

This note has attempted to summarise the main characteristics of the Saxon pottery from Barking, and outline a few issues which bear on the study of the Abbey's domestic and foreign relationships beyond the monastic enclosure.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Patricia Wilkinson and the

Passmore Edwards Museum for permission to publish this note in advance of a more definitive report of the excavations, Ken MacGowan and Mike Stone for discussing their excavations, Graham Reed and David Williams for the pottery drawings, Paul Blinkhorn for information on Ipswich-type ware and Lyn Blackmore and Ken MacGowan for comments on this note.

Letters

The minster parish of Waltham

Peter Huggins' paper in *L.A.* 6, no. 11, contains a lot of new ideas about the minster parish of Waltham and its relationship to that of London. It seems to me that a possible boundary on the northern edge of the Waltham *parochia* might well include the line running from the south-east of Roydon Hamlet across Roydon itself to near the Stanstead/Hunston boundary (this can be followed on Huggins Fig. 1 from TL 423 073 to TL 410 102). This line has been postulated elsewhere (fn 17 in the paper) as an estate boundary of c 700, mainly on the basis of stretches of bank and ditch incorporated in it. Since the estate in question was granted by a king of the East Saxons for the foundation of a religious house, it seems reasonable that this boundary could follow the line of the minster parish boundary probably established a generation earlier.

More relevant to the history of London are two references to grants claimed to have been made by king Offa of Mercia to the abbey of St. Alban, which he founded or re-founded in 795, the year before his death. Extant charters by Offa to his new foundation appear to be restricted to Cashio and Park (Hertfordshire), Stanmore (Middlesex) and lands in Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire. These charters exist only in 13th-century (B. L. Cotton Nero D1) and later copies, and it has been fashionable to describe them as spurious; textually they may be so, but in general they refer to lands owned by the abbey in 1066 (*Domesday Book*). The B. L. manuscript also contains lists further donations claimed for Offa, including *Edelmetunam*, and a late 14th-century manuscript mentions *Edelmentuna* and *Enefelde*, as well as the lands previously mentioned, among others. The archaic name for Edmonton, in particular, certainly suggests derivation from an Old English source, now lost. Other donors are recorded and their respective donations listed.

It seems to be generally agreed that Mercian power had reached the Lea Valley well before the 790s, although detailed documentation is lacking; but it does not seem to have been noted that Edmonton and Enfield were royal estates at this time. The Waltham church 2 (Huggins Fig. 2) shows several close parallels with the church at Brixworth (Northants.): the two rows of *porticus*, the arrangement of the west end (so far as the Waltham evidence goes), and the widths of the two buildings being all very similar. However Brixworth's nave is longer and has four *porticus* on each side compared to three at Waltham, while the chancel at Waltham is not square as Brixworth's is, and has no eastern extension of any kind. Professor Fernie dates Brixworth to c 800-860 and the less-developed state of the east end at Waltham could imply a somewhat earlier date, putting it back into Offa's reign (757-796). We thus have Mercian influence straddling the Lea, the river clearly not constituting a boundary. Did the Mercians advance further into Essex or were they concerned primarily with the protection of London against invaders (East Anglians?) down the Lea valley?

Had St. Alban's abbey retained Enfield and Edmonton it seems likely that these places, together with South Mimms (an outlier

of Edmonton in *Domesday Book*), would have remained in Hertfordshire rather than providing a north-east excrescence to Middlesex. The date of the abbey's loss is difficult to determine; the 9th abbot Eadmer, however, is said to have died (probably in the 980s) leaving the monastery much in debt, so that some possessions had to be sold and some timber cut down. Half a century later Enfield, Edmonton and Waltham were all in the hands of Tovi the *staller*, the legendary founder of the church of Waltham. The first two places were certainly attached to the office of *staller*, which seems to have involved inter alia the defence of London, and their allocation to this office would fit very well into the 980s, when Danish raids were developing for the second time.

Ken Bascombe

25 Monkswood Avenue
Waltham Abbey
Essex EN9 1LA

The Museum of London

I REGRET THAT my concern about policy changes in the Museum of London should have been construed as personal criticism of the Director. I would also point out that Gromaticus underrates Max Hebditch's strong initial resistance to the changes imposed on the organisation of London archaeology by English Heritage. There was no capitulation until it became clear that English Heritage could not be dissuaded from using its financial muscle to achieve its ends. A deciding factor was clearly their decision to phase out the annual grant, initiated by the GLC to establish an archaeological service in Greater London. The Government had agreed that this should continue after the abolition of the GLC, and would in future be administered by English Heritage, whose own grant from Government was accordingly increased. As the decision to phase out the grant was taken at a time when the Museum was facing other grave financial difficulties—a decline in developer funding due to the recession and a Government decision that the museum could no longer be regarded as a local authority museum and must therefore pay VAT—the Director and Board of Governors could only accept English Heritage's terms, which included funding for current post-excavation work and the probability of future payments for excavation in competition with others. Nevertheless most of those who have long been concerned with London archaeology are deeply saddened by the dismantling of an organisation that has served London well and is popular with local authorities and archaeological societies alike, in favour of something unknown and possibly inferior that has yet to be set up. We are further saddened because it will result in the enforced departure from the London scene of archaeologists with long experience and special knowledge of London problems. It is regrettable that these changes have been enforced for what seems to many of us an ideological quibble of little practical significance. It is ironical that they should have been imposed by a Quango at a time when the Government itself seems to be adopting a much more pragmatic attitude.

Ralph Merrifield

32 Poplar Walk
London SE24 0BU