

iii) The pottery industry was re-started, while most of the ditch system was still open, and sections of the ditches became the repository of dumps of waster material, deriving from a kiln or kilns which must have existed near to the limits of the excavation. A square pit, cut into natural clay and containing much re-deposited clay, may have been a puddling pit.

iv) The kiln (Phases I-IV, fig. 66) was inserted through the ash and pot layers described above. A single-flued up-draught kiln of simple design, it was re-lined on several occasions. The waster material associated with the operation of this kiln was distributed around the area of the kiln, or in adjacent pits, or forming the upper fill of the outer ditch. While the kiln was in operation, the puddling pit was re-cut, and enlarged.

v) In this phase all industrial activity on the site ceased, and part of the area became sealed under a linear spread of clean brown soil, perhaps to be associated with the eastern defences of the Norman Castle. Further phases intervened before the area was disturbed by the construction of the 12th-century hall complex, and the landscaping of its courtyards.

Dating. Although this is at present only provisional,¹⁰⁰ there seems little reason to doubt that the pottery industry in this part of Stamford was a short-lived phenomenon, which is unlikely to have started before the late 9th century, and which had certainly died out before the Norman conquest. The production of red-painted wares was an early experiment, which was not continued.

SAXON SOUTHAMPTON

The statement by P. E. Holdsworth (*Medieval Archaeol.*, xx (1976), 30) that archaeological sites in the Chapel and St Mary's areas of Southampton "will continue to be referred to as Hamwih" cannot be justified on either onomastic or historical grounds. One of the conclusions of my recently-completed analysis of the names recorded as referring to Southampton in the period up to A.D. 1100 is that there is no adequate justification for the modern use of the name-form 'Hamwih' to refer to these sites. Furthermore, there is no reason to apply either of the main alternative names *Hamtun* or *Hamwic* exclusively to any particular part of the Test-Itchen peninsula rather than to its whole. The full results of my research, based on a collection of ninety-eight name-forms, will be published in the excavation report on the Melbourne Street site at Southampton (forthcoming) but in the meantime it may be useful to have a brief summary of my conclusions.

The use by many archaeologists and some historians of the name-form 'Hamwih' to refer to the area where remains of the Anglo-Saxon period have been found on the shores of the R. Test at Southampton has been conventional since the publication in 1949 of the first interim report of excavations there by Maitland Muller.¹⁰¹ In it he defined the sites of ancient settlement at Southampton as "the Roman Town of Clausentum" and "the Saxon Town of Hamwih". Ignoring here the question of the identification of *Clausentum* with Bitterne, the use of the name-form 'Hamwih' in this context and in the work of most subsequent writers on Anglo-Saxon Southampton is open to criticism on both linguistic and more general historical grounds. As a convention it represents the antiquarian promotion of an alien name-form from the status of a 'sport' spelling to one of apparent normality. The spelling on which 'Hamwih' is based is in fact a rare Continental Germanic one (*Ham-wih*), standing for Old English *Hamwic* (*hamm + wic*) and recorded only in a manuscript of the Life of Willibald written in Middle Franconia in the late 8th or early 9th century.¹⁰² The use of this rare Continental spelling as the conventional label for an Anglo-Saxon settlement has led to several confusing and inaccurate statements in archaeological literature, which make the

¹⁰⁰ Dr A. Clark reports that archaeomagnetic measurements made by the Ancient Monuments Laboratory and the Department of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, Newcastle University, gave a mean declination of 15.8°E. and inclination of 68.6° (corrected to Meriden). Calibration data are sparse for this period, but this result appears to support the earlier dating for the kiln.

¹⁰¹ *Proc. Hants. Field Club*, xvii (1949), 65-71.

¹⁰² *Vita Willibaldi Episcopi Eichstetensis*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *Mon. Germ. Hist. Script.*, xv, i (Hanover, 1887), 91.

spelling *Ham-wih* seem much more usual in an English context than it is. The lack of appreciation of the spelling's provenance, which its use as a conventional label engenders, may in itself have unfortunate results. If one knows that the source of the spelling is a Continental Germanic manuscript, in which OE *wic* would naturally be spelled *wig* or *wih*, the spelling *Ham-wih* presents no problem as the name of an English settlement, but were this provenance not known, then in an English context the element OE *wig*, *wēoh*, 'pagan temple, shrine', would immediately suggest itself. English place-names are perhaps difficult enough for archaeologists without putting pitfalls of this kind in their way.

The name-form 'Hamwih' was no doubt originally chosen as a handy label for sites of the Anglo-Saxon period at Southampton because the spelling *Ham-wih*, on which it is based, is the earliest recorded name of the settlement in that (or any) era. This fact in itself does not however make it automatically the best spelling to use as a label. It would have been better, although, as I hope to prove, not ideal, to adopt the normal usage of onomastic commentary and to talk of the sites by the latest rather than the earliest spelling of this lost place-name, that is as *Hamwic*, the insular form represented on coins *c.* 973-1015.

Holdsworth's proposal to continue to use 'Hamwih' as a convention in future references to the said sites is thus to be rejected on grounds of both irregularity and confusability. The argument that the present generation of archaeologists know what they mean by it is not strong enough to excuse its shortcomings. In fact, from recent articles it seems that most of the people who employ it do not know either its significance or its linguistic provenance. Its perpetuation seems likely to compound errors already made through its adoption.

As already stated, the spelling *Hamwic* is preferable to 'Hamwih' on linguistic grounds in any reference to the lost place-name *per se*. This is not to say, however, that *Hamwic* should replace 'Hamwih' as a label for those areas of Southampton most associated with the Anglo-Saxon period. The name *Hamwic* (OE *hamm* + *wic*: 'the trading settlement at the hemmed-in piece of land') was but one of several alternative and co-existent names for Southampton recorded before A.D. 1100. Others names for the settlement were: *Hamton* (OE *hamm* + *tūn*: 'the enclosure (or estate) at the hemmed-in piece of land'; later interpreted as OE *hāmtūn*, 'estate, manor, vill'); *Ham* (OE *hamm*: 'the hemmed-in piece of land'; but perhaps representing a numismatic abbreviation for either *Hamwic* or *Hamton*); and *Sudhamton* (OE *sūd*, 'south', added to the earlier name *Hamton* to distinguish it from the other shire-town called *Hamton* (Northampton)). More informally, the place was also described by the simplex name *Wic* (OE *wic*: perhaps, but not necessarily, a colloquial abbreviated form of *Hamwic*) and the term *port*, 'market-town, town with a mint'. Apart from the name *Wic*, referring specifically to the St Mary's area after its decline, any of the other names may refer to a settlement occupying the whole land-mass of the peninsula between the R. Test and R. Itchen rather than just to a particular part of it. Because of their co-existence and alternation, all but one of the recorded names should be regarded as being in the nature of alternatives for the same place rather than as the names of constituent parts of a divisible whole.

In the past, the knowledge of the existence of the two most obvious alternating names, *Hamwic* and *Hamton*, has stimulated much speculation about the way in which the early medieval settlement at Southampton evolved. Although L. A. Burgess's theory¹⁰³ of the existence at Southampton of two mutually dependent but physically separate settlements — the one a *wic* having a commercial function and the other a *tūn* with an administrative and defensive role — cannot be substantiated, its influence remains. The idea that the mercantile remains found in the Chapel and St Mary's areas must be

¹⁰³ L. A. Burgess, *Origins of Southampton* (Leicester, 1964).

those of a settlement called *Hamwic* rather than *Hamtun* is a result of Burgess's theory and, with it, stems from an inadequate appreciation of the nature of the place-name evidence involved. Each of the alternative names listed above (apart from *Wic*) represents an 'alias' of the same place, coined to describe a different aspect of the settlement: mercantile (*Hamwic*; also the term *port*); administrative (*Hamtun*); topographical (*Ham*, and *Ham-*); and directional (*Sudhamtun*). These alternative aspects represent flexible mental images of the whole place rather than the existence of physically separable 'quarters' of a town each with its own function and its own name. Because place-names are essentially cerebral in nature and are thus capable of a degree of nuance, the context in which they were formed, used, and recorded must be considered before they can be employed as historical evidence. The provenance of a particular spelling must always temper the weight to be laid upon it. This is most important when dealing with major place-names, those of settlements and major landmarks rather than of minor topographical features; such names were often used and recorded at a great distance from the places themselves and by people not usually familiar with their precise location or topography. In contrast to the undoubted value to archaeologists of minor place-names, there are real limitations to the use of settlement-names for minute topographical investigation. This is particularly true where the elements involved are descriptive of the function of the place (such as *wic* or *tūn*) rather than of a natural feature at it. Even the latter type of name ceases to be identifiable with a particular habitation site when the feature involved is used to name an extensive estate surrounding it. For these reasons it is dangerous to take but one of several alternative names of the same place (such as *Hamwic*) and apply it without historical justification to one archaeological site or small cluster of sites within the settlement rather than to the whole place. In the same way it is incorrect to take, as Holdsworth does, the term *villa regalis* (in the dating clause "*in villa regalis quae appellatur Hamptone*" of an Anglo-Saxon charter) to refer specifically to a royal residence at Southampton.¹⁰⁴ In this context, the term means no more than that Southampton was a 'royal vill' and is not evidence one way or the other for the existence of a royal palace within the settlement.

If one must have a conventional usage by which to refer to Southampton in the Anglo-Saxon period it is probably best to use the term 'Saxon Southampton', already employed by some archaeologists, when talking of the settlement as a whole, and the modern local district and street-names (such as St Mary's or Melbourne Street) to pinpoint archaeological sites which have been chosen, after all, through political expediency rather than free will. Perhaps if we were to think of Saxon Southampton more as an estate extending as far as the boundaries of the neighbouring estates of Millbrook and South Stoneham — including the whole peninsula between the R. Test and R. Itchen, and both the St Mary's area and the later walled town as well as the ground in between — it might lead to a better appreciation of the continuity between Saxon and later medieval Southampton. In spite of the fact that the nucleus of the settlement shifted from one side of the peninsula to the other in the late Anglo-Saxon period the settlement as a whole survived and probably retained the same commercial influence in its region and the same immediate land-boundaries. Quite a lot of attention has already been paid to Southampton's position as an international port in the Anglo-Saxon period, that is, on the aspect of the settlement exemplified by the name *Hamwic*. It is now time to pay equal attention to the position of Saxon Southampton as a regional centre of trade and government, the aspect which had much to do with the appearance of the name *Hamtun* in the shire-name Hampshire.

ALEXANDER R. RUMBLE

¹⁰⁴ W. de G. Birch, *Cartularium Saxonicum*, No. 431, ex Sawyer 288 MS 2; A.D. 840 (c. 1340).