have references to grey stones, great stones, long stones, hollow stones and old stones which no doubt served as
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convenient and permanent markers in the landscape against which to set out boundaries, if
indeed, they were not moved to their locations for that very purpose. But of a uniform
tradition of marking out boundaries with certain types of stones, the evidence is only very
slight. From the project study area alone there is only a single reference to a ‘boundary
stone’ (tham merc stane).738

Stones associated with personal names might stand out as potential candidates for
boundary markers and one method of exploring this would be to look at charter
beneficiaries for land granted alongside locations where personal named markers are
recorded. The Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England database allows for all recorded
personal names to be searched and whilst the beneficiaries of grants and leases are
recorded, as well as charter witnesses, it currently does not hold information on individuals
mentioned in boundary clauses. Attempting to find matches in this fashion is, however, a
tenuous and often fruitless business. Of all the personal named markers recorded in the
project study area (so including posts, stones, roods and stakes), in only one incidence is it
likely that a known individual recorded in an early medieval documentary source can be
associated with a named boundary mark.739 This is Beornwulf, who is referred to as the
lessee in receipt of 15 hides of land at æt Eblesburnan, granted by the community at
Winchester in 902.740 As we saw in Study Area 7, the only land that Old Minster,
Winchester owned in the Ebble Valley at that time was their estate at Bishopstone and the
stone referred to in the boundary clauses for this estate (recorded at a later date and at 7.3
SU02NE) is referred to in a contiguous grant of land at Pyrigean as beornolfes stan
[Beornwulf’s stone], identified as an estate to the immediate SW of Wilton.741 Whilst there
is a fifty-seven year gap between the lease of 902 and the Pyrigean charter of 959, what is
of note from the earlier charter is the obligation placed on Beornwulf to perform service in
the fyrd and to conduct bridge and fortress work. These dues must be considered,
alongside his leasing of the land, as potential factors that may have influenced
the designation of the stone to Beornwulf.

This does not mean that using the Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England in this
manner is invalid, in fact, our understanding of the early medieval landscape would only
benefit from including the personal names recorded in boundary clauses and identifying
any correlations with the existing database of named individuals. In any event, that

738 S 963.
739 Although see Byrfterths hlawe (S 543) and Byrfterth the recipient of the Odstock grant (S 400) in Study Area maps 8.2 and
7.3.
741 S 586 – not covered in the original study area charters; G. B. Grundy, ‘The Saxon Land Charters of Wiltshire’, Archaeological
Journal, 26 (1919), 143-301 at 293-5.
personal named monuments are more than just boundary markers is suggested by the association of named individuals with stones in other place-names – particularly those places that go on to become hundred-names but that are not recorded on boundaries. In the study areas, Kinwardstone is a fine example of this. Surviving as a farm name to the immediate south-east of Burbage, Cyneweard’s stone may have marked the crossing point of the major N/S and E/W aligned routes through the hundred (10.3). Brixton (Surrey), Tibblestone (Gloucs.) (the name meaning ‘Þēodbald’s stone’) and Ossulston (Middlesex) are just a few examples, from many outside the project study areas, of personally named stones that have leant their names to the hundred for which they are likely to have served as the meeting places.

So it seems likely that certain types of stones, such as the Copplestone, King’s Stone and stones with personal associations, sit more comfortably in a grouping that includes crosses, roods and crucifixes (discussed below) and are monuments with a meaning that transcends simple boundary demarcation. John Blair has observed that such monuments are not ‘in the first instance’ boundary markers and that if they were, there would be very many more references in the boundary clauses to them. Studies undertaken in Cornwall support this view where, during the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, granite crosses appear to have been set up to mark routes radiating out of church sites. Few relate to parish boundaries. The case of St Buryan provides an even clearer example. Here, not a single cross is recorded in the charter boundary clause whilst a total of forty-two have been identified on the ground, mostly situated on the course of a route.

One particular type of marker from the project study area that requires discussion are the stænan stapol [stone posts] that feature most prominently in Study Area 8. The use of the term stapol is instructive in that it has long been recognised as translating directly as ‘post, pillar or column’. The term occurs frequently as a boundary marker in Anglo-Saxon charters and very often in conjunction with routes. Whilst ceotan stapole (S 412), gæcges stapole (S 463) and Finces stapol (S 619, 811) [kite, cuckoo and finch] might feasibly, although not necessarily, be referring to timber posts (perhaps the trunks of dead trees), that the ‘stone’ qualifier is linked to the stapole element in this and other study areas, might suggest that when this landmark is mentioned, a very specific type of
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monument is being referred to. It is the regular spacing of the stone posts on the old herepath in Study Area 8 that goes furthest in supporting the notion that stapolas, ‘posts’ or ‘columns’, are actually Roman milestones that have survived into the late Saxon period. The closest comparable monument that can be found today in situ, is the stone post that sits on Stinsford Hill almost exactly a mile, on the Roman road, from the gates of the civitas of Dorchester. A beatan stapole (S 382) helps to describe the condition of such columns for, in the Leiden Glossary of circa. 800, the term Ungeb[e]itne stáne is glossed in Latin as non tunso lapide with both terms meaning effectively, ‘unbeaten’ or ‘unhewn’ stone. In this case then, the ‘beaten’ stapole may very well refer to a column of worked stone. Quite often these landmarks are associated with personal names and we saw in Study Area 6 the locations of a possible two columns called wigheardes stapele [Wigheard’s post] (6.2, 6.3, ST81NW/ST82SW). Elsewhere in the corpus of Anglo-Saxon charters Pinstanes stapole (S 488, S 511), Ælfheres stapole (S 800) puttan stapul (S 255) and pinagares stapule (S 1032) are referred to but it is difficult to know exactly what the association with an individual might entail. Only further research of these and other named stones might help to elucidate a clearer picture of the function of such edifices as boundary, assembly or way markers. What is clear however from the archaeological evidence from the third and fourth centuries is that the Salisbury basin was an area of dense settlement in the Romano-British period and it must be anticipated that a complex and extensive network of routes served the communities living around the area and within the valleys of the Bourne, Avon, Wylye, Nadder and Ebble. The stone posts on the old herepath, may well represent the course of Roman road and the same might be said for the ðone stenenan stapul, located on the herepath (7.4, SU21NW). A further stapol (7.3, SU12SW) is recorded on the white (or Wilton) way and if we entertain the possibility that such monuments are of Romano-British origin, they may provide the best indicators we have of Roman roads that are otherwise not as obvious as those that adopt the characteristically straight lines in the landscape.

Roods

Ic me on þisse gyrdel beluce and on godes helde bebeode

wið þane sara s[ht]ice, wið þane sara slege,
wið þane grymma gryre,

---


D. J. James, 'Settlement in the Hinterland of Sorviodunum', Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine, 103 (2010), 142-80.
I entrust myself to this staff, and commend myself to God’s guardianship (for protection) against the pricking of afflictions, against the blow of afflictions, against the awful horror, against the great terror that is hateful to each person, and against all that evil that invades the land.750

By comparison with stones, references to roods in the project study areas are rare and almost entirely confined to the Bradford-on-Avon study area (9). What has been presented in Study Area 9 is the maximum view for the interpretation of the OE rōd (‘rood’ as in ‘cross’) element used in the boundary clauses. Confusion with the OE hrēod [reed], rōd [a ‘rood’ of land] and rod [clearing] can easily lead to misinterpretation.751 In the case of the rodestan (S 727) we can be fairly certain as elsewhere this place-name, surviving as Radstone in Northamptonshire and recorded in 1086, has been interpreted as ‘a stone used as a socket for a rood’.752 As Alexander Rumble stresses, a consideration of the topographical contexts and compound elements is essential to making more assured interpretations of rōd, and in Burgred’s rood, the personal association and surrounding terrain, along with the marking of a prominent summit, weigh the evidence in favour of a wooden cross marking the way to Bradford-on-Avon.753 ‘The roods’ (ðære rodæ) that mark ðære stræt on ða streatan hlywan [the street to the great refuge] can also be placed in a visible location to traffic crossing the Frome at Farleigh Hungerford but necessarily, the interpretation must remain conjectural. The rodendich recorded in the boundary of the Edington charter (9.2 ST95NW) however seems very much more likely to warrant a translation of ‘reed(y) dyke’ than rood dyke.754

Rumble, by analysis of the poem The Dream of the Rood, also points to a range of other terms that may share a meaning with ‘rood’. Whilst the cross on which Christ is crucified is referred to in the poem on five occasions as a rōd, it is also called a bēam and
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trēow and this gave Rumble cause to speculate that, in fact, there may be a significance in the use of such elements in place-names. The obvious examples for trēow would be Hallatrow, Somerset (Helgetrev 1086) and Hallytreeholme, Yorkshire (Halitreholm 1175-90) and for beām Rumble draws attention to Bladbean, in Elham, Kent (Blodebeame 1226) where he concurs with J. K. Wallenberg’s interpretation that this is a reference to a red-oak. There could, however, be another interpretation of the blood element in this name. Also in The Dream of the Rood, we learn that not only was the cross decked with foliage, bejewelled, hung with garments and ‘drenched in gold’, it was also soaked in blood and at one point is described as shedding its own blood. This may provide the rationale behind the redeston in the Edington charter (S 765) (if it is not a scribal error for rodeston), the red stane and in particular, the readan rode [red rood] of the Winchester study area (2.2 SU43SE).

It is probably wrong, therefore, to seek out uniformity in the terminology being used and the manner in which it is applied to the entities being described in such instances. In fact, quite the opposite is likely to be the case; as far as popular practice is concerned, we should anticipate regional variation – both in terms of dialect, spellings and practices. In their respective studies of Anglo-Saxon perceptions to prehistoric burial mounds, Sarah Semple and Della Hooke have both observed the interchangeability of hlæw and beorh when describing barrows. There is clearly a lack of distinction (again in the terminology used) to discern prehistoric mounds from early medieval constructions and anthropogenic landscape features from comparable topography. One phrase however, that appears fourteen times in boundary clauses and a further four times in place-names, does exhibit a degree of uniformity and this is cristel-mæl or ‘Christ’s image’. Although no examples have been recovered from the project study areas, they are worthy of mention here primarily because they too have been observed to occupy roadside locations. John Blair has identified two next to fords, one on a headland, five on routes and at least two of the remaining six ‘likely to be on routeways’.
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Crossroads

A particular aspect of markers that the mapping of charter boundary clauses has identified is their common occurrence with crossroads. This has already been observed in the instance of certain named stones and there are undoubtedly practical considerations for placing such monuments or ‘messages’ at places where traffic converges. In the case of meeting stones, they form a permanent marker at a site to which people could travel from all around (for example, observe the centrality of the likely location of Cyneweard’s stone in Kinwardstone hundred 10.1 SU26SW). Accessibility and convenience to the greatest number of ‘moot’ attendees for stones with such a purpose was undoubtedly a consideration. As far as crosses are concerned, we are reminded of Rumble’s observation that such monuments should be seen primarily as ‘wayside edifices at which travellers pray to Christ’ and those ‘sited on significant hills or on coastal promontories’ as ‘landmarks for travellers’ as well as ‘Christian Symbols in the landscape’. It is likely that the same rules of visibility apply to execution sites and cemeteries where a roadside location has also been identified. So far, much of the emphasis here has been placed on articulations of belief systems in the landscape but execution sites undoubtedly represent articulations of power and control, with structures like gallows and heads placed on stakes designed to communicate that message to travellers both alien and familiar to the landscape. Yet, in both instances, is there more to their situation than just a roadside location? Is it the case that they actually occupy crossroad sites and actually allow us to project back into the early medieval period the later medieval and modern tradition of burying deviants and suicides in crossroad locations?

To the veneration of trees, shrines and holy wells can be added worship at crossroads as a practice deplored by the early medieval European church in both sermons and legislation. Martin of Braga, for example, writing his Reforming the Rustics in Gallaecia during the sixth century, is said to have lamented the habit travellers had of carrying stones to cairns at cross-roads for a sacrifice in honour of ‘Mercury’. Some five hundred years later Burchard of Worms, in his Corrector, inveighs against the same practice and also condemns the ritual of ploughmen, herdsmen and hunters secreting enchanted...
ligatures at crossroads to protect the animals on whose lives they depended. It is highly likely that such sources influenced the writings of Ælfric, who, writing in the late-tenth or early-eleventh century, warned against witches who resorted to crossroads to raise the evil dead. Similar condemnations can be found in chapter 16 of the Canons of Edgar, attributed to Wulfstan II of York who died in 1023. A less demonic aspect to crossroads is observed by John Blair who has drawn attention to C. A. R. Radford’s reference to a practice in Devon in the early-eleventh century of slaves being ceremonially freed at crossroads after a mass during summer.

The origins for such behaviour can be found in classical precedent and it is likely that the prevalence and variety of crossroad-related folklore and rituals throughout medieval Europe is based on a tradition with a deep time signature founded on a Roman cultural milieu. Some of the evidence Stephen Wilson has drawn together from the earliest written examples includes two associations with ‘dark’ deities. Hecate, the Greek goddess of witchcraft, ghosts and magic was invoked at a crossroads in the Aeneid and Plato recommended in The Laws that ‘certain criminals should be buried at a crossroads with a stone over their heads’. More specifically, Wilson suggests that the placing of statues of saints and of crosses at crossroads was ‘a custom continued perhaps’ from the Lares at crossroads. The Lares, guardian spirits and deified ancestors, were described by Varro in his De Lingua Latina (Book VI, Chapter 25), where he tells of how sacrifices are made to the Lares Compitales (‘Lares of the crossroads’) at crossroads. One is immediately drawn to consider the personal named stones and their apparent crossroad locations. Increasingly scholars of the early medieval period, stimulated by researches of prehistoric periods, are considering the landscape in terms of the longue durée wherein human action is informed and altered by knowledge of and/or the remains of past societies and communities. In this paradigm it is possible that such monuments went on to become the focus for the practices so reviled by the likes of Ælfric and Wulfstan. The long-term ritual transformation of these sites will be considered (below) but for now, it remains
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to explore briefly some of the evidence from the project study areas for crossroads and the types of monuments that appear to be associated with them.

Elsewhere the marking of crossroads by the Copplestone and by Beornwin’s stone has been explored in depth, and from other project study areas evidence supports the case for stones being crucial to the articulation of junctions. The *bræges pibæ* stone (1.7 SU45NW) may sit at the crossing of the ‘honey well way’ with what G. B. Grundy would term a ‘summerway’, a route that skirts the foot of the scarp slope parallel to the ridgeway. Both the King’s Stone and the hollow Stone can be seen to mark crossings of the Roman road by E/W ways traversing the downland to the north of Winchester, the latter of which is called the ‘London way’ (2.2 SU43SE, SU43NE). The King’s Stone might also be welcoming traffic coming from the north using the *wic herepath* that converges on the course of the Roman road at this location. It is possible from the reading of two boundary clauses on the Isle of Purbeck that the *weilaite* [ways’ meet] of S 534 and *anne stan* [a stone] of S 573 sit at the same location (5.1 SY98SE). The ‘stone that lies on the street’ almost certainly marks the junction of the major E/W ridgeway with the ‘Offa’s way/street’ that runs up past Winklebury and through the serf’s dyke gate (7.2 ST92SE) and Beornwulf’s stone also sits on a major E/W aligned ridgeway and marks the crossing of this with a route from Bica’s bridge to Wilton (7.3, 8.1 SU02NE).

The crossroad location of the *heafod stoccan* [heads stakes] in the Chalke estate (S 582) has already been discussed in Study Area 7 and there are indicators of judicial execution and the burial of social outcasts and deviants from other study areas. In Chapter Four attention was drawn to the small group of four charters, dated to between 774 and 801, within which detailed perambulations feature for the first time, written in Latin, whilst the actual boundary marks are written in Old English. These represent an important set of documents for the study of Anglo-Saxon boundaries, charters and the landscape both because of their dating but also because many of the terms used in Old English are glossed in Latin. This extra information allows for improved interpretations of what would otherwise be at best, enigmatic and at worst mundane landmarks. Two of these charters were covered in the project study areas and in each case, certain clauses are revealing of the character of particular places on both boundaries and at likely crossroads. The first concerns land at Little Bedwyn, covered in a charter dated to 774, where we learn of a
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This site of execution is recorded as being in close proximity to *illa antiqua monumenta in locum ubi a ruricolis dicitur aet dam holen styphum* [the ancient monuments in the place the locals call ‘at the holly (?hollow) stumps’].

Today the site is marked by Harrow Farm and, in view of the gallows and the ancient monuments, it seems satisfactory to suggest a derivation from Old English *hearg*, a term now thought to denote long-lived localised cult practice peaking in the late Iron Age and Romano-British periods.

The likely location for this monument is the intersection of a significant E/W aligned valley route with the N/W aligned route from Great Bedwyn and Chisbury hillfort to Ramsbury. Furthermore, the course of the *Cunetio to Spinæ* Roman road, although little trace can be found in the landscape of the twentieth century, would theoretically have passed very close to this location.

The second example from one of these early charters is found in a grant for land at Crux Easton and dated to 801. Here we learn of *uno acerbo lapidum quem nos stancestil uocamus* [an acerbic/bitter/sharp stone that we call (in Old English) a ‘stone cist’], *a curio habet cothongian*. The second half of this clause has proven difficult to translate with the authors of the Langscape translations preferring *eurio* [east] as a scribal error for *curio*.

The popular consensus on *cothongian* is a corruption of *hangra* [hanging wood] with *cat(t)* [cat] or *cot* [cottage]. However, the verb *habeo* [to have, hold] creates problems in this translation and a more literal translation, devoid of scribal errors, is offered here. If we see the *acerbo lapidum* as ‘embittered’ in a wronged and evil sense, it is logical that the ‘stone cist’ should be, ‘by the curate/priest, held to be the bed chamber of the hung’. Kit’s Coty, a megalithic portal dolmen over-looking the Medway provides a comparable link between stone chambered tombs and the *cot* element. The Hellstone in Dorset, the name given to a monument of similar date and structure, provides an analogous link with the presumable damnation the executed individuals of the *cothongian* had confronted. Elsewhere, the Devil’s Bed and Bolster, the name applied to the remains of a chambered tomb in Somerset, provides an example of a lingering association with the resting place of the damned and most famously, the *henge* element, as in ‘hanging’, appears in the name given
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to Stonehenge, a site known in the seventh century as a place of execution. Like Stonehenge, the *cothongian* sits at the convergence of a number of routes of which a ‘way’ and a ‘lord’s way’ is mentioned in the boundary perambulations for the area (1.6 SU45NW).

There are two incidences of the term ‘heathen burials’ in the project study areas and it is now believed that such features represent not the burial mounds and cemeteries of prehistoric peoples but the burials of early medieval outcasts and felons deprived of inhumation in consecrated ground and consigned to internment at boundary locations. Of the *hapenum byrgelsan* of the *Chalke* charter, it seems that a location between the hundreds of Downton and Chalke is likely, although they would be some distance (c. 1km, 0.6 miles) from the shire boundary between Hampshire and Wiltshire. They appear to lie at the junction of the Old Sarum to Dorchester Roman road with another major E/W ridgeway (7.3 SU02SE and the ‘street’ of ST92SE – although not marked on the map). Traffic passing on a NW/SE axis from Fordingbridge, Hampshire, to Broad Chalke, Wiltshire, and beyond could also feasibly pass through this point. The other reference to heathen burials comes from the Collingbourne Kingston charter where *þam haþenan byrgelsan* are much harder to locate. It is possible that they fall on or close to the N/S route from Old Sarum to *Cunetio* (a possible ‘Romanised’ ridgeway and the course on which both *Wylberhtes Stan* and Cyneweard’s stone may have stood 10.3) but without further wide-scale analysis of other routes around the area it is impossible to infer where these burials may have been.

In all of the above examples, a crossroads location for the siting of these monuments and the activities that took place at them is possible. Of course, in making the case for an almost endless number of possibilities for routes through the landscape of early medieval Wessex, one might see the significance of the coincidence of such sites with crossings and junctions as weakened. Perhaps however, it is the overlapping of these junctions with liminal areas that is of significance. The association of such sites with death, deviancy and the demonic goes some way to justifying the lines of *The Journey Charm* where it is clearly felt that outside of the protection of the central, the consecrated and the sacred, a *gyrde* [a rod/rood/crucifix] is needed to ward against ‘all the evil that invades the land’.
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Conversion processes and changing ritual landscapes

Nowhere is the profane and the sacred in the landscape better illustrated than through the evidence for conversion to Christianity. The range of wayside monuments and symbolism described above makes it clear that the landscape of early medieval Wessex was deeply imbued with messages and meanings conveyed between landscape and traveller. The landscape was sacred, mythologized and manipulated to fit ideological frameworks and political messages and these were conveyed to all who moved through them – orally at meeting places and through symbols, monuments and physical articulations of power. Thus, the traveller constructed a meaningful space in their mind; a ‘mental map’ punctuated by symbols that articulated both space and identity. All that remains now is to consider the degree to which, over time, particular landscape places and features may have changed and how traditional meanings may have been incorporated into new narratives.

We begin by looking at the evidence for stones and the reasons for ambiguity in the term ‘stone’, meaning either ‘standing stone’ or ‘stone cross’ may very well be the result of an enduring conversion process spanning hundreds of years. It is interesting how Wulfstan referred to the ‘King’s stone’ as being made in ‘ancient stone’. Was this in reference to the nature of the stone material being used or the re-working of an earlier stone monument? Richard Morris entertains the idea that, beyond the obvious use of prehistoric stones for building material, large monolithic orthostats would have been attractive for early medieval sculptors.

If the carving on the Copplestone is of Scandinavian design, is it possible then that the copelan stan as recorded in a reliable charter of 974 was in fact a standing stone and that a reworking of the stone took place in the reign of Cnut (1015x1035), the period when Scandinavian influence in Devon was at its strongest? That Cnut had a hand in the monumental inscription of the Devonian landscape through the medium of stone monoliths is in evidence from the place-name Knowstone, recorded as Chenutdestana in 1086 and Cnutsstan in 1220. This may be highly speculative, but where the worship of stones is concerned, conversion resonances are strong. Most explicitly, in the Vita S. Samsonis, Samson confronted the simulacrum abominabile on Bodmin Moor by carving a cross on a nearby stone and entreating the pagan peoples that it should be revered instead. Archaeological examples of this practice are known from Brittany where Iron
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Age Stele have been adulterated with later Christian Crosses, most visibly illustrated by the
Croas-Men at Lampaul-Ploudalmézean in Finistère.\textsuperscript{793} Closer to home, the Long Stone in
East Worlington Devon, a four-sided standing stone, has had crosses carved into each face.
It sits on the Crediton to South Molton herepath that is served by two ‘planked’ bridges,
connecting the minster of South Molton with the Bishop’s seat in Crediton (at SX 277500
115900). It has also been suggested that the Anglian cross, a tall monolith from Bewcastle
in Cumbria, was carved from a salvaged Roman column rather than a result of \textit{ad hoc}
quarrying in the seventh century.\textsuperscript{794}

Whilst we can be confident the crosses marking the funeral procession of
Aldhelm’s body along the Fosse Way to Malmesbury were a feature in the landscape of
William of Malmesbury’s time, is the story of how they came about to be taken quite so
literally? With a lingering supernatural significance to stones set at crossroads and the clear
evidence from this project’s study areas that Roman stone way-markers existed in the
landscape well into the tenth century, could it be that the ‘crosses’ or ‘bishop’s stones’
William informs us of are commandeering a more ancient tradition of reverence towards
wayside (and perhaps even crossroad) sacred stones?

This coercing of earlier stones into later conceptual frameworks would have been
an ongoing process. From Study Area 8, the location of Beornwin’s stone is dependent on a
new reading, as an anti-clockwise perambulation, of the boundary clause for a charter for
land at \textit{Winterburnan} (8.2 SU13SE – see discussion in Chapter Four). The placement of the
stone at the NE corner of the estate is, however, bolstered by reference to a later
monument in this location. In October 1651, \textit{en route} to exile, Charles II retired to
Clarendon Palace where, contemplating his fate, he walked to ‘Park Corner’ where we are
informed that the Beckett Cross stood.\textsuperscript{795} Park Corner lies in the very northern tip of
Clarendon Park at the angle where the ‘fort way’ intersects both the Roman road and a
WNW/ESE aligned route. The dedication of the church in Salisbury to St Thomas, St
Thomas’s Bridge (on the site of what was once the ‘deep ford’) and Beckett’s cross
articulate the popular pilgrim route taken towards the martyr’s shrine at Canterbury and it
seems only natural that Beornwin’s Stone, a monument whose meaning and function may
very well have become remote and obscure in the early thirteenth century, found itself
incorporated into a later geography of travel.

\textsuperscript{793} B. Cunliffe, \textit{Facing the Ocean: The Atlantic and Its Peoples} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) 346, Figure 8.27.
\textsuperscript{794} T. Eaton, \textit{Plundering the Past: Roman Stonework in Medieval Britain} (Stroud: Tempus, 2000), 16.
\textsuperscript{795} T. Beaumont-James and C. Gerrard, \textit{Clarendon Park: Landscape of Kings} (Macclesfield: Windgather Press, 2007) 99-100,
Figure 42.
One landscape feature common in boundary clauses but not covered in any depth by this research project, are trees. In many cases they can be seen to bear the same characteristics as stones and are similarly drawn into a Christian worldview. Returning to William of Malmesbury, we are told of how Aldhelm, while preaching, stuck his ashen staff in the ground where from it instantly ‘grew to a marvellous size, quickened with sap and covered with bark, having put forth young leaves and beautiful branches’. It is likely William is referring to the modern-day Bishopstrow, Wiltshire, (Biscopestreu 1086) where the parish church is dedicated to St Aldhelm but again, is the ritual significance of Aldhelm’s staff commemorating an existing reverence in that place to a sacred ash tree? Whilst reference has already been made to ‘hallow’ trees (above), the circumstances surrounding the place-name Cressage in Shropshire is potentially an intriguing example of the long-term ideological significance of a particular place. The earliest surviving record of the place-name is Cristesache (1086) meaning ‘Christ’s Oak’ and Margaret Gelling has identified the ‘Lady Oak’ to the NW of the present village as a former location for this sacred monument. Here she observes the hulk of an ancient oak supported by a younger tree and goes on to say that ‘successive replacements could have been recurring since Saxon times’. Both Gelling and Alex Rumble speculate that the tree may have carried a crucifix but it is also important to note the crossroad location of the village. One aspect this study has not taken in to account is the significance of trees that appear to share a number of attributes with stones. They clearly function as meeting places, roadside locations are important and, as Gelling and Rumble both suggest, they may also have found themselves marked and symbolised – perhaps as part of a ‘conversion’ process. There are a number of trees associated with personal names in the project study areas. Briefly, and with translations offered, these are; helmes treowes (Helm’s trees), beredes trowe (Bered’s tree), lullyngestrowe (Lulla’s people’s tree), beornwunne treow (Beornwyn’s tree), brunwoldes treow (Brunwoldes tree), egesan treow (Egsa’s tree), waccas treow (?watch/lookout person’s tree) and scyldes Treowe (?the guilty one’s tree). Whilst there are no specific elements here such as cristes or hālig to imply a form of sacredness, in some instances these may, of course, be mere boundary markers. Yet, a greater understanding of the role and function of trees and their relationship to issues of travel and communication
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can only be gained by expanding the landscape and charter-based approach to a wider study area.

The rich variety of ideologically charged terminology that we find associated with stones, trees, crossroads and wells has led John Blair to comment that this is a reflection of the types of sacred features that are gradually being incorporated into a Christian ambit and that, as such, this may be telling us as much about conversion practices. He writes, ‘The rituals and folk magic which centred on such places, and gave them their significance, were themselves an area of negotiation between normative Christianity and popular belief’ and that it is only when we get to the writings of Ælfric and Wulfstan in the eleventh century that we get an open hostility to pagan sites which previously was notably absent.801 The evidence from the project study areas tentatively concurs with Audrey Meaney’s ‘inclusive practices’ whereby an early sacred geography was assimilated into a Christian world.802 If we envisage a degree of tolerance for such places and their incorporation into ninth- and tenth-century cultural norms – whether as places for continued reverence or execution – is it the case that roods and cristel mæls represent a slightly different Christian geography? In contrast to sacred trees and stones, these are overt Christian symbols. To a degree, they share a uniformity of terminology and probably appearance in terms of materials used. They are likely to have been made of wood (two of the fourteen cristel mæls recorded in boundary clauses are associated with oaks and one with a beam) and the term cristel mæl (‘Christ’s image) is so literal it has led Blair to suggest that an actual figure rather than just a cross was being depicted here.803 For roods and crucifixes, Rumble cautiously (because of the bias in charter distribution) puts forward the idea that in the north and east midlands, ON kross and OE cros seem to have replaced rōd and in the south Cristel-mæl is ‘seemingly [being] more common than, or as common as’ OE rōd.804 Is this a reflection however of the growing number of pilgrims on the road in the later Anglo-Saxon period? Whilst we know of pilgrimages being made as early as the seventh century, the rise of popular pilgrimages in the later tenth and eleventh century presents us with a journeying community that, unlike traders, envoys, messengers and the army, were unfamiliar with the landscapes through which they had to travel. Whilst guides (particularly for the blind) are recorded in some of the accounts of these journeys, many people, through their lack of knowledge of regional and national geography, clearly placed themselves in the hands of God when

801 Blair, The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society 481-83.
803 Blair, The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society 479, footnote 240.
taking to the road. The evidence for the placement of roods and crucifixes doesn’t seem to suggest that a crossroads location is important but rather that a roadside location in a visible position is of primary concern (especially in the instance of the Bradford-on-Avon study area). These are monuments not, like sacred stones and trees, whose meaning has been refashioned for a local community but monuments placed anew in the landscape to guide an ever greater number of lower-status pilgrims to the churches at whose shrines miracle cures was to be received.

This brings us back to the ‘experience’ of travelling in the landscape of early-medieval Wessex. This section on ‘markers’ has been dedicated to trying to gain an insight into what it must have been like to have experienced and engaged with the landscape as one moved around it. The various features that have been listed and discussed here were no doubt intended to inform people’s concept of space, both physically and conceptually, and in ‘lived’ landscapes of the past we must anticipate the entailing of myths, whether these myths are explicitly known or implicitly understood. For one of Europe’s most popular pilgrimages in both the modern and medieval periods, it has been asserted that the archaeological remains and images along the road highlight the merging of myth and landscape and the construction of tradition on the Camino de Santiago. ‘Landscape’ in this context therefore becomes an act or ‘process’ that engages with the world. Elsewhere this has been observed most clearly in the siting of rock-art in hunter-gatherer communities where visibility and a relationship with natural features plays a key role in the significance and meaning, especially when incorporated into a knowledge base that is predicated on memory and story-telling.

Through analysis of markers in the early medieval landscape of Wessex, it is clear that meaning was being conveyed and communicated through a number of symbols and monuments as people travelled past them or to them. The methodology adopted by this thesis and the findings derived from it, will therefore only serve to contribute to a geography of pilgrimage, a growing understanding of which is being derived from archaeological investigation where it is clearly the case that the ‘architecture’ of pilgrimage should focus as much on the roads, bridges, hospitals and cemeteries that were as much a part of the enormous physical infrastructure of pilgrimages as where the shrines themselves.

Access in the Early Medieval Landscape of Wessex

The application of access analysis to archaeological sites and standing buildings is a growing and fruitful area of study for our understanding of how social space was organised amongst past societies. Applications of these methods on a grander scale – i.e. to the archaeology of landscapes – has been restricted primarily to the archaeological analysis of frontier zones where studies are characterised by their emphasis on cultural contact and zones of ‘cross-cutting’ social networks. One way in which to understand movement in the landscape is to attempt to understand how access was restricted and controlled and the evidence for gates and stiles in the early medieval landscape of Wessex provides an opportunity to explore not only the symbolic but also the practical considerations of controlling the movement of both humans and livestock through the landscape.

It was first suggested that the numerous gates referred to in the charter boundary clauses for grants of Little Bedwyn, Great Bedwyn and Burbage represented a continuation of the Wansdyke frontier in a paper presented by the author and Andrew Reynolds in 2006. In Study Area 10 the evidence is set out in cartographic form and the location of the gates is justified partly on the basis of local place-names and partly on the alignment of the parish boundary. In 2010 Ben Lennon drew up a similar distribution map attempting to place this sequence of gates in relation to evidence for linear earthworks derived from previous antiquarian investigations and the 2006 LiDAR survey conducted by the forestry commission. Ultimately Lennon questioned the continued course of Wansdyke through Savernake Forest on the grounds that there is no evidence for a ‘large linear feature’ and in his critique attention was drawn to the fact that the term used in the boundary clause to describe the form of the boundary between each gate was *septum*, the Latin for ‘fence’ or ‘hedge’, and not *vallum*, meaning ‘dyke’.
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813 Ibid. 286. S 264 – the charter for Little Bedwyn dating to 774 and with a lengthy Latin boundary clause but with landmarks in Old English.
This is not the place to address the individual issues raised in Lennon’s excellent review of the evidence but it is important to draw attention to the fact that elsewhere the use of the term *haga* to describe linear boundaries in areas of both dense woodland and wood pasture is common. Figure 17 illustrates the number of hedges (both *haga* and *septi*) that are referred to in Study Areas 1 and 10 and it is clear from this evidence that this was an area (in contrast to the other study areas) where physical linear boundaries and gates controlled access and movement in the early medieval period. What needs to be envisaged however is that this was likely to have been the case in the late Iron Age and Romano-British period too. In Savernake, for example, a thriving pottery industry, now thought to have its origins in the late Iron Age but peaking in the Roman-British period, is represented by a number of kiln sites located within the dense woodland.\(^{814}\) The requirement for a plentiful and well-managed supply of coppice wood for firing and burnishing would have necessitated protective boundaries. The point is also made by Joanna Ramsay and Graham Bathe that where short stretches of dyke are in evidence in this area, they are over the chalk bedrock (rather than the clay) and it is the protection of valuable arable land that is of concern to the dyke builders.\(^{815}\) Figure 18 illustrates the density of arable production (thought to be of Iron Age and Roman date)\(^{816}\) in an area to the immediate south of Savernake Forest (depicted via a red rectangle in Figure 17) and it seems likely that this area of clear arable productivity was bounded by a *haga* referred to in the charters to the immediate north (SU26SW).

Anticipating a frontier laid out between Wessex and Mercia, the key reason to postulate a continued course for Wansdyke, it is highly likely that such a boundary would have been restricted by the existing geography of the region. Over the open expanses of the chalk downland the course of a large bank and ditch could have been predetermined. However, through a densely subdivided landscape of enclosed woodland, no such luxury could be afforded and an existing arrangement of linear boundaries would have required negotiation. To seek an earthwork in Savernake Forest is to preconceive the form such a boundary would take on this geology and through this terrain. Most commentators on the dykes in this region have observed that over the clay they are inconsistent in form, but perhaps this inconsistency is borne out of the fact that the chosen method of barrier
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construction in this region comprised of hagas or septi which made use of the existing timber and brash resources to create what is known in modern hedging parlance as a ‘dead hedge’. Although themselves potentially formidable boundaries, they leave little in the way of archaeological evidence.

It is re-iterated here that the Wansdyke frontier fits more comfortably within a seventh and eighth-century context, a period characterised by a pan-European tradition of drawing up large linear frontiers. Its function and purpose is almost certainly bound up with a sense of emerging ‘national’ identity and the articulation of power. On the ground level however, whilst the pure military practicalities of such monuments has always been in question, it is useful to consider Ramsay and Bathe’s comments that it is only to wheeled traffic that such physical boundaries represent any real obstacle. This is a crucial observation for the purposes of understanding these monuments and their wider function in the landscape during the middle Saxon period. Attention has been drawn to the Peadan stigele (10.4, SU36SW), pyddes geate (SU36SE) and pædes paþe (SU36SW), all interpreted as references to pedestrian access, and this is a clear indication of a differentiation made in this region between those paths that were accessible to carts and those that were restricted to the movement of pedestrians alone.

When we consider the other major infrastructure developments of the middle Saxon period, at the forefront stand the vast trading complexes – the wics – of which Hamwic is Wessex’s key site. Royal control of such centres has been presumed to explain their genesis as the king’s social standing – and thus his power – depended heavily on his ability to redistribute wealth amongst his immediate followers. The link between King Ine (688x726) and Hamwic has been made explicit and Martin Welch has suggested that its establishment was a direct result of Ine’s desire to bring in luxury goods from the Frankish realm. It is perhaps then in this context, one presuming an economic function, that such linear monuments, designed to restrict traffic, should be seen. If a significant aspect of kingship in middle Saxon England concerns the control of trade – Joachim Henning’s ‘Command’ economy – it may very well be that steps were taken at the same time to prevent the passing of bulk goods (using carts) outside of a predetermined trading zone or equally, to arrest the influx of cheaper bulk imports. Whether or not we accept the
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continuation of a linear monument, the gates in this area do exactly that: They restrict the free-flow of wheeled traffic along a N/S corridor of movement that connects the major rideways to the south with the Icknield Way to the north.

One other area where we might consider it important to restrict and control access is in the management of livestock and there is some circumstantial evidence from the project study areas to suggest that livestock were not only being controlled on a local level but also in their transportation over longer distances. The *lunden weg* [London Way] clearly takes a course that bypasses Winchester. This may be an early sign of the economic pull exerted by London beyond its immediate hinterland and evidence that traders from the South West were choosing to ignore the financial lure of Winchester for, presumably, greater reward in London. It may also have something to do with the keeping of an important commodity that used this route – i.e. large herds of cattle – as far away as convenient from the *urbs* and arable ‘inland’ of Winchester? Chapters 9, 10 and 11 of Edgar’s Code issued at *Wihtbordesstan* are all concerned with witnesses and cattle purchases and cover various eventualities and scenarios that might arise as a result of rustling and illegal trading. In particular, the stress on witnesses to purchases made outside the boroughs (chps. 6, 6.1, 6.2) and the proximity of this chapter of the code to those concerning both ‘riding out’ to make purchases (chp. 7) and the bringing in of purchased livestock to common pasture for witnessing (chp. 8).822 This all describes a form a trading quite different, in practical terms, from the trading of goods within the *burhs* and the London Way may therefore represent an early form of drove road by which cattle brought up from the West Country were traded and exchanged on a trade and drove route that had London at its terminus.

David Hill continues the London Way west past Wilton and on as far as Ilchester (Figure 2).823 Along this course, the route takes up the alignment of nineteenth-century Ox Drovers recorded in early editions of Ordnance Survey maps. North of Winchester, the London Way is referred to as an Ox Drove, and the stretch running west from Wilton as far as the junction with the A303 (a likely continuation of the Harroway) is also referred to as an Ox Drove. Similar Ox Drovers, deviating from this ‘London Way’ to the south west of Wilton, bound the Ebble Valley to the north and south and converge on a point just outside Shaftesbury whilst a further spur runs to the SW towards crossings of the Rivers Iwerne and Stour. In the Shaftesbury study area there is good evidence of the importance of cattle and
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dairying to the local economy. A smeriate [greasy or butter gate] may be an echo of the terminology Harold Fox has argued indicates a form of outdoor butter-making associated with transhumance.\textsuperscript{824} Two separate references to a ‘cow gate moor’ and an oxene bridge refer directly to the presence of a bovine-based economy and the hig weg discussed in Study Area 6 indicates the requirement for hay for winter feeding (6.2, 6.3).

Whilst it is risky to use nineteenth-century references to Ox droves as indicators of the early medieval movement of livestock, if cattle were being moved over long distances in the tenth and eleventh centuries, they would almost certainly have made use of similar terrain: open downland where the prevalence of ridgeways can keep the potentially hazardous trampling of cattle away from valley bottom settlements, hay meadows and arable fields. The ‘oxen bridge’ has been placed at the point where the OS records a ‘ridgeway lane’ crossing the River Stour and this may represent a recognition that this route continued up on to the high ground to the east. Continuing past the meeting place of Six Penny Hundred, referred to as \textit{ðies littlen Seaxpennes} in the charter for Fontmell, there is a ‘Drove Lane’ recorded on the nineteenth-century OS map. On the ridgeways to the north and south of the Ebble Valley, where Ox Drovers are recorded in the nineteenth century, a number of cross dykes are located across downland spurs. The dating of these is unknown but as we saw in Study Area 7, the one recorded as the ‘serfs’ dyke’ (7.2 ST92SE) may reflect that at least some are of an early medieval origin and perhaps constructed to aid in the channelling of cattle along the ridgeways and again, away from arable and pastoral areas in valley bottoms.

Finally, the gates in the Buttermere and Æscmere area and in the Upper Itchen Valley east of Alresford bound two very different types of pasture, downland and woodland respectively. It might not only be the wood pastures identified by Christopher Currie in the Stoneham and New Forest areas that were supplying Hamwic with its bovine goods.\textsuperscript{825} The analysis of the faunal remains from Hamwic have demonstrated that a well-managed and ‘productive’ hinterland was serving the emporium with a large number of high quality beasts for slaughter and this hinterland may well have stretched to the upper reaches of the Itchen Valley where eight gates are recorded (four of which fall outside of 2.1 SU63NW).\textsuperscript{826} In which case, cattle from this locale could have been driven SW on one of the

many ways that are recorded in the charter boundary evidence and that intersect the South Downs Way (2.1 SU52). Thus Hamwic was provided with meat, bone and leather for consumption and processing but the Buttermere area (Map 1.7) may well have been providing the dairy products. Transported to the possible minster at Hurstbourne Priors (perhaps from Upton down the Bourne Rivulet), various dairy products could then be floated down the River Test from the stæpas [landing places] referred to in Map 1.5 (SU44NW).
Chapter Eleven: Bridges, Herepaths, Trade Routes and the King’s Peace

In the following chapter the case will be made for *herepaths* representing purposely-constructed routes and the likely product of a form of military obligation. To arrive at this conclusion the obligation placed on landholders from the mid-eighth century onwards to build bridges will be assessed in relation to the evidence for bridges from the project study areas. The character of both the term *herepath* and the form these routes take in the landscape will be scrutinised with a view to offering an interpretation on their role and function as public works designed to contain the threat posed by Viking (and other) raiding, and as corollaries through which the emerging overland trade of the later Anglo-Saxon period could develop.

The chapter will explore some of the evidence, both from the study areas and by analogy to other examples, for the origins and development of the *herepath* network and it will explore how the evidence can help us to establish on whom the burden for maintenance fell. *Herepaths* were, of course, not the only routes in the landscape and in this discussion it will be demonstrated that charter boundary clauses provide clear indications of a hierarchy of routes of differing function and use – from the local to the national. In the increasingly numerous documentation of the later Anglo-Saxon and immediate post-Conquest period, evidence for a legal status attached to certain roads suggests an emerging ‘highway code’ and the project study areas will be reviewed for the evidence there is in support of this.

Chapter Three reviewed the debates concerning the development of the early medieval economy and considered how the shift from coastal *emporia*, ‘productive’ sites and minster/estate centres to an economy characterised by a hierarchy of towns will have impacted upon the landscape of travel and communication. Thus, in this chapter, the evidence for trade and trade routes from the project study areas will be presented and related to what we know of urban development and economic trends from the eighth to the eleventh centuries. This ultimately brings us to consider the issue of change in the landscape of travel and communication in early medieval Wessex. Throughout therefore, the chapter will assess how changes identified in wider Anglo-Saxon society and economy are identifiable in the charter boundary clause evidence for routes. What has become clear from the undertaking of this research project, is that many more avenues of enquiry have opened up. These will be phrased as recommendations for future research and presented
alongside a summary of the major findings of this research project in a concluding section that will bring the thesis to a close.

**Bridge-work, Fortress-work but no Road-work**

By the end of the eighth century, the *Trinoda Necessitas*, a three-fold obligation to undertake work on bridges, forts and in the host army appears to have become a standard feature of landholding in Anglo-Saxon England.\(^{827}\) These obligations were seen as burdens from which no one was relieved and they have attracted the attention of numerous commentators concerned with its implementation for the purposes of defending the realm.\(^{828}\) As we saw in Chapter One, the proximity in texts of the obligation to work on forts with the obligation to construct and repair bridges naturally caused commentators to see the two as, in Nicholas Brookes’ words, ‘a single military unit’; defended ‘bridge-heads’ across major rivers.\(^{829}\) Whilst there can be little doubt that this approach to the defence of Britain’s navigable waterways clearly played a major part in arresting the speed with which the Viking hordes could penetrate inland, this neat link between bridges and forts is not without its problems. This is because despite the requirement to build bridges appearing in charters as early as the mid-eighth century, there seems to be very little evidence both archaeologically and in documentary sources for a significant number of bridges before the tenth century. To quote Alan Cooper’s maxim, we have ‘Bridge-work but no bridges’.\(^{830}\)

There are nine bridges recorded in the project study areas and, analysed in their wider landscape context, together they enable some commentary on a programme of bridge-building proposed by both David Harrison and Alan Cooper to have taken place during the later centuries of the Anglo-Saxon period.\(^{831}\) The ‘king’s bridge’ recorded in the boundary clause of a charter for land at Sorley (S 704), in Churcstow, goes on to lend its name to the fortified promontory town known today as Kingsbridge and is believed to be part of a scheme in Devon within which major bridges were constructed at fortified sites across the heads of estuaries in order to defend against river-borne attack.\(^{832}\) This fits then with the view that the military obligation to build bridges resulted in structures with
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primarily a defensive role. However, the remaining bridges in this project’s study area are all associated with routes and not directly with forts. The *beoccan* bridge [7beech], planked-bridge, Bica’s bridge, Creedy bridge, wood bridge, broom bridge, oxen bridge and the stone bridge are all to be found servicing routes across small streams to moderate rivers.

The *beoccan* bridge of the Sorley charter does not make up a boundary mark in the perambulation but is rather a reference to the destination of a route that does. Other commentators, on etymological grounds, have associated it with Bickham Bridge some distance to the north and if this can be substantiated, such a bridge would facilitate the crossing of the Avon River for traffic travelling directly from Modbury to Totnes (4.3 SX75NW).833 The planked-bridge to the north of Crediton lies on the course of a *herepath* and as we have seen, a second Thelbridge (derived from *ðel bricge* meaning ‘planked-bridge’) appears again as a place-name further north on the same course (presumably) as it makes its way to South Molton (3.2 SS80SW). There are two other examples of planked bridges from Anglo-Saxon charter bounds and these occur as far afield as Kent (S 535) and Shropshire (S 723). In the second instance, the bridge is referred to as ‘of *þæl bricge to þære heh stræte*’, clearly in conjunction with a ‘high-street’ and likely to be the Roman road that lent its name to Church Stretton. Bica’s bridge improves access to Wilton and Shaftesbury (both *Burghal Hidage* forts) for settlements south of the Ebble River (7.1 SU02NE) and the Creedy bridge serves the well-documented course of the *herepath* from Crediton to Exeter and the east (3.1 SS80SW). The stone bridge recorded, potentially as late as the eleventh century, to the immediate north of Corfe and in the gap of the ridge, undoubtedly played a crucial role in providing access from the Isle of Purbeck to Wareham and beyond (5.2 SY98SE). The ‘broom’ bridge of the Chilcomb charter survives as Brambridge to the south of Winchester and provides a crossing of the Itchen on the most direct route between the minsters of Romsey and Bishop’s Waltham.834

Two observations can be made about the bridges in the project study areas. In the first instance, the link between bridges and significant routes, and in particular *herepaths*, is apparent. This tends to further shift the emphasis away from bridges – and by implication, bridge-work – as defensive bridge-heads over navigable rivers and more towards bridges as key components on a route network that facilitated movement around

---

the landscape. Of the nine bridges mentioned in the study areas, seven (over 75%) can be
seen to either serve a herepath or sit on a route that connects burh to minster, burh to
burh or minster to minster. In only one study area do the bridges appear to serve only very
minor functions of linking lesser manorial centres either with the wider network of routes
or with their own resources in the more remote parts of the estate (Study Area 6).

The second observation to be made is in the character of these bridges. Four out of
the five bridges where the name indicates the material of construction, were made of
wood. The instance of the stone bridge at Corfe might be seen as exceptional in that this is
an area famed for the availability of good building stone and, perhaps more importantly, as
Susan Kelly surmised, the reference to it may well derive from a post-Conquest source.835
Yet even in this situation, as John Blair and Andrew Millard demonstrated in Oxfordshire,
the term bridge might just as well refer to a causeway as much as it does to a structure that
actually passes over running water.836 From the project study areas the ‘broom’ bridge
gives a similar sense of meaning with the broom element perhaps referring to a causeway
reinforced with brush-wood, gorse or broom. Elsewhere the strongest evidence for bridge
meaning ‘causeway’ comes from the bounds of Old Swinford in Worcestershire (S 579)
where an eorthbrycge [earth bridge] is recorded. Across the Test the broom bridge finds a
parallel in a risbrigge, referred to in a charter for Romsey (S 812) and a derivation, in this
instance, from hrīs [brushwood] is possible.837 Archaeological evidence for causeways
dated to this period comes from St Aldates, Oxford and a timber causeway linking Mersea
Island to the mainland of Essex.838 The latter, where it is presumed a series of horizontal
timers were secured to the excavated vertical piles, may indicate the form taken by the
various ‘planked’ bridges both in the study area and elsewhere. Otherwise, the wood
bridge, beech bridge and planked bridge are all clear indications of timber constructions
and they fit alongside references to stoc bridges,839 beam bridge840 and perhaps stapul
bridge841 (although see discussion of stænan stapols in Chapter Ten) as clear indicators that
Saxon bridges were primarily wooden structures.

In summary; ‘bridge-work’, despite its proximity to work on forts in the trinoda
necessitas, seems, from the charter boundary clause evidence, to be concerned with the
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improvement and amelioration of passage across low-lying river plains and are critically linked more to herepaths than they are to burhs. In fact, support for this comes from contemporary sources from the continent. Charles the Bald’s bridge-building endeavours, famously epitomised by the Pont de l’Arche, are mostly associated with the kind of bridgehead structures designed to prevent the free movement of Viking fleets along Francia’s navigable rivers. In his Edict of Pîtres (862 – 869) however, there is a suggestion that such structures were not his only concern. Firstly, the obligations he imposed on his subjects are described as iuxta antiquam et aliarum gentium consuetudinem [according to ancient custom and the custom of other peoples] and the ‘other peoples’ are believed by some commentators to be the Anglo-Saxons. The text goes on though to stipulate work on civitates novas [new cities] and pontes ac transitus paludium [bridges and passages across swampy ground]. The clear implication here is that the crossing of the river was as much about building a causeway – a road – across uncertain ground as it was about building the structure that crosses the running water. This further supports the case for bridgework in Anglo-Saxon charters implying work on roads. The connection between these structures and the major thoroughfares identified in the study areas present the case for an obligation placed on estates for the maintenance and upkeep of the roads of the kingdom. This is our first suggestion that herepaths may represent these routes and may be named so as a result of this obligation.

*Herepaths and the Hierarchy of Anglo-Saxon Routes*

That the link between the trinoda necessitas and the Anglo-Saxon road system has not received a greater degree of investigation is perhaps understandable in view of two seemingly insurmountable obstacles. Firstly, explicit references to work carried out on roads in the Anglo-Saxon period are extremely rare. Only two have been recovered by this research project from the historical sources and the idiosyncratic nature of these references does not in any way imply a route network subject to regular, state-funded maintenance.

---

844 H. R. Loyn, *The Governance of Anglo-Saxon England*, 500-1087 (London: Edward Arnold, 1984) 155. There is a reference in the *Canons of Edgar*, in the section entitled ‘Of Penitents’, to redemptions of penance by gift which include the building of churches, the gift of land to the church, improvement of highways and the building of bridges, in McNeill and Gamer,
Secondly, where the *trinoda necessitas* appears written in Old English in charters, the term *fyrd* is consistently used as a translation for expeditionary/military service and yet, the term *here* is almost ubiquitous in its association with paths in the Anglo-Saxon landscape.845 This dichotomous situation between *fyrd* and *here* is exacerbated by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which consistently refers to the marauding Danish army as the *here* and the defending Saxon forces as the *fyrd*. Thus with the term *here* comes connotations of lawlessness, raiding and pillaging. Chapter thirteen of the laws of king Ine state that: 

*Deofas we hateð oð VII men; from seofon monnum hloð oð XXXV; siððan bið here [we use the term ‘thieves’ if the number of men does not exceed seven, ‘band of marauders’ for a number between seven and thirty-five. Anything beyond this is a ‘raid’].*846 The *here* in this instance were clearly being associated with thievery and gang-like behaviour and ultimately, something that must be legislated against. This situation has led one commentator to suggest that on no account can the *here* element in *herepaths* be associated with an army charged with the maintenance and upkeep of roads.847 Other appearances of the *here* element in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* go no further to reconciling the term with the notion of an orderly and disciplined force concerned with the defence of the realm. The *herebeacen* are the war-signals ignited by the Danish as they travelled from their winter camp on the Isle of Wight to Reading, the *here-hyð* is the booty and spoil with which they went on to reward themselves and the *heregild* was the taxed raised in an attempt to pay-off such lawless banditry.848 The last of these though is a tax raised specifically to deal with the issue and what if *herepaths* are so named because they too were designed specifically to deal with the problem of the *here*?

A closer analysis of the distribution of the term identifies the fact that, for the most part, *herepaths* recorded in charter boundary clauses and as place-names are restricted to Wessex.849 In Kent they are not nearly as frequent and they are less abundant in the West-Midlands where Della Hooke has observed that whilst they are of ‘a limited number’, they nonetheless played a ‘particular role in the Anglo-Saxon period, one connected with the defence of the kingdom, and were maintained to a standard facilitating the easy movement

---

845 For the use of *fyrd* in conjunction with military obligations in Anglo-Saxon charters see S 218, ‘butan fyrdsocne & fæstengeworce & brycggeweorce’; S 333, ‘fyrdc & brycgewerces’; S 355 ‘fyrdc & fæstingewerces’; S 514, ‘fyrdære, and brycgwurce, and burhbohte’; and S 1032, ‘fyrdsocne & burhgeworce & brycgworce’.


848 ASC 1006.

of troops’. In its various forms, the term appears almost exclusively in charter boundary clauses and references to it are rare outside of Anglo-Saxon charters. In fact, whilst in Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses herepaths are referred to on no less than 292 occasions, a mere three references to them can be found outside of the charters. These appear in the Book of Daniel in the Junius Manuscript and once each in Beowulf and the poem Judith. We have already seen from the project study areas that the term seems to have been applied to a specific identity, a type of route that uniformly connects the main central places of Anglo-Saxon Wessex. There is also however, a uniformity in the application of the term itself. Rarely does it come with a qualifier. Of the 79 times it is mentioned in this research project’s database, on only fifteen occasions is any descriptive terminology applied to it and these are restricted to ‘old’ (x5), ‘broad’ (x4), wic (x4) and beod (x 2). Compare this to 168 ‘ways’ where in 96 cases, a vast range of terms are used to describe the colour, shape, condition, ownership and function of these routes.

Scrutinizing in even greater detail the term herepath, we might explore why the – paþ element prevails (in all but two cases) over –weg. Paþ or pap has naturally drawn comparisons with the Greek πάτος [trodden or beaten way], but the occurrence of the original initial p in Teutonic is uncertain, making correspondence with the pre-Teutonic bat- and a suggested route of Latin batuĕre [to beat] the more likely borrowing. In either case though, and as with the modern sense of the meaning, a ‘path’ is something that is trodden and although not formerly ‘constructed’ it is a purposefully made thoroughfare. ‘Way’ on the other hand, with an Indo-Germanic root and a sense development influenced by the Latin via, perhaps has a more generic meaning of ‘a track prepared or available for travelling along; a road, street, lane or path’ simply because such routes already existed in the landscape. They were open passages through the land- and seascape, corollaries that needed no maintenance but simply existed and through which movement could pass at will. These routes then are set against the ‘paths’ that needed treading afresh by the Anglo-Saxons. The predominance of ‘ways’ on the open downland in, for example, the eastern half of the Shaftesbury study area (6.1) and on the downs to the SE of Winchester (2.1) along with the repeated association with the qualifier ridge- in charter boundary clauses

(x20) indicates something of their character. Whilst the Harro-, Icknield, London, ridge- and ‘British’ ways are all legacies of an earlier age determined as much by the natural lie of the land, the pædes (probably from Latin pedes [foot traveller, walker]) (S 756), horse (S 640), Cutherd’s (S 756), Strutherd’s (S 534) and the various here- paths are all routes beaten out and trodden in a working early medieval landscape. We are reminded here of O. G. S. Crawford’s division of all roads into two classes; natural tracks and made roads.\(^{854}\) The distinction between the two is suggested again by Anne Cole’s brief assessment of respective gradients where wëgs are generally much steeper than stræts and usually steeper than the pæðs.\(^{855}\) The steeper gradients of wëgs may be a general reflection of their initial use for foot and pack travel whilst a concern for newly created paths (even when they incorporate earlier routes) is their suitability for cart travel where steep inclines are more of a concern.

It seems, therefore, that what is emerging, both from the landscape evidence and from documentary sources, is evidence in references to herepaths for a quite specific entity and one which by name seems concerned with the containment of the threat posed by the marauding here. Analysis of the dating of the first widespread appearances of the term in Anglo-Saxon charters initially seems to correspond with that period in the mid-ninth century when the Vikings begin to over-winter in England – a strategy that would require a sustained hoarding of provisions and food supplies. The term first appears in any significant numbers in charters of the 860s, the earliest and most trustworthy of this group being those dated to 868 and 869/870 recording, respectively, land granted by Æthelred, King of Wessex, at Martyr Worthy, Hants (S 340) and Cheselbourne, Dorset (S 342). Both these examples are broadly accepted as reliable documents and there is no reason to believe the boundary clauses are not contemporary with the grants. However, it is clear from references to herepaths in charters of an earlier date, such as the Crediton charter of 739 (S 255) and a grant by Offa of land in Gloucestershire (S 141), that the boundary clauses are much later additions. There are two comparatively isolated references to herepaths in charters recording grants made by Æthelwulf in 840 (S 290) and 846 (S 298) (of, respectively, land at Halstock, Somerset and in the South Hams, Devon). If these references are contemporary with the dating of the grants, we may be seeing the very first implementation of the herepath idea and the possible result of Egbert’s successful suppression of the combined Viking and British aggression in the SW of England in the


830s. This might also explain their relative abundance in this exposed part of the kingdom. However, using charter evidence to elucidate a true chronology of herepath origination and development is encumbered by the bias in charter numbers towards the later-Saxon period and the obvious problems of identifying boundary clauses that are contemporary with legitimate documents from those that appear in later copies and forgeries.

Overall, their ubiquity in Wessex and distribution in the landscape, and their uniformity in terms of the terminology used to describe them all go some way to suggest that in the herepath system, some kind of national policy and strategy has been implemented in response to the Viking threat. Is it possible we have here a scheme of national defence over which the documentary sources are entirely silent? Accepting the view that herepaths are the product of a planned system of road maintenance for the defence of the realm, we should consider them in relation to another more famous scheme of national defence – the Burghal Hidage.\(^5\)\(^5\) Much has been made of the spacing of the forts listed in this document and while current research is demonstrating that many other burhs existed at the time the document was drafted,\(^5\)\(^7\) there is some sense to the regular spacing of the burhs in the Burghal Hidage – particularly in relation to our maintained herepaths and the causeways/embankments/bridges that are a crucial part of them. Let us envisage a situation whereby a signal, a beacon or horn, from a recognised signalling system indicates an incoming threat.\(^5\)\(^8\) With no point in Wessex being more than twenty miles from a burh, the safety of the fort walls could be achieved within circa seven to twelve hours. Many, in journeying to the local burh, would need to cross watercourses and at any point of the year fords could prove unreliable and dangerous to negotiate – particularly for carts. By improving the roads and in particular, by improving river-crossings with bridges, carts could more reliably be used and in all weather conditions. Carting allowed very much more produce to be brought into the protection of the burh and crucially it is here that we see the tactical benefits of an improved road network implemented in conjunction with fortified centres. Essentially, this system would allow the West Saxon kings to, in effect, starve any invading army and if the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle’s account of the year 894 is to be believed, in just such a situation the Viking army had to resort to eating the greater part of their horses. By improving mobility to the designated

---


\(^5\)\(^7\) J. Baker and S. Brookes, Beyond the Burghal Hidage: Anglo-Saxon Civil Defence in the Viking Age (in prep.).

burhs through implementing a standard of road maintenance, and bridging particularly tricky or unreliable parts of journeys, surplus food (and other resources) that would otherwise fall into the hands of the invading here could be transported to the local burh – at a day’s notice. This interpretation allows us to reflect back on the Burghal Hidage document. Does it represent a unique episode – a particular campaign in a particular year – to ensure that when the warning beacons went up, and folk took to the road in their carts, they made for one of the officially sanctioned burhs on the list so as to concentrate provisions, supplies and arms in central places everyone was aware of? The speed with which the Viking army could penetrate the heartlands of England and return to their ships and winter camps booty-laden might be taken as an indication of a sophisticated level of mobility. At the same time however, it may reflect a desire on the part of the raiding army to return as quickly as possible to a supply base to avert potentially morale-sapping hunger. Ryan Lavelle’s model of the relationship between supplies, cohesion and prestige in early medieval campaigns illustrates how food and supplies, whether derived from foraging, centres of collection or purchase, underpins the success of effective military strategy.

So whilst the herepath network almost certainly facilitated response times, in terms of mustering, troop movement and intercepting raiding parties, the above interpretation invites the reader to consider the crucial role herepaths played in the control of resources. Whether hay for horses, timber for fuel or food for warriors, improving the route network and, most importantly, providing bridges for the free flowing movement of carted bulk goods, would have gathered up precious supplies away from the unacceptable insecurity of the manor to the central sanctuary of the burh. The ‘way the serfs dug’, recorded in the South Hams charter, allows exactly for this to take place: For the agricultural surpluses to be moved from the relatively exposed manors of Kingston and Bigbury to the security of a centrally designated fortification (in this case Halwell). It may be significant that the South Hams grant is likely to be the earliest West Saxon charter to contain an immunity clause (i.e. immunity from obligation but with reservation of the trinoda necessitas). The ditch where the serfs dug the way, recorded in 846, was likely to have been an event that took place within living memory and when Nicholas Howe writes that this is ‘evidence of the most mundane local history’ and an act perhaps, ‘in violation of

860 R. Lavelle, Alfred’s Wars: Sources and Interpretations of Anglo-Saxon Warfare in the Viking Age (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2010) 179, Figure 5.1
the customary standards of road maintenance’, he arguably could not be more wrong.\textsuperscript{862} In the wider context, if we accept the crucial link between herepaths, the trinoda necessitas and the scheme of national defence represented by the burhs, then the serfs’ labour may well represent a small but integral part in a campaign that rescued Wessex, ultimately, from the ‘crucible of defeat’.

**Classical Precedent and the Notion of Highway Maintenance**

A case has been made for seeing herepaths as a result of the trinoda necessitas and the general military obligations placed on society in the ninth and tenth centuries. We have, however, no historical references to such a scheme and it must therefore remain conjectural. Support may be found in exploring the evidence from late-Roman legislation and its influence on the ideas of Anglo-Saxon rulers in the ninth and tenth centuries. That early medieval kingship drew on classical precedence seems clear from examples across the continent and the parallels between English and continental obligations are seen by both Nicholas Brooks and Janet Nelson as a result of ‘contemporary contacts’ and a shared Germanic and Roman past.\textsuperscript{863} In particular, the Theodosian Code, a compilation of leges dating from the early fifth century, delegated responsibility for public buildings and duties, in what was presumably a crumbling state infrastructure, into the hands of local landowners.\textsuperscript{864} The Church sought to evade these obligations, the so-called sordida munera (‘dirty works’ or ‘base services’), which included the servicing of the army and the repair of public buildings. Therefore, in 423, Emperor Theodosius II decreed that no one, not even venerandas ecclesias [venerable churches], should be exempt from the responsibility for the upkeep of roads and bridges (XV.3.6).\textsuperscript{865} And this was echoed in 441, in a law issued by Emperor Valentinian III, wherein explicit clarification comes that the obligation rested on land and not on people.\textsuperscript{866} The idea of the sordida munera passed into the Breviary of Alaric in Visigothic Spain (although not, as Alan Cooper points out, the specific clause concerning road repair).\textsuperscript{867} Both the Breviary and the Theodosian Code were well known in Francia – particularly in church circles where clerics made copies and were schooled in the laws.\textsuperscript{868}

\textsuperscript{862} Howe, *Writing the Map of Anglo-Saxon England: Essays in Cultural Geography* 35.
\textsuperscript{864} Th. Mommsen and P. Krueger (eds.), *Codex Theodosianus, I, Theodosiani Libri Xvi Cum Constitutionibus Sirmondinis* (Berlin, 1905b) 593, 601-03, XI.10.2 (370), XI.16.15 (382) and XI.16.18 (390).
\textsuperscript{865} Ibid. 818.
\textsuperscript{866} Th. Mommsen and P. Krueger (eds.), *Codex Theodosianus, ii, Leges Novellae Ad Theodosianum Pertinentes* (Berlin, 1905a) 91-92.
Thus the notion of the *consuetudo antiquam et aliarum gentium* [customs ancient and of other peoples] appears in Charles the Bald’s *Edict of Pîtres* (862 – 869) and when Pippin, son of Charlemagne, decreed that repair of churches, making of bridges and repair of streets should be done *sicuntique fuit consuetudo* [as was the ancient custom], he is almost certainly referring to late-Roman legislation.\(^{869}\)

It is possible that these ideas and existing copies of late-Roman legal texts may have influenced the thinking of Wessex’s ruling elites in the ninth century and their implementation of a strategy that both defended the realm but that also built capacity through ensuring the prerequisites of a state infrastructure were in place. The exact phrase used to describe one of the subjects of the *sordida munera* in the Theodosian code is *viae publicae et pontium stratarumque* (XV.3.6),\(^{870}\) and if we take the -rumque element to be an adjective of *rus* in the plural masculine genitive case, a literal translation might read ‘public ways and bridges, streets of the country/estates’ (in opposition to those of the *urbs*). It should also be questioned however whether the institution of Anglo-Saxon kingship was reintroducing such ideas or whether, in certain parts of Britain, these obligations can be traced as a continued arrangement from the late-Roman period. A recent trend in the study of the fifth to seventh centuries has established from the cultural and political evidence, that the west of Britain bore all the characteristics of a late Roman province and ultimately a ‘failed state’.\(^{871}\) If this is the case and *Britannia Prima* can be seen to have successfully operated into the seventh century, it may very well have seen itself as subject to Theodosian and Valentinian legislation and the process of cultural assimilation with Anglo-Saxon England may explain the apparent reappearance of these ideas in the eighth century. In such a scenario, attention should be drawn to the ‘old’ herepaths of the Crediton and Exeter study area (3), and the possibility raised that there may have been a recognition of the fact that these were routes at one point maintained for the benefit of a late Roman city state based on Exeter (3.2 SS80NW, 3.4 SX99SW). Equally, the ‘old’ herepath of the Salisbury study area, furnished as it was with Roman milestones, may again be a reference to the fact that the same hypothetical services that were required to maintain routes in the Anglo-Saxon period had applied back in the fifth and sixth centuries. The argument is, of course, encumbered by the differences of the language used and reconciling the Latin *via publica* with Old English *herepath* is problematic. However, the
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\(^{869}\) Boretius, *‘Edictum Pistense’*, 321-22; K. Fischer Drew, *‘The Immunity in Carolingian Italy’*, *Speculum*, 37 (1962), 182-97 at 184.

\(^{870}\) Mommsen and Krueger (eds.), *Codex Theodosianus, I, Theodosiani Libri Xvi Cum Constitutionibus Sirmondinis* 818.

faintest suggestion of this link comes from the only reference to a via publica in the project study areas where a ‘public way’ is recorded along the course of the north Hampshire downs ridgeway (1.7 SU45NW). The reference comes from one of the four charters with lengthy Latin directional terminology, dated to 801 (S 268), and the same route is referred to as a ‘street’ in a later charter dated to 961. It is however, the reference to this ridegway as a herepath to the west of Walbury in a charter reliably dated to 931 (S 416) that creates the critical, if tenuous, link. In this instance a via publica, an entity that took the appearance at a later date of a street, is referred to in the intervening period as a herepath and along with the evidence from the ‘old’ herepaths there is at least the case to be made for further research along these lines, employing this methodology. The terms via publica or publica strata occur in ten other boundary clauses, seven of which predate the tenth century, and analysis of their course in the landscape, how they may be described in other charters and how they relate to a wider geography of civil defence may bear fruits.872

**Church Obligations and Herepaths**

Anglo-Saxon military obligations first appear in a charter of 749 recording Æthelbald of Mercia’s decree, at a council held at Gumley, that church lands were freed from the obligation of all of the regular dues and services owed on land but that they still had to contribute to certain specific public obligations; work on bridges and fortresses (later in the century the burden of ‘military watch’ is added to create the trinoda necessitas).873 One of the main issues to have attracted the attention of scholars in the study of military obligations is the degree to which these mid-eighth-century obligations represented a novel imposition on church lands (and indeed secular lands) or whether they were merely a ratification of burdens that already existed.874 W. H. Stevenson believed that the church had never been immune from these obligations and it was simply that they were so common and well-known that no mention of them was warranted in earlier charters.875 Eric John sees their inclusion in the charter of 749 as an indication that they were being exacted de novo.876 Nicholas Brooks however, disagrees with John pointing out the difference between exemptions granted to ecclesiastical dignitaries and those granted to the estates they owned.877

---

872 S 9; S 100; S 187; S 268; S 287; S 1209; S 1267; S 1288; S 1628; S 1629.
873 S 92.
Analysis of some of the herepaths recorded in the project study areas, whilst not necessarily indicating whether these burdens were novel or ancient impositions on the church, may at least indicate where it was felt, by the tenth century, the burden for the upkeep of roads lay. A series of seven charters exist for land in Bishopstone (7.3). Two of these concern a portion of the later parish to the north of the Ebble (S 522; S 640) whilst five describe the bounds of the entire area covered by the later parish (S 229, S 275, S 393, S 540 and S 891). Only the latest of the five (S 891) is thought to be acceptable as a reliable account of the restoration, by King Æthelred II to the Old Minster, Winchester of 100 hides at Downton (55 hides) and Eblesburnan (i.e. Bishopstone, 45 hides) in 997.878 Were it not for the fact that the boundary clauses from the four earlier charters contain minor, although not insignificant differences, they could be dismissed altogether. In particular the boundary clause of S 275, itself an entirely unacceptable fabrication of the tenth century,879 differs in the terms used to describe certain features. In two instances ‘ways’ as they are referred to in the near identical boundary clauses of S229, S393, S 540 and S 891 are termed herepaths and further minor differences suggest that two separate perambulations were conducted. The two charters that describe only the northern half of Bishopstone (S 522, S 640), one a grant of 947 from King Eadred to Ælfsige, his faithful man, the other of 957 from King Eadwig to Ælfric, his faithful minister, also use the term herepath in place of ‘way’. It would seem that the use of the term herepath predates the use of the term ‘way’ as its inclusion in the authentic charters S 522 and S 640 is earlier than the most reliable survey to include the term ‘way’ (S 891). However, it would also appear to be the case that the herepaths in this instance are referred to in charters where the beneficiary is a secular individual and where the church is the recipient of the grant these routes are referred to merely as ‘ways’. The use of the term herepath in the forged charter where Old Minster is the beneficiary (S 275), purporting to date to 826, suggests an origin for that boundary clause which was different to those from the other Downton forgeries. Where it has been suggested that the forger of this charter has used parts of genuine charters from the 820s it may therefore also be that the boundary clause was gleaned from a ninth-century document and that the recipient was a lay individual.880


A similar scenario can be observed in the charter boundary evidence that describes the north Hampshire ridgeway in Study Area 1. We have already seen how a *via publica* is recorded in our earliest charter. In 931, the date of the next reliable charter, this route is called a *herepath* (S 416) and the beneficiary is Wulfgar, one of the king’s ministers. In the not so reliable charter of S 378, dated to 909 but likely to be a forgery of the eleventh century,\(^{881}\) the route is called a ‘way’ and the beneficiary of the grant is St Peter’s, Winchester. In both instances, by the time of the later forgeries it might be considered that the term *herepath* was becoming obsolete and that there was less necessity to recognise their function in the landscape. This pattern does, however, warrant further research. Is it the case that *herepaths* appear mainly in charters where a secular individual is recorded as the beneficiary and if so, what are the implications of this? Crucially the process would involve actually mapping routes and identifying where particular examples are referred to differently in separate documents to see if there genuinely is a difference between the institutions of church and state in attitudes to the status of certain routes – namely *herepaths*.

**Fortress-work and ‘street watch’**

That the burden of responsibility for the defence of the realm fell heavily on the shoulders of secular individuals – ministers and *thegns* – is illustrated in the archaeological evidence for the emerging manorial centres in the late Saxon period. The obligation to build bridges and forts survived as two of a wide variety of obligations owed by freemen to the shire in the thirteenth century. By this time though, they have been commuted to cash payments known as *pontage* and *murage* and the obligation to undertake guard duty becomes a cash payment known as the *wardpenny*.\(^{882}\) If these customary ‘rents’ as they came to be known can be seen to have their origins in the Anglo-Saxon period, is it the case that *streteward*, a thirteenth-century obligation to ‘guard the street’, represents a similarly ancient obligation to keep watch over the highway and possibly even to see that it is good repair? The process of ‘shiring’ and defining *hundred* boundaries to provide for the defence of the realm may represent, Rosamund Faith argues, ‘an important stage in the definition and fixing of specific burdens on specific land’ so it may be that the late Saxon period is when such obligations became fixed.\(^{883}\) Of these burdens in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries H. Neilson wrote, ‘there is no indication in the records of their very

---
\(^{881}\) Ibid. 1145.  
\(^{883}\) Ibid. 101.
recent origin. The names given them are all English names with a certain ring of antiquity about them'. How ancient these burdens may have been in the thirteenth century can be suggested by certain documents dating from the eleventh century. Geþyncðo, concerning wergilds and dignities, provides a window into the social mobility of the late Anglo-Saxon people and it stipulates that a ceorl, provided he is wealthy, possessing ‘fully five-hides of land’, with a bell-house, burh gate and a seat of office in the king’s hall, was entitled to the rights of a thegn. These entitlements are outlined in more detail in the Rectitudines Singularum Personarum, a document dating from the middle years of the eleventh century that lists the rights and ranks of people. In return for a thegn’s service consisting of, amongst other things, armed service, equipping a guard ship, guarding the coast and ‘military watch’, the thegn is entitled to ‘book-right’. One way of exploring the link between the equation of military watch with the later obligations of wardpenny and Streteward is to examine the archaeological evidence for ‘thegnly’ residences dating from the ninth to the eleventh centuries and their location in relation to the network of Anglo-Saxon communications.

Excavations in the 1970s within the Roman walls of the Saxon Shore fort of Portchester revealed a distinct period of occupation during the tenth and eleventh centuries consisting of phases of high status halls, stone-based towers, other ancillary buildings and a small fenced cemetery. It is suggested that the whole site, with the exception of the second phase of the tower and the cemetery, came to an end with the building of the Norman keep. The features of this period of occupation are very much reminiscent of the statutory requirements of thegny status articulated in the Geþyncðo and the Rectitudines and Portchester represents the perfect location with which to meet with one’s obligation to watch the coast.

Because of its unique location and setting however, Portchester may represent an exceptional example. Other occurrences of high-status sites carrying the same thegny archaeological signatures have been found at far more ordinary locations. At Faccombe Netherton in north Hampshire, for example, excavation exposed successive phases of buildings dating from the beginning of the ninth century. The site sits not at the centre of its estate (i.e. the later parish of Faccombe Netherton) but on the boundary with an estate centred on Buttermere (S 336). Several phases of buildings throughout the tenth and

885 Whitelock (ed.), English Historical Documents, Volume 1, c. 500-1042 468-69.
eleventh century, along with the construction of a more substantial retaining earthwork bank and ditch and evidence for high-status metal working all reinforce the identification of Faccombe Netherton as a *thegnly* residence.\(^{888}\) Importantly, for our purposes, the location of the residence was thought by the excavator to be so that the complex could control the main route through the estate.\(^{889}\) Figure 20 depicts the location of Faccombe Netherton in the combe referred to in the charter boundary as *faccan cumbes*. It is feasible that the route the fortified residence is controlling is a N/S route, with the crossing of the Kennet at Hungerford the likely northern destination. However, the charters record a *cissan anstigo* [Cissa’s footpath] and it may be that this is a direct reference to Chisbury, the likely destination of the path and recorded as *Cissanbyrig* in the *Burghal Hidage*.\(^{890}\) In which case, Faccombe Netherton is very much keyed into the geography of late Anglo-Saxon mobility and defence.

Archaeological evidence from Trowbridge has drawn comparisons with Faccombe Netherton.\(^{891}\) The site exhibited evidence of occupation from the Middle Saxon period but from the tenth century onwards the same distinctively *thegnly* features begin to emerge. These included a church and graveyard founded on the site in the tenth century and a substantial ditched and banked enclosure. We have already seen how Trowbridge is located on a major route running from the SE to the crossing of the Avon at Bradford-on-Avon and a possible E/W route across the upper Avon flood plain (9.2 ST85NW/NE). Finally, the best evidence for *thegnly* control of highways comes from excavations undertaken throughout the 1990s at Yatesbury, north Wiltshire which revealed evidence of what could be interpreted as a late Saxon *thegnly* residence.\(^{892}\) An enclosure some 200m in diameter straddled a major through-route – known locally as the Harepath – and the place-name, interpreted as the ‘gate of the burh’, is reminiscent of one of the stipulated requirements of *thegnly* status in the *Geþyncsðo*. One key element to the site at Yatesbury is its role in a localised scheme of defence and its position in relation to Silbury, an important signalling site, and the larger *burh* at Avebury.\(^{893}\)

What seems clear, at least from these Wessex examples, is that a factor in the location of these residences is proximity to, if not immediate control of, a major


thoroughfare. The chronology suggests that the routes were already in position for them then to have served as the focus for later fortifications. So, whilst this arrangement is a good archaeological articulation of the burden to perform ‘military watch’ or steteward, it does not necessarily indicate an obligation to maintain and keep in good order the main highways of the realm. This may, however, be a wider reflection of the fact that by the tenth and eleventh centuries the emphasis on the status of the herepath network had changed from one concerned primarily with dealing with the here problem to one that also had as its remit the wider protection of people as they moved around the landscape.

The People, the Peace and the King’s Highway

Alan Cooper’s analysis of the Leges Henrici Primi has demonstrated that many of the laws concerning highways in this legal treatise composed in the early twelfth century can be seen to have their origins in the Anglo-Saxon period. In particular, in a prefatory summary of the king’s rights we are told that ‘All Herestrete pertain wholly to the King, and all cwealm stowa [killing places], that is places of execution, pertain totally to the king and are in his soke’. Cooper establishes that this connection between the highway, peace and the king’s jurisdiction has its origins in the mid-tenth century. Indeed, this relationship, or at least the connection between highway and execution site, is observed on the Winchester to Old Sarum highway on which no fewer than four pre-Conquest execution sites have been identified and this distribution has been interpreted as reflecting royal control. Again, classical legal concepts can be seen to have played a significant role in the formation of these ideas across the continent. As well as being concerned with the maintenance, state, repair and dimensions of roads, clauses in the Theodosian Code and most of the continental law codes of the period feature provisions for the protection of strangers, pilgrims, women and children who use the highways.

From the project study areas some evidence tentatively supports Cooper’s back-projection of highway law. A particular phrase that appears in the charter evidence, twice in the study areas and once elsewhere, is þeod herepath. A translation might read ‘people’s herepath’ but the interpretation of the qualifier þeod is problematic. On a local level, it can simply refer to ‘the district occupied by the people’. Thus we might assume that a Peod herepath is, perhaps, maintained locally (i.e. by local people) for the protection of a local
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district. It may be of relevance here that the charters within which this phrase occurs are all of small grants of land. In the study areas the phrase appears as *pone þeod herpað* in a perambulation for a single hide granted at Monkton in Wyke, Shobrooke, Devon (3.3 SS80SE) and as *ðæne þeod herpað* in a perambulation for a 2-hide estate at land near Wilton (8.1 SU13SW). In both these instances the term potentially describes a path aligned to the nearest *burghal* forts at, respectively, Exeter and Wilton. In the third reference, appearing in a boundary clause for a grant of 5 hides at West Buckland, Wellington, Somerset, (S 380) the term appears to be describing a SW/NE route connecting Tiverton and Taunton on a local level (and a Lyng/Exeter axis is also likely). However, *þeod* is also a term with much deeper connotations, one with poetic resonances and a meaning intimately bound up with a Germanic sense of identity. In such a situation, we might view ‘the people’ here referred to as something more generic and all-encompassing with notions of ‘humankind’, ‘nationhood’ and ethnic identity. What, then, if these three references to *þeod* herepaths – albeit a tiny sample – represent a perception, at least in the minds of boundary surveyors, that an added characteristic of these roads was that they were ‘for the people’; the roads of a nation where ‘the people’ enjoyed the right to go on them in peace?

The single reference in all charters to a *folc hearpað* in a grant of land at Grimley, Worcestershire (again, small at only 4 hides), gives the same sense of meaning but creating the link between this idea and the post-conquest evidence for such a notion (discussed below) is justified by one other single reference from a boundary clause. In what is believed to be an authentic charter purporting to date from the reign of King Æthelstan, the phrase *þæs frið herpaðes* appears in the boundary clause for land at North Newton in the Vale of Pewsey, Wiltshire (S 424). William Stubbs, in his *Constitutional History of England*, identified the term *frið* in the context of the Anglo-Saxon legal tradition with notions of public peace and a form of protection that was extended to all people in the kingdom. It appears in one of Æthelred’s law codes: *And beo man georne ymban friðes bote and ymbe feos bothe æghwor on earde and ymbe burhbothe and ymbe bric-bote æghwar on earde an æghwilcum ende and ymbe firdunga, áá þonne neod sy, be þam be man geraðe* [And the People are to be zealous about the improvement of the peace, and about the improvement
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of the coinage everywhere in this country, and about the repair of boroughs [and repair of bridges] in every province and also about military service, according to what is decreed, whenever it is necessary].903 What is intriguing about this law code is the proximity of this ‘improvement of the peace’ to the trinoda necessitas of burhbote, bric-bote and firdunga [fort-work, bridge-work and service in the host]. What can be meant by ‘the peace’ in this law? It is a tantalising possibility that our single reference to a frið herepath is enough to substantiate the link between herepaths, routes constructed initially to deal with the here but ones that went on to provide frið to the peod and folc as they travelled and communicated through the landscape of Anglo-Saxon England.

Trade and Trade Routes

By the later Anglo-Saxon period the concern kings had for the free and unmolested movement of people through the landscape reflects an understanding that such movement facilitated trade and exchange. Chapter Three outlined some of the main issues concerning the development of the economy in the early medieval period and in the following sections we will set out to explore how the evidence for these developments will have impacted on the landscape of travel and communication. A speculative geography of overland middle Saxon trade routes will be proposed, albeit based on evidence from charter boundary clauses of the tenth and eleventh centuries. The shift in emphasis from a route network concerned with the here to one with an increasingly commercial function is evident from the tenth century and in particular, from the appearance of the term port stræt and weg. This shift will be addressed along with the evidence from the study areas for planned commercial developments in the late Saxon period.

The Age of Emporia

Wic herepaths are mentioned on four occasions in the project study areas and in one incidence outside at Tarrant Hinton, Dorset (Figure 21). Of the study area examples, in the region of Downton and Salisbury, these routes were discussed in association with a geography of middle Saxon trading sites (Study Areas 7 and 8) and the implication here is that the wic element should be associated with ‘emporium’ rather than the sense of

903 V Atr. 26.1; F. Liebermann, Die Gesetze Der Angelsachsen (Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1903-1916) at 243; Whitelock (ed.), English Historical Documents, Volume 1, c. 500-1042 445. Loyn, The Governance of Anglo-Saxon England, 500-1087 163-64 has, ‘People were instructed to be zealous about the maintenance of the peace, about the improvement of the roads everywhere in the country, about the repair of fortifications and bridges, and also about military service, doing whatever was decreed whenever it was necessary’.
‘specialised farm or building’. Whilst the *wic herepaths* in Salisbury and Downton areas can be seen to be in close proximity to Berwick St John (off the map but to the immediate north of Stapleford, 8.1 SU03NE) and Wyke (not marked but on the opposite bank of the Avon from Downton, 7.4 SU12SE) respectively, in the case of all other references made to *wic herepaths* in the charter boundary clause evidence (see Figure 21) no ‘wyke’ or ‘wick’ place-names can be located nearby. Furthermore, if we took an interpretation of the term to mean ‘the herepath for which the specialised farm was responsible’, might we not expect then to have come across *burh*, *tun*, *minster* and *ham herepaths*? It seems likely therefore that in the record of *wic herepaths* we have a consciousness on the part of Anglo-Saxon boundary surveyors that these routes at some point were the routes by which traders travelled to and from the major *emporia* of the middle Saxon period. In the distribution of the term and the orientation of the routes they refer to, there does indeed seem to be a connection with the large trading centres of the eighth century and the West Saxon hinterland (Figure 21).

From the project study areas, the *wic herepath* observed heading north, out of Winchester, from the King’s stone (2.2 SU43NE) can be unified with the *wic herepath* in the Highclere and Burghclere bounds on the Hampshire and Berkshire border (1.7 SU45NE) by virtue of the fact that they undoubtedly refer to a N/S aligned route connecting Winchester to Oxford and the upper Thames (discussed in more depth below). The reference from outside the study areas, at Tarrant Hinton (S 429), refers to a route running roughly parallel to the modern Salisbury to Blandford road. The boundary marks of this clause are particularly well suited to the toponymy and topography of the present parish boundary of Tarrant Hinton and it makes the placement of this *wic herepath* fairly certain. However, vestiges of this route beyond the parish are difficult to trace and all that can really be said of the short stretch that is identifiable is that it runs on a WSW/ENE axis.

Figure 21 also depicts the locations of certain ‘chapman’ place-names that have occurred within the study areas but also some that are known from beyond. The rational for including these is based in part on their apparent relationship to the *wic herepaths* but also because, as we saw in Chapter Three, the term *ceapmannana*, meaning ‘traders’ occurs in Ine and Alfred’s law codes and the context of them travelling *uppe on londe* [inland] suggests that these were groups who plied their trade on overland routes. In the study
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908 Ine. 25 for example, we learn *Be ciepemonna fore uppe on londe* [Of traders travelling up inland] and are told *Gif ciepemon uppe on folce ceapie, do þæt beforan gewitnessum* [If a trader (makes his way) up amongst the folk, and [proceeds to] traffic,
areas there is a record of a *chympanna ford* in the charter granting one hide of land at Laverstock (S 543) and the same phrase appears as a place-name – *Chepmannesford* – at the point where the Harroway crosses the Bourne Rivulet (1.5 SU44NW).\(^9^0^9\) *Ceapmanna* are also mentioned in two other boundary clauses. Firstly, there is a reference to a *cipenenanna dene* in a set of bounds outside the study areas for land in Maddington, Wiltshire (S 1589), and secondly, a *ceapmanna del* is recorded in a boundary clause for Crux Easton, Berkshire (1.5, 1.7 SU45NE). Chapmanslade sits on the Bath/Warminster/Old Sarum road, a route discussed by Ivan Margary as having likely early origins, and as a place-name is first recorded in 1245.\(^9^1^0\) We saw from the discussion in Study Area 5 that the nomenclature of Chapman’s Pool on the Isle of Purbeck, despite the charter reference to a *schort mannes*, may have its origins in the fourteenth century and a recorded local surname. This does not represent an exhaustive search for *ceapman* place-names and it may be that other examples that can be reliably dated to at least the fourteenth century can shed further light on this distribution.\(^9^1^1\) One example, a Chapman’s Pit, Kent (TQ 97185917), recorded as the location of an early Saxon inhumation cemetery, is situated on a N/S route believed to be of early medieval date and running north to an important middle Saxon central place at Faversham.\(^9^1^2\)

Considering the function of these chapman place-names, it is interesting to note that none of them go on to become towns. Here they differ from the various place-names that retain the *chipping-* element such as Chipping Barnet, Chipping Campden, Chipping Norton, Chipping Ongar, where they are thought to represent pre-Conquest market places.\(^9^1^3\) In a charter dated to 904, granting Bishop Denewulf and his *familia* trading rights in Taunton, we are told of the *mercimonium quod anglice þæs tunes cyping appellatur* [the trading centre that in English is called the town/tun cyping] and this translation gives a sense of the function by the late ninth century and creates, at least by word association, a link with the type of trading centre referred to in Hugeburc’s *Vita Wynnebald*.\(^9^1^4\)
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911 Since the time of writing, *Chapmannescumb* (1327) has been identified in the parish of Bicknoller, Somerset. The site sits on the main route running SE out of Watchet in the direction of Taunton with Ilminster, Crewkerne and Dorchester beyond. See J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer, and F. M. Stenton, *The Place-Names of Wiltshire* (16; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939), 147.
difference in the *chipping*- and *chapman*- element is that the former are nearly always compounded with a readily formed place-name suggesting that the marketing function was a secondary designation to an existing settlement. In the character of the slade, the dene, the dell, the pit, the pool and the combe we have landscape locations that are non-settlement related. They are more indicative of sheltered places and it may be that the chapmen where the men of the road in the eighth and ninth centuries and that these were their 'pit-stops'. Trade may, of course, have occurred at these locations and they are all in very accessible places. For example; the crossroads location of the *ceapmannan dell*, at the place where the North Hampshire Downs ridgeway crosses the major N/S route from Winchester to Oxford (1.5 SU45NE), stands out as an excellent place for officials to ride out to, in accordance with Ine’s laws, to bear witness to transactions.

A range of evidence vouches for the vibrancy of a trade route in the early medieval period connecting Winchester (and Hamwic to the south) with Oxford and the Upper Thames Valley to the north. In the tenth century the interests of the Old Minster, Winchester in property at *Clere* (Highclere) may reflect a desire to provide a way station *en route* to the emerging urban centre at Oxford within which it went on, in Domesday Book, to be recorded as having nine *messuages*. That this way-station and thus the need to travel this route was important to the bishops of Winchester as early as the mid-eighth century, is suggested by a charter claiming ownership of the same estate in 749. The location alone on this significant trade route may be a point in favour of this charter which, in its surviving format, although containing clear interpolations, is thought by some commentators to be broadly legitimate in its record of the transaction.

In Study Area 8 attention was drawn to the relationship that the *wic herepaths* around the Salisbury area had to a regression analysis distribution of Hamwic’s Series H *sceattas*. The N/S route from Hamwic to the Upper Thames is very clearly articulated through coin finds along its course and in places, these have led commentators to speculate on a possible trade route connecting the two regions. In particular, *Sceatta* coin finds of a type U and J recovered from excavations in Hamwic indicate links with a minting
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place in the Upper Thames Valley.\textsuperscript{919} A coin of Offa from Radcot Bridge, comparable with an Offa penny from the site of Martyr’s Memorial in Oxford, is also said to indicate this N/S route.\textsuperscript{920} Furthermore, Series J sceattas – probably originating from the Oxford area – recovered from excavating and by metal detecting at Winchester again re-affirm this link with the Upper Thames Valley.\textsuperscript{921} North of Winchester the likely course of the route is indicated by a silver Frisian sceatta and a coin of Offa found near Cranbourne Clump, Wonston, Sutton Scotney.\textsuperscript{922} Katharina Ulmschneider has suggested that this route may have lead via Walbury Camp where a die-linked sceatta of Series U type was recovered although it is more likely that this find is indicative of an E/W aligned route, following the course of the North Hampshire Downs ridgeway, discussed above and referred to variously as a via publica, herepath and street, with its crossing of the Oxford to Winchester route at the site of the ceapmanna dell.\textsuperscript{923} Even the early importance of Abingdon as an ancient minster site and royal vill, before the establishment of an Abbey in the mid-tenth century, is thought to be dependent on a major trade route linking the Midlands with Southampton.\textsuperscript{924}

More widely in Hampshire, the distribution of Sceatta coin finds seems to confirm a geography of inland trade restricted to a few major routeways. St Catherine’s Hill yielded five Continental sceattas and other high status metalwork. The site of an Iron Age hillfort, it is very well connected with the major prehistoric ridgeways of the South and Hampshire Downs and, in sitting just outside of the walls of the Roman city of Winchester, it also enjoyed the access provided by the Roman road network. Two sceattas from Warnford, where the South Downs Ridgeway crosses the Meon, two from Twyford, a further two from Otterbourne where the Roman road forks and finally three from Clausentum are all tied into this early geography of exchange in middle-Saxon Hampshire.\textsuperscript{925} Part of Ulmschneider’s assessment of the archaeological evidence for the Middle Saxon material from Hampshire is organised around major route-ways. She considers the Wey Valley, the ‘Great Northern Ridgeway’, the Winchester/Silchester Roman road, the Ports Down

\textsuperscript{923} Ibid. 100.
\textsuperscript{925} Ulmschneider, \textit{Markets, Minsters and Metal-Detectors: The Archaeology of Middle Saxon Lincolnshire and Hampshire Compared} 90-91, 100. Since Ulmschneider’s time of writing however, many more examples are coming to light as part of the Portable Antiques Scheme which will further allow for this type of analysis to be made.
Ridgeway, the Chichester/Bitterne Roman road and the South Downs Ridgeway – recognising the equal – if not greater impact that prehistoric ridgeways had over Roman roads in the distribution of archaeological material of the mid Saxon period.\textsuperscript{926}

This undoubtedly represents a future avenue of enquiry – to explore the exact routes by which middle Saxon coinage found itself distributed throughout Wessex. In some of the study areas attention was drawn to where single coin finds of the seventh- and eighth-centuries were thought to indicate a node on the network of overland trade and the example of Lazarton (6.4), at the foot of Hod Hill, stands out a very good candidate for what may be as good as it gets as far as a West Saxon ‘productive’ site is concerned. The place-name element \textit{hōd} meaning ‘shelter’ aligns the location well with the kinds of landscape locations favoured by our chapmen and crucially, the proximity to a major ridgeway connecting Wilton with Dorchester indicates another middle-Saxon overland route. In Chapter One John Blair’s theoretical map of inland trans-shipment routes was reviewed (Figure 4) and from it, we can now take the evidence from this research project to indicate some of the exact courses traders between the south coast and the Thames may have taken. The first of Blair’s theoretical routes to be address is the proposed N/S route from the Itchen estuary to the Thames at Oxford and the references to \textit{wic herepaths} on exactly this course are the clearest indication of this major overland route. A parallel N/S route from the mouth of the Hampshire Avon to the Cricklade/Lechlade stretch of the Thames is also possible, passing through the Salisbury Basin and heading due north. Again, a \textit{wic herepath} is referred to on this course. Finally, the exact routes taken by Blair’s suggested trade between Dorchester and London can be suggested by the evidence from the Lazarton site or the \textit{wic herepath} referred to in the bounds of Tarrant Hinton.\textsuperscript{927} In fact, that this latter route travelled to Dorchester and beyond may force us to consider the possibility that Wyke Regis (\textit{Wike} in 988 and \textit{Kingeswik} in 1242), with its proximity to the natural landing ground of Chesil Beach and harbour of Weymouth Bay, is so named because it represents the location of a middle Saxon trading site and not the site of a ‘dairy-farm’.\textsuperscript{928}

Together, with the references to chapmen and \textit{wic herepaths}, the evidence (albeit at this stage selective) from coins and the key role that ridgeways appear to have played in this period, we can tentatively begin to construct an earlier geography of trade in the \textit{Age of Emporia} – but more work needs to be done.

\textsuperscript{926} Ibid. 45-48.
\textsuperscript{927} J. Blair, ‘Introduction’, in J. Blair (ed.), \textit{Waterways and Canal-Building in Medieval England} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007a), 1-18 at 18, Figure 5.
\textsuperscript{928} S 938; Ekwall, \textit{The Concise Oxford English Dictionary of English Place-Names} 515.
Changes in Trading and the Emergence of the ‘Port’

One particular term that concerns traders and trading in the early medieval world is the word ‘port’. Whilst the Latin portus refers to a harbour, in the Anglo-Saxon sense of the word it can relate to an urban centre of trade at a coastal or inland location and by the eleventh century it had become almost synonymous with the word burh. Unlike cyping and ceapman, port only appears to have been more widely used from the tenth century.

It features in the laws first in a code of Edward the Elder where na man ne ceapige butan porte [no one shall trade except in a port] and later in the laws of King Æthelstan where ðe mon ceapige butan porte [one is not to buy outside a port], reiterated again when we are informed þæt ælc ceaping sy binnon port [that all trading shall be carried on in a port].

There is evidence from the study areas and from examples taken from outside that helps contribute to our understanding of ports and their role in the late Saxon economy.

Falling just outside of the study area charters – although some landmarks have been included in Map 1.7 – a series of boundary clauses for land at Clere provide potentially important information on the continuing association of the ceapmanna del location and trade into the tenth century. Intriguingly, the reference to the ceapmanna del in S 689 is followed immediately afterwards in the boundary clause by a portmanna del (1.7 SU45NE). A number of interpretations might be envisaged here. The case above has been made for chapman place-names having their origins in the eighth century and therefore associated with the trade on which the emporia flourished. So it may be that the use of portmanna is ‘updating’ the relevance of the location by making an association with a more contemporary term for trader. The possibility also exists that the two terms referred to quite specifically different types of traders. Were, for example, the portmanna considered the men of the actual market who came to witness transactions, if not to transact themselves, with the ceapmanna, the men of the road and the later-day carriers and carters? What is interesting is that in one set of the Clere bounds, whilst the same cypmanna dell is referred to, in place of the portmanna dell is a scipdel. Naturally, in a landscape context in close proximity to an area of downland grazing, the interpretation of ‘sheep dell’ is possible, perhaps also indicating the subject of exchange. However, as we saw with the etymology of Chapman’s Pool, where versions were recorded in the sixteenth century.
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century as Shipman’s Pool, there may be a possible link with ships and therefore trading of a more long-distance kind. Unfortunately, the chronological relationship between the references to the portmanna dell and the scipdel are not clear as both come from charters whose authenticity is suspect. Purportedly dating to 961 a number of issues stand against S 689 (portmanna) being a genuine charter.932 The charter within which the scipdel and other reference to the cypmanna dell feature is the 749 Winchester grant mentioned above which, although suspected to have a basis in fact, is undermined by later interpolations, of which the boundary clause, a detailed perambulation in Old English, is entirely out of character for the eighth century. One further landmark of potential significance referred to in this area appears in another charter for Clere in an entirely new set of bounds drawn up by a royal scribe in 958.933 This is the frang sing æcer that, by G. B. Grundy’s reckoning, was located on the course of the wic herepath and to the west of Burghclere Iron Age hillfort.934 Grundy fails to provide an interpretation of this term but an association with Frang-land is possible and this ‘acre’ may therefore have belonged to the ‘Frankish people’.935 Further support for this comes from ‘Frankford’, a field name Grundy observed on a Tithe map and award for Highclere, located at the point where the wic herepath crosses a small brook that feeds the River Enbourne to the north.936 This association with the Franks further points to this location, with its varied references to ceapmanna, portmanna and scip, as being somewhere at which merchants from afar gathered. It is an association that can very likely be projected back to the days when the wic herepath carried trade between Hamwic and the Upper Thames and one that by the tenth century, clearly took many guises.

In the charter boundary clause evidence, port is most commonly associated with stræts and wegs although in the very first reference it is to a herepath that the qualifier is linked.937 In a grant of land made by King Eadwig on the River Nadder to the immediate SW of Wilton, the bounds are recorded as running along þes port her pa∂es. This route is one that runs along the valley from Wilton out to Barford St Martin where it crosses the Nadder and heads due WSW to Shaftesbury. In a later charter for land at Ditchampton, immediately alongside the above estate, the same route is referred to as a port weg.938 From the study areas, a single instance of a port stræt, and the fact that it occurs in the same location as a (possibly) earlier herepath (2.2 SU53SW), is another indication that the

933 S 680; Keynes, The Diplomas of King Æthelred ‘the Unready’ 978-1016: A Study In Their Use as Historical Evidence 75-76.
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938 S 1010.
terminology used to refer to such routes in the Wessex landscape was changing to reflect the emphasis-shift away from routes designated and maintained to counter the threat posed by the _here_ to routes that were increasingly taking on an emerging legal status concerned with the protection provided by the king. Alan Cooper’s justification for projecting back into the Anglo-Saxon period the legal definition assigned in the _Leges Henrici Primi_ to the _via regia_ as a route that runs from _burh_ to _burh_ is justified on the basis of Edward the Elder and Æthelstan’s restriction of trade to royal boroughs.\(^9\) As we have seen above, the notions of _frīð_, _þeod_ and the concept of a state-sanctioned peace are all prevalent in late Anglo-Saxon Wessex and as the term _herepath_ slipped into obsolescence so too does the _port weg/stræt_ change in character. This is best indicated by two stand-alone boundary clauses from the archive of Malmesbury Abbey that, as post-Conquest perambulations (though attached to copies of earlier charters), represent the very tail end of the Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clause tradition. In both perambulations two separate routes radiating out from the _burh_ at Malmesbury, routes bearing all the characteristics of our early _herepaths_ and _port wegs_, are referred to as _kingswei_ and _kingsweye_ respectively and give a final indication of the process of evolution that the early medieval route network had undergone from the ninth through to the twelfth century.\(^9\)

In this later shift however, a critical link between trade and peace is made and the institution of kingship can be seen as arguably central to the promulgation of both to meet one in the same ends. The degree to which late Anglo-Saxon kings are either responding to rising societal wealth or actively setting out to achieve it, is a debate that to explore in any detail is beyond the scope of this research project. However, what seems clear from the evidence is that a concerted effort to structure the late Anglo-Saxon landscape of Wessex is being made in the interests of a ‘market economy’, one that is characterised by ‘price-making markets’, where producers are incentivised to increase output.\(^9\) We see this most clearly in the concept of the _port_ and the use of this term in particular prompts us to consider how much a Roman imperial ideal permeated the thinking of tenth-century kingship. Should we see the _port_-related features of the Anglo-Saxon landscape as indicators of a wider project to stimulate or respond to a growing economy? Of course, this classical idea does not necessarily need to have derived from a first-hand knowledge of the wealth of the Roman Empire as a cause of the _Pax Romana_. Much closer evidence of the

\(^9\) Ew. 1; II As. 13, 13.1.
\(^9\) S 1577 and S 1585.
role of the *portus* could be found in the example set by Carolingian France of the eighth century where the *portus* sat second in a three-tiered exchange network that had estate centres at its base and the large monopolistic *emporia* at its summit.\(^{942}\) In comparing eighth- and ninth-century East Anglia with contemporary *Francia*, Grenville Astill has suggested that the lack of *portus* may indicate that the scale of economy on the Frankish model could not be supported in England till the ninth or tenth century.\(^{943}\) A key aspect to the Carolingian *portus* was its administrative role in an increasingly complex state machinery and arguably, it is only in the wake of the *burh* building campaigns of the ninth and early tenth centuries that state-development in the south of England at least, can be seen to have reached that level of complexity.\(^{944}\) This is when the notion of the *port* appears in the documentary sources for Anglo-Saxon England and a case must exist therefore for an attempted importation of an urban model by the Anglo-Saxon kings in which, under invitation, the Franks of the *frang sing æcer* may have been playing an instrumental role.

The Salisbury basin study area allows us to explore the success of this policy in terms of founding a lasting urban centre. The topographical evidence for an earlier settlement and trading focus centred on the crossroads at St Thomas’s Church was discussed in Study Area 8 (see also Figure 15). From the evidence provided by Domesday Book and from various documentary references made in the twelfth century, it seems clear that there were already two Salisburys in existence prior to the apparent founding of the new city in 1220. Problems arise in attempting to identify these references with the possible sites, in particular the Salisbury ‘market’ from which the tolls were granted to the church at Salisbury in 1130.\(^{945}\) However, the presence of a *Portwey*, recorded first in 1364, on the line of the Silchester to Old Sarum Roman road, indicates the likely location of the late Anglo-Saxon *port* foundation. Importantly, the course of this ‘port way’ can be seen on an eighteenth-century map to extend beyond the gates of the Iron Age hillfort to the southern entrance of a plan-form that in shape and size is similar to those of the *burghal* foundations at Cricklade, Wareham and Wallingford (Figure 19).\(^{946}\) The morphology of the
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\(^{946}\) Wiltshire Records Office cc/chapter/14/2; cc/chapter/14/6.
Salisbury site and its proximity to an earlier set of earthworks is reminiscent of a similar scenario proposed for Avebury. It is not only the port element that suggests royal prerogative in the foundation of the site in the shadow of Old Sarum hillfort. On the same eighteenth-century map the meadow at the south-westerly extent of the Port Way is referred to as Kingsbridge Meadow (see B 119 on Figure 19). This evidence not only supports David Hill’s assertion that the burh or ‘town’ of Salisbury was outside the walls of the hillfort but it is also a clear indication of royal instigation.

Old Sarum has gone on to become the classic example of a ‘rotten borough’ but exactly when this port ‘failed’, despite the best efforts of tenth-century kings to coerce trade into its walls, is ultimately dependent on whether we accept the case for an earlier settlement focus – perhaps minster related – at the location of St Thomas’s Church and the later medieval market place of Salisbury’s cathedral city (presented in Study Area 8). It is re-iterated here that elsewhere studies have suggested that the success of towns in the tenth to eleventh centuries was dependent on existing communications and minsters founded in the eighth and ninth centuries. Furthermore, as Grenville Astill has written, it is the older, pre-burh pattern of trading and assembly places that, ‘despite royal efforts to the contrary, continued to determine the social and economic relationships of the majority of the population’. Taking a much longer term perspective on the urban developments of the Salisbury Basin therefore, one which embraces a trajectory from the seventh to the thirteenth century, it might be argued that ultimately, the trading site at the major crossroads prescribed by E/W and N/S routes past the church of St Thomas won out as the place eventually settled on as the major market for the region – as it remains today. Crucially in this discussion, it is the evidence from the topography and toponymy of routes that allows us to explore some of these processes in more depth in a landscape context.

Study Area 1 established that the Roman road from Silchester to Old Sarum had fallen out of use, at least the stretch as far as Andover. But between Andover and Old Sarum, it is questionable whether this stretch, the stretch that went on to be recorded as the Portway in the fourteenth century, remained in constant use from the Roman period through to the tenth century (when it presumably took the port association). Is it the case that, like the Roman roads from Winchester to Silchester and the course of Watling Street between the River Medway and London, the Old Sarum portway was also a late-Saxon re-

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{947} A. J. Reynolds, ‘Avebury: A Late Anglo-Saxon Burh’?, \textit{Antiquity}, 75 (2001), 29-30.
  \item \textsuperscript{948} Hill, ‘Trends in the Development of Towns During the Reign of Ethelred II’, 223.
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instatement? Certainly, when we consider the route by which trade will have moved between Study Area 1 and Study Area 8, the line of the ridgeway, and the course of the later medieval road, is the most obvious candidate of assured passage between the two with the Chapmansford of Study Area 1 and the chypmanna ford of the Laverstock charter making up two crossing points on a route that ultimately connected London to Dorchester via the Salisbury Basin and Andover. This raises the possibility that the setting out of the portway may have been as much at the behest of royal instigation as the laying out of the conjectural burh at the foot of Old Sarum. It may be significant that Æthelstan’s Grately Code, an ‘impressive piece of legislation’ and the ‘major ‘official’ statement of his reign’ , was the result of an assembly held on the course of this portway between Old Sarum and Andover. Concerned with coinage, minting and the functioning of boroughs, this was a law code set out by one of Anglo-Saxon England’s most European-minded kings and it seems credible that the physical edifices of a past great civilization might be seen, in a show of power to the gathered dignities, to be reinvested with the greatness they enjoyed at the high-point of the Roman imperium.

---

Conclusions

It is hoped that the main research questions detailed in the conclusion to PART 1 have been addressed sufficiently in discussion in the various sections of Chapters Ten and Eleven in PART 4. This conclusion is therefore intended only to provide a summary of the main findings of this thesis and to recommend some profitable avenues of future research.

In the first instance, this research project has demonstrated that it was anything but ‘oceans of mud’ that lay between the places that the Anglo-Saxons of Wessex travelled to and from. The physical means by which people, goods and ideas were moved around the early medieval landscape was clearly comprised of a dense network of purposeful routes, proficiently managed so that people of all classes were denied the inconvenience of ‘blundering through trackless woods’ in their need to get from A to B. Important aspects of this network of routes are recoverable, not only from the information contained in charter boundary clauses but also from archaeological examples, place-names and from the application of horizontal stratigraphy to landscape studies. Elucidating this network in greater detail clearly has a contribution to make to our wider understanding of the processes of change and development in Anglo-Saxon England. Critically, it is clearly no longer credible to employ the network of Roman roads as a means to illustrate our maps of early medieval phenomena and less still to provide meaningful commentary on the distributions of archaeological, toponymic and historical data. It is abundantly clear from the study areas, as well as from studies made elsewhere, that the network of Roman roads in Britain was subject to variable rates of survival from the second to the eleventh centuries. Furthermore, there is the distinct possibility that some Roman roads were ‘reborn’ as part of a conscious strategy of urban development in the later Anglo-Saxon period. So in the first instance, we must ask of Romanists what evidence there is for the survival of certain roads within the opening four centuries of the first millennium and crucially what role the existing network of prehistoric ridgeways may have played in the Roman landscape. Then, by employing the references to streets, ‘old’ herepaths, stones and stone posts, we can explore in more depth the legacy of the classical period on the early medieval landscape of movement. It is only by adopting this approach over a wider study area, and integrating archaeological evidence, that we will be in a position to provide a data set hugely significant in its importance to our understanding of continuity and change from the late Roman through to the late Anglo-Saxon periods.

Of early medieval routes the charter boundary clauses provide evidence for a rich variety of character and function. Hay ways, salt ways, wood ways, the mill way, the horse...
path, the butter mere, the ‘smear’ gate, oxen bridge and the stone way are just some examples that indicate the uses such routes had in service to the agrarian economy. That they were at times narrow, green, broad, hollow, foul and muddy indicates relative levels of usability. Of the distinctly Anglo-Saxon routes though, one term stands out in particular and this is the ubiquitous herepath. The evidence from this research project points distinctly towards the herepath being a particular road with a particular function and subject to a particular set of laws and maintenance. The uniformity of purpose around Winchester in the east of the study and Crediton in the west, and the manner in which they connect up Anglo-Saxon places such as burhs, minsters, manors, look outs and harbours, all suggest central instigation and a level of grand design. This research project therefore puts forward the notion that herepaths were routes purposely constructed to deal with the threat posed by the raiding here. Under a system of corvée labour, this represented a form of obligation as crucial as bridgehead building, work on fortresses and service in the host army. But it was also an obligation over which the Anglo-Saxon historical sources are almost entirely silent.

As far as the origins of this system are concerned, the issue is blighted by the familiar bias of having an ever-greater number of documentary sources towards the end of the period and avoiding the subsequent temptation of allowing this to reflect an introduction and increase in real terms. It is therefore extremely difficult to assess the level of continuity such a system may have had from the clear evidence for late Roman legislation concerning the upkeep of the viae publicae and pontium stratarumque. Does the herepath network represent an adoption of an existing set of practices in the fifth and sixth centuries in Britain or is it a hybrid of Germanic custom and classical ideal and a ‘re-introduction’ by the luminaries of the emerging Anglo-Saxon state? It is unfortunate in this context that the earliest surviving lengthy Old English boundary clause in original (or near original) form is also the first reliably dated appearance the term herepath makes in the documentary record. If a significant corpus of detailed boundary clauses without reference to herepaths existed for the period running up to the South Hams charter, we might be able to postulate an introduction of the herepath system broadly contemporary with the first appearance of the trinoda necessitas in West Saxon charters of the mid-ninth century. But this is not the case. It is only by mapping the herepath network on a wider scale and observing how it correlates with the wider map of Roman roads and the settlement archaeology of the fourth to seventh centuries that we might begin to speculate
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955 This is S 298, the charter for South Hams covered in Study Area 4 and dating to the mid-ninth century.
further on the continuity or ‘re-introduction’ debate. But in any event, this project recommends as a primary goal the future mapping of *herepath* data to further understand the character of the system and how it operated and related to what we know of other infrastructural processes in the landscape of Anglo-Saxon Wessex. Charter boundary clauses need not be the only means by which this is undertaken. Place-names can go some way to contributing to the distribution and *Harepath* Farm of the Kinwardstone study area and the *Harepath* that runs between Yatesbury and Avebury are just two of many examples where the term has survived in the modern landscape.

One area where an improved understanding of the *herepath* network stands to make a significant contribution is in the development of the Anglo-Saxon economy from the eighth through to the eleventh centuries. Crucial to this subject is identifying facets of the dynamic played out between the defensive priorities and economic ambitions of late Anglo-Saxon urbanism. In setting about constructing a better network of routes with which to move goods from the relative insecurity of the manorial setting to the sanctuary of a central refuge, to what extent did Anglo-Saxon elites facilitate the urban and economic developments of the later tenth and eleventh centuries? To what extent from the outset may this have been part of the rationale behind the *herepath* network?

This connection between *herepaths* and trade is most explicit in the term *wic herepath* which, if a survival from the eighth century, provides us with the critical link between protecting routes and commercial functions. This project has been able to speculatively put forward a geography of eighth-century trade based, not only on the references to *wic herepaths*, but also on references to ‘chapmen’ and through the selective analysis of numismatic evidence. Extending this methodology over other study areas – and more comprehensively over Wessex – will allow further elucidation of the lines of communication between the places of production, trade and settlement in eighth-century Wessex. This will only help us further to explore the current themes of the apparent lack of ‘productive sites’ in the kingdom, the impact of limited water transport in the region, the regressive distribution of coinage and the character of trade in Wessex. The major Wessex ridgeways clearly had a role to play during this period and the hypothesis that such watershed routes may have been resorted to by eighth-century traders instead of the higher-maintenance Roman roads seems to be borne out by the findings of this project. In Figure 21 just some of the major ridgeways have been drawn onto the landscape of Wessex. If we are prepared to continue the course of the *wic herepath* out of Study Area 8 along the course of the modern A36 towards Bath and the Bristol Channel, then in
Chapmanslade we have a chapman place-name that sits in an almost identical landscape setting as the ceapmanna del of Study Area 1. In both cases a purposely-built ‘path’ with a designated trade function intersects with a major ridgeway and both sites sit in the frontier zone of West Saxon power in the seventh and eighth centuries. It would therefore appear to be the case that the major watersheds of the Wessex area, beautifully illustrated in Hippsley-Cox’s The Green Roads of England (Figure 5) seem very much to be active corollaries of trade in the eighth century and arguably fairing better than their Roman counterparts. Again, then, it is only by mapping this information over a wider study area that we can be more confident in identifying the patterns of overland trade in the Age of Emporia.

As reviewed in Chapter Three, the trade of the ninth century was characterised by the demise of Hamwic and a conjectural ‘nadir’ before the clear evidence for urban occupation towards the end of the tenth century. Understanding the herepath network may further help us to shed light on this shift from an ‘allocative system’, one of gift-exchange and institutionalised distribution, to a system whereby ‘commodities were increasingly exchanged for money in price-making markets’. Analysing the route network in particular will contribute to comprehending the processes by which this shift took place in the landscape. It may actually be that the missing wealth of this ‘nadir’ period can be found in the infrastructural projects that were undertaken at this time, not just the forts that provided economic resilience but also in a network of routes and bridges that allowed for the greater flow of goods between places of production and central refuges. We might therefore posit an ‘Age of Infrastructure’, instigated, administered and governed by elites but with the complicity of a self-determined people with an appetite for trade and exchange and the social standing and personal advancement it brings about. Understanding the changes and developments in the network of overland trade routes from the eighth through to the tenth century will allow us to commentate further on the reciprocity of the dynamic between top-down royal instigation and the endogenous processes of growth.

In charter evidence of the later tenth and eleventh centuries we start to see the arrival of a new terminology for certain routes. ‘Port ways’ and ‘King’s ways’ begin to become a standard feature of the landscape and in general, they corroborate the evidence for a legal campaign restricting trade to certain ‘ports’ and affording protection to all people whilst on the road. The king’s role in all of this is clear and the increasing emphasis

956 Jones ‘Transaction Costs’ 658; Hill ‘Development of Towns’ 217 – a market-based economy had come to exist in the tenth century
placed on the economic function of the route network of Wessex is reflected in the archaeological evidence for urban occupation in the later tenth and eleventh centuries. Whilst ‘King’s Ways’ and ‘highways’ might be seen to have a longer period of use as terms to describe the status enjoyed by certain routes, running into the twelfth century and beyond, the term ‘port way’ might be considered to have a more limited chronological range and one associated with the concept of the Carolingian *portus* and the urban ambitions of tenth and eleventh century kings. The mapping then of ‘port ways’ on a larger scale might very well serve to contribute further to our knowledge of the processes of urbanisation in later Anglo-Saxon Wessex (and beyond). The term ‘port’ occurs twenty-six times in the boundary clauses. Of these, it is linked most frequently with *stræt*, and only four times with ‘way’ with the earliest reliable reference coming from the mention, already covered above, to *per port her paðes* in the grant of land to the immediate SW of Wilton and dating to 956 (for 959). It does however occur frequently as a place-name and the example of the Andover to Old Sarum *Portway* is one of a number recorded in the county by the fourteenth century. In the study areas alone, the ‘port’ element in place-names provides interesting insights into town developments in this period. Rainbird and Druce argue that AMS dates from Oldaport make it a strong candidate for an unrecognised *burh* built to counter the Viking threat. But in the dating and the name – first recorded as *Yoldeporte* in 1310 – might we actually have a settlement designed for commercial purposes – engaging in particular with the re-emergence of long-distance trade – rather than one designed entirely for defensive reasons? In Shaftesbury, the name given to the road that runs along the spine of the outcrop upon which the town sits is ‘Bimport’. Running perpendicular to the High Street and thought to be a derivation from *binnan* and *port* [within the port], it is a further indication of the intention for sites of this stature to serve as both a centre of taxable exchange and a fortified refuge.

In Chapter 3, *Table 2*, a hypothetical and simplified shift in trade patterns between 650 and 1200 was put forward. Many of the findings of this research project can contribute more detail to create *Table 14* (below) and in particular to provide information on the networks of trade that were the characteristics of these periods. There were, however, undoubtedly phases of transition between each period and if we are to properly
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understand these changes in a landscape context of travelling and communicating, it is only by extending the methodology adopted by this project over a much wider area with a view to ultimately providing a comprehensive map of the route networks of Southern England.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circa. 650 - 850</th>
<th>Circa. 800 – 1000</th>
<th>Circa. 950 - 1200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-Distance trade</td>
<td>Regional over-land trade</td>
<td>Re-emergence of long-distance trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Roman roads</td>
<td>Herepath network</td>
<td>Long-distance over-land routes ('King’s ways and highways')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric ridgeways</td>
<td>Developments in infrastructure</td>
<td>Evolution of Herepath network to Portways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigable rivers</td>
<td>Burh to Burh connectivity</td>
<td>Quaysides and revetments at major ports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach markets/Coastal connection</td>
<td>Small to medium bridges and improved fords</td>
<td>Major bridge-building/bridgeheads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emporia</td>
<td>Greater stratification in trading-place types:</td>
<td>Emergence of cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second tier trading centres:</td>
<td>• Large towns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minsters</td>
<td>• Small towns/minsters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <em>Villa Regalis</em></td>
<td>• Minsters/estate centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Productive’ sites</td>
<td>• Manors/villages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HAMWIC</strong></td>
<td><strong>WINCHESTER</strong></td>
<td><strong>SOUTHAMPTON</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Simplified shift in trade patterns 650 - 1200 with examples

Attention shall finally be drawn to the method applied by this research project where it has been demonstrated that mapping Anglo-Saxon charter boundary clauses, so that the information they contain can be cross-analysed against other relevant landscape, place-name, historical and archaeological data, has the potential to make significant gains in our understanding of the landscape context of early medieval processes of economic development, social transition and cultural assimilation. One of the key principles that underpins modern archaeological study is the importance of understanding the spatial attributes of the phenomena we study – the ‘mapping’ of data. Indeed, as O. G. S. Crawford himself noted fifty years ago in a chapter on ‘Archaeology and Maps’; ‘Objects should be capable of being so marshalled spatially, that is to say geographically, as to yield new knowledge’. In their documentary and literary context, charter boundary clauses are a strong contributor to our knowledge of how the English language was used and developed during the Anglo-Saxon period and the *Langscape* project recognises this significance. Yet,
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964 Crawford, *Archaeology in the Field* 41.
the landmarks referred to in the boundary clauses are also ‘objects’: They are places that existed (and exist in an archaeological state today) in a landscape (i.e. a spatial context) and placing them in this arena means that they can be subjected to the complex geographical and spatial analysis that they deserve in order to present us with new data sets. Mapping this data on a grand scale allows the charter boundary clauses to speak for themselves, outside of the literary, diplomatic, constitutional and political subject areas that have for the most part been the orbit of their discussion.

This is not to say that the corpus of boundary clauses has not before been used successfully for landscape study but for the most part, the mere elucidation of ‘solutions’ (i.e. the marrying of the clause with a landscape) and the linking of that information to local studies have proven to be the extent of most attempts to engage with the material. Otherwise, boundary clauses have found themselves ‘quarried’ for certain terms to support the various studies reviewed in the section in Chapter Four entitled ‘Boundary Clauses: Their Development and Use’. Whilst no doubt yielding results that have significantly developed our understanding of early medieval landscapes, extracting with a preconceived notion of the terms considered relevant to one’s study means that much of what the clauses have to say is ignored. Della Hooke’s *Anglo-Saxon Landscapes of the West Midlands: The Charter Evidence* stands out as an early study that provides a synthesis on the collective analysis of certain terms found in boundary clauses. Yet, in the thirty-two years since the publication of this landmark study, archaeologists, geographers and landscape historians have failed to make use of the technology available to them to place this data in a digital format and to publish it so that it can be subjected by a wider community of scholars to the manipulation, interrogation and scrutiny of which this important source of information is so deserving. This study has demonstrated that in mapping on a wider scale the information contained in boundary clauses, real developments in our understanding of the landscape context of early medieval phenomena can be made.

It is the author’s view that arguably, it is not until the Romantic poets of the eighteenth century that the landscape of England is described in such rich, vivid and colourful detail and it is hoped that the database from which this study has been made, over time, will be extended to cover a wider area and will be published so that anyone with an interest in Anglo-Saxon England can explore this invaluable source of information in its primary context: the landscape of early medieval Wessex.
## Abbreviations

### Law codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abt</th>
<th>Æthelberht of Kent, 602-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hl</td>
<td>Hlóthere/Eadric of Kent, 673x686.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wi</td>
<td>Wihtæd of Kent, 695-96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ine</td>
<td>Ine of Wessex, 688x694.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Af</td>
<td>Alfred’s <em>domboc</em>, 871x899.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Edw</td>
<td>Edward the Elder, 899x925.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II As</td>
<td>Æthelstan’s Grately Code, 925x939.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Atr</td>
<td>Æthelred’s Council at Enham, 1008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Cn</td>
<td>Cnut’s Winchester Code, 1020-23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECf</td>
<td>Edward the Confessor, ca. 1114.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other Abbreviations

| OS  | Ordnance Survey. |
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