

Putting the pieces together

The long-awaited decision on the future funding of the Portable Antiquities Scheme has finally been announced. For the three years from April 2003, the Heritage Lottery Fund will contribute almost £2.5m, and a further £1.5m will be contributed by a consortium of museums, archaeological bodies, and the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. The funding will enable the scheme to expand from its present fourteen staff, covering half of England and all Wales, to 31 posts covering the whole country, with provision for Education, ICT and Administration. There are hints that Government may be prepared to pick up the bill in the longer term. From a local point of view, this will enable Greater London to be covered by a scheme similar to that described by Michael Lewis for Kent in our previous issue, though the details have still to be worked out. It is likely to complicate further the already Byzantine organisation of archaeology in London; this may be a small price to pay for the additional attention it will bring to London's archaeology.

One reported feature of the Scheme has been the discovery, not just of isolated finds, but of whole new sites made visible by careful plotting of the accumulation of findspots, perhaps over many years. Even in the built-up areas of Greater London, significant undiscovered sites may be more common than we think. A few weeks ago I visited work on a substantial Roman building, possibly a villa, that has been discovered in the evaluation of a small backyard development in an outer London suburb. That the site was found at all is a tribute to the working of PPG16; nevertheless, it might have gone unnoticed if it

had not potentially been within a medieval village. This reminds us that there may be many undiscovered sites, of all periods, remaining in Greater London.

So how do we go about finding such sites? One way, as I have hinted, is through the careful plotting of 'chance' finds (which seem to be found less by chance than by design these days) and looking for unusual concentrations. Another may be by looking for finds that are out of context on known sites -- for example, Roman finds on a medieval site may suggest the presence of a Roman site nearby, and *vice versa*. Research in the LAARC may reveal many such possibilities. To make the most of these disparate sources of information requires coordination, cutting across many of the barriers that we have built for ourselves in London's archaeology. The common point of this information should be the GLSMR, so perhaps that is where we need to devote resources, to build up a record on which we can all ultimately rely.

An apology

We finish Volume 9 with an apology: the location plan of Bruno Barber's article on the *Globe* in issue 12 was seriously distorted. This was due to an editorial error, and we apologise to both the author and to our readers.

Thank you

At the start of Volume 10, I would particularly like to express my thanks to Richard Gilpin, who has designed this new look for *London Archaeologist*.

Index

An index to Volume 9 is being prepared and we hope to distribute it with the next issue.

Annual Lecture and Meeting

The thirty-third AGM of the **London Archaeologist** was held on Tuesday 7 May at the Institute of Archaeology, 31-34 Gordon Square. The following officers were elected: Editor, Clive Orton; Assistant Editor, Mårit Gaimster; Secretary, Monica Kendall; Advertising and Promotions, Roy Stephenson; Subscriptions, Shiela Broomfield; Managing Editor, David Gaimster. Stephen Miller was re-elected as

Auditor. New members representing Kingston upon Thames Archaeological Society, Extra-Mural Archaeological Society and Enfield Archaeological Society were elected to the Publication Committee. The accounts showed a small surplus for the year, and the new constitution was agreed *nem. con.* After the close of business, Bruce Watson of MOLAS spoke on the archaeology of London Bridge.