



Contextualising Metal-Detected  
Discoveries:  
Staffordshire Anglo-Saxon Hoard

Project 5892

Stage 3 (EDIT) Project Design

Submitted 9 February 2018

Peter Guest



(Company no. 3929951; VAT registration 747960390)

# Document Control Grid

**Title:** Contextualising Metal-Detected Discoveries: Staffordshire Anglo-Saxon Hoard

**Author:** Peter Guest.

**Start Date:** 1 February 2018

**History:** Developed from the Stage 3 (EDIT) Project Design draft2 submitted to Historic England 12 January 2018; feedback received 15 January 2018. Draft3 submitted to Historic England 19 January 2018. Final Stage 3 (EDIT) Project Design submitted 2 February 2018; feedback received 9 February 2018. Final (v2) Stage 3 (EDIT) Project Design submitted 9 February 2018.

**Version number:** 4

**Status:** Final

**Circulation:** Historic England

**Required Action:** Response from HE

**File name:** 5892 SH S3 (EDIT) PD\_v2.pdf

**Approval:** Peter Guest on behalf of Barbican Research Associates Ltd. 9:2:2018

**Contact details:**

14 Bibury Crescent,  
Henleaze  
BRISTOL BS9 4PW

Tel: 0117 962 2537  
Mobile: 00 44 7494 353068  
Email: peter.guest24@gmail.com

# Contents

1	Project name	5
2	Summary description	5
3	Overview of the Stage 3 (EDIT) Project Design	5
4	Introduction and Background	6
4.1	Statement of Research Potential and Research Questions	
4.2	Project Outputs	
4.3	Outcomes of Stage 2	
5	Project Scope	8
6	Business Case	8
7	The Results of Stage 2	9
7.1	Output 1 - the Digital Archive	
7.2	Output 2 - the 'Letterpress' draft	
8	Stage 3 (EDIT) - Referees' Comments, Editors' Response and Editorial Work Tasks	10
8.1	'Collated Anonymous Referee Report' and Academic Editors' Response	
8.2	The Edit-based Text	
8.3	Editorial Work Tasks	
8.4	Digital Catalogues (e-catalogues)	
9	Stage 3 (EDIT) – Edit Products and Timetable	12
9.1	Product 1: Edit Stage Set-up	
9.2	Product 2: External images - obtaining permissions	
9.3	Product 3: Draft Project Design preparation	
9.4	Product 4: Final Project Design preparation & submission	
9.5	Product 5: Editorial Tasks to produce Agreed Final Manuscript	
9.6	Product 6: Submission of Final MS to Historic England	
9.7	Product 7: Submission of Stage MoRPHE Report	
9.8	Timetable	
10	Stage 3 Budget	13
10.1	Overall budget by EDIT Products and Main Tasks	

10.2	Product 5 - Editorial Tasks to produce Final MS	
10.3	Overall budget by EDIT Year	
11	Project Team Structure	15
11.1	Project Executive	
11.2	Project team	
12	Communication	16
12.1	The secure website	
12.2	Stage team meetings	
12.3	Communication with the Executive	
13	Project Review	16
14	Health and Safety	16
15	Ownership	16
16	Bibliography	17

#### APPENDICES

1	The Referees' Report and the Academic Editors' Responses (In red).	18
2	Arrangement of the Final Manuscript	27
3	The Editorial Work Tasks (those recommended in the 'Collated Anonymous Referee Report' shown In red)	28
4	The Stage 3 Main Edit Products and Tasks – summaries of Time, Costs and Timetable	32
5	The Editorial Work Tasks – summary of Costs by Chapter and Parts (those recommended in the 'Collated Anonymous Referee Report' shown in red)	33

## **1 PROJECT NAME**

Contextualising Metal-Detected Discoveries: Staffordshire Anglo-Saxon Hoard

## **2 SUMMARY DESCRIPTION**

This third and final Stage of the project involves the amendment, editing and preparation of the draft publication that will present the results of the ground-breaking analysis and research conducted on the Staffordshire Hoard since its discovery in 2009. The printed volume and e-book will be entitled '*The Staffordshire Hoard: An Anglo-Saxon Treasure*' and are to be published by The Society of Antiquaries of London. This Stage begins with the referees' report on the so-called 'letterpress' draft (submitted June 2017) and ends with submission to Historic England of the signed-off final manuscript.

## **3 OVERVIEW OF THE STAGE 3 (EDIT) PROJECT DESIGN**

This document describes the programme of work required to produce the final agreed manuscript that will be published as '*The Staffordshire Hoard: An Anglo-Saxon Treasure*' (editors Chris J R Fern, Tania M Dickinson and Leslie Webster). The Project Design summarises the results of Stage 2 before focusing on the work required to produce the agreed manuscript that concludes the EDIT Stage. It is intended that this work will be carried out over a period of 4 months between February and May 2018.

Most of the topics normally expected of a MoRPHE project design are covered here (potential, research aims and objectives, business case, project scope, timescales, interfaces, communication, project review, health and safety, project team structure), although given that the vast bulk of the work to complete the project has already been done, these are necessarily summary and either simply restate what was presented in the first two Stage Project Designs, or are sometimes subsumed in other sections.

This Project Design closes with Appendices that present:

1. The Referees' Report and the Academic Editors' responses
2. Arrangement of the final manuscript
3. The Editorial Work Tasks
4. The Stage 3 Main EDIT Products - time, costs and timetable
5. The Editorial Work Tasks – summary of costs

The Academic Editors for the EDIT Stage of the Project are Tania Dickinson, Leslie Webster and Chris Fern.

It is proposed that Barbican Research Associates will continue to manage the project through to the end of the EDIT Stage, although due to other work commitments Hilary Cool will be replaced by Peter Guest (whose CV and list of publications were submitted to Historic England's Project Assurance Officer prior to preparation of this Project Design).

## **4 INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND**

The short yet occasionally complicated history of the 'Contextualising Metal-Detected Discoveries: Staffordshire Anglo-Saxon Hoard' project is fully described in the project designs for Stage 1 (Assessment) and Stage 2 (Analysis), as well as the Development and Progress report that was submitted at the end of Stage 2.<sup>1</sup> While it is unnecessary to record the discovery of the Hoard and the progress since then again here, it is worth repeating the Project's primary aims and objectives. These can be divided into Research Potential and Research Questions, culminating in the Project Outputs:

### **4.1 Statement of Research Potential and Research Questions:**

The Project began with extremely ambitious aims, particularly in terms of the programme of academic study that would subject the Hoard to a battery of scientific and non-scientific analysis, adding considerable knowledge and leading to a much better understanding of Britain in the Anglo-Saxon period. If anything, the aims of the Project have become even more ambitious as the various analytical studies were completed and new questions asked. Overall, the Statement of Research Potential of the Project remains much as it was at the start of Stage 1, consisting of six main areas or themes where the study of the Staffordshire Hoard will have a major impact:

- The Hoard as an artefact - exploring depositional practices
- The Hoard as art – re-writing decoration
- The Hoard as history – the origins of Mercia
- The Hoard as economy – the gold standard
- The hoard as worth – value then and now
- The Hoard as a window – new perceptions of the seventh century

Fulfilling these ambitions requires that the Staffordshire Hoard itself is as exhaustively studied and as thoroughly understood as possible, as an archaeological artefact in its own right as well as a collection of thousands of separate component artefacts. The Hoard's components are all fragments of broken prestige objects in gold and silver, Anglo-Saxon and mostly dating from the seventh century. The Project's Research Questions are:

1. What did the Hoard consist of?
2. When was the Hoard deposited?
3. Why was the Hoard deposited?
4. What does the Hoard tell us about seventh-century life?
5. What can we learn from the experience of studying the Hoard?

---

<sup>1</sup> Cool 2013; Cool 2015; Cool 2017.

## **4.2 Project Outputs:**

From the outset of the Project, two related Outputs<sup>2</sup> were planned. These are both highly complex products involving the combined efforts of numerous individuals over several years. Although the form and character of both Outputs have developed somewhat over the course of the Project, their purposes remain as they were at the beginning.

Combined together the Outputs are the primary product of the project, which when completed will form the definitive account of the Staffordshire Hoard for many decades to come. As the project's legacy (as well as the legacy of the many individuals and organisations involved), it is essential that the Outputs are completed to the highest achievable standards in terms of analysis and interpretation, as well as communication and dissemination. Although the years since 2009 have seen very dramatic changes in the political and economic situation in the UK, the Project is on-course to deliver one of the most extensive and ground-breaking publications of a British hoard find, comparable to any archaeological site or find in Britain.

The Project Outputs are:

1. Integrated database of the complete Hoard assemblage, including full conservation and research information for each object. This will form the fundamental research archive and is to be made publicly available;
2. Scholarly publication, consisting of the definitive illustrated catalogue and a series of synthetic discussions addressing the major questions surrounding the hoard. The publication is intended to be the authoritative point-in-time statement which (backed by on-line dissemination of the archive as a research resource), should stimulate future scholarship.

## **4.3 Outcomes of Stage 2**

Stage 2 saw the completion of full draft versions of both Outputs. The work involved in reaching this point involved over 50 individual conservators and material scientists, historians and archaeologists photographers and illustrators, who together over seven years were able to piece together a remarkably clear picture of the objects contained in the Hoard, how they were made and what they were for, what happened to them prior to their burial, as well as ideas about when and why the Hoard was deposited in the ground and never recovered.

The integrated database has been delivered to the Archaeology Data Service (ADS) and is almost ready to be made publically available through the ADS website to coincide with the publication of the scholarly publication (see section 7.1 below).

The scholarly publication is now ready in initial draft form. It includes extensive discussions of all the original Research Questions (as well as numerous others),

---

<sup>2</sup> Sometimes previously referred to as 'Deliverables'.

and a full catalogue of the Hoard's fragments and objects (see section 7.2 below).

## **5 PROJECT SCOPE**

The overall scope of the Project remains as described in the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Project Designs.<sup>3</sup> Effectively, Stage 1 was a very large assessment and scoping exercise to establish what was in the Hoard and to confirm that the proposed avenues of research were viable. In Stage 2 most of the analysis and research were undertaken and completed. The final products of Stage 2 were A) a digital archive, and B) a 'letterpress' draft ready for external refereeing.

The referees' comments on the 'letterpress' draft represent the starting point of the final Stage 3 (EDIT) element of the Project, which will finish with submission to Historic England of the full manuscript as signed off by the Academic Editors and Project Manager, together with permissions and image files for all external images (i.e. of non-Staffordshire Hoard objects).

The costs of the Stage 3 (EDIT) phase of the Project include all those associated with the amendment, revision and editing of the 'letterpress' draft to produce the final manuscript, including Tables and Figures, together with the reproduction fees of all images from external sources required in the final publication. Permissions and image files for all external images will be submitted with the full manuscript to Historic England.

The Stage 3 (EDIT) phase will not include any copy-editing, typesetting or formatting of the final published volume (or its e-version), which will be the responsibility of Historic England and the Society of Antiquaries of London.

## **6 BUSINESS CASE**

The business case for funding the research project remains the same as it was at the outset of the project.<sup>4</sup> Funding Stage 3 will continue the process that started when English Heritage agreed to fund the excavation which recovered the Hoard in 2009 under SHAPE sub-programme 32144.110: Heritage at Risk: Recording historic sites, buildings and monuments under imminent threat outside the planning process.

Stages 1 and 2 of the project were funded by Historic England (English Heritage until April 2015), and the Hoard's owners, Birmingham City Council (Birmingham Museums Trust) and Stoke-on-Trent City Council (The Potteries Museum & Art Gallery). The total cost of the project to the end of Stage 2 is in excess of £750k.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Cool 2013 Section 9; Cool 2015 Section 8.

<sup>4</sup> Cool 2013 Section 8; Cool 2015 Section 9.

<sup>5</sup> Not including the staff costs of team members employed by the Hoard owners and at the British Museum, capital costs of new displays at museums in Birmingham and Stoke, or the cost of initiatives such as the Mercian Trail.

Stage 3 of the project is costed at £ [REDACTED] (with VAT). This includes all correcting, amendment and editing work to produce the agreed manuscript for publication (including all text, Tables and Figures). Fees charged for images provided by external sources are also included. The cost of Stage 3 represents some 9% of the funding already provided for the Staffordshire Hoard project.

## **7 THE RESULTS OF STAGE 2**

It is now known that the Staffordshire Hoard contained at least 4,599 individual fragments of mainly gold (846 fragments; 3939.94g), and silver (3,529 fragments; 1695.69g), but also copper alloy as well as loose garnets, glass and stone (224 fragments).

It is unclear exactly how many objects these would have originally represented prior to their fragmentation, but it is considered most likely that the Hoard contained parts of some 600 separately definable 'objects', almost all of which were examples of prestige, high-status Anglo-Saxon material culture of the sixth and seventh centuries. The Hoard comprised a preponderance of military items, including at least one helmet as well as elements of numerous sword hilts and scabbards, combined with a smaller, but no less fascinating, collection of Christian objects such as the large gold altar or processional cross, a unique priestly head-dress, a gold sheet with a biblical inscription in Latin, and several mounts and pendants.

Stage 2 of the Project involved the conservation, identification, cataloguing and analysis of these many fragments and objects, together with a multi-authored and wide-ranging discussion of the Hoard, its contents and what these tell us about life in the seventh-century. All this is contained in the two main project Outputs, each of which is described separately below.

### **7.1 Output 1 - The Digital Archive**

The full Digital Archive has been delivered to the Archaeology Data Service and is ready to go live as soon as the scholarly publication is published. The Staffordshire Hoard Digital Archive will be available at:

[http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/staffshoard\\_he\\_2017/index.cfm](http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/staffshoard_he_2017/index.cfm).

Each catalogued fragment will be fully described and illustrated in the Digital Archive, which itself consists of the following separate but complementary elements:

- 6 e-Tables of data
  - e-Table 1\_Spreadsheet of objects and fragments by K-number, finder and catalogue
  - e-Table 2\_Spreadsheets of soil blocks 1-21 and others
  - e-Table 3\_Spreadsheets of other find associations
  - e-Table 4\_Summary of sets of objects identified in the Hoard (plus Notes)

- e-Table 5\_Measurements for metal sheet and filigree
- e-Table 6\_Measurements from weapon parts and marks
- 10 e-Catalogues that group the fragments and objects by type and function (sword pommels, hilts plates etc).
- 143 sheets of all fragments x-rayed in Stage 2
- 24 Staffordshire Hoard Research Reports produced during Stage 2 (currently available on the website as pdf and csv files).
- 10 Research Project Newsletters produced during Stages 1 and 2 (currently available on the website as pdf files).

## **7.2 Output 2 - the 'Letterpress' draft**

The main product of Stage 2 was the 'letterpress' draft of the full volume, which was submitted in June 2017. This was the work of some 23 authors and runs to over 160,000 words (excluding Bibliography, Tables, and Figure captions). The 'letterpress' draft was divided into 4 Parts, each including several Chapters. Most of the Chapters comprise several sub-chapters or sections, often written by different authors. The final publication will include 27 Tables as well as 345 Figures (colour maps, photographs and drawings of objects and their details).

The 'letterpress' draft is a monumental archaeological and historical achievement, particularly as it was produced in just two-and-a-half years. The research described in the draft is extraordinarily broad and complex, so to keep to such a tight timescale required determination and dedication by everyone involved, but particularly the previous PM and the Academic Editors.

The 'letterpress' draft is the amalgamation of all the commissioned Stage 2 reports pieced together into a sequence of parts, chapters and sub-chapters in a single document. The main challenge of the Stage 3 work will be to integrate the numerous constituent elements into a seamless coherent whole that is greater than the sum of its parts.

## **8 STAGE 3 (EDIT) – REFEREES' COMMENTS, EDITORS' RESPONSE AND EDITORIAL WORK TASKS**

This and the following section outline the main Products and Tasks that will complete this Stage (the penultimate phase of the overall Project), beginning with the referees' comments on the 'letterpress' draft.

### **8.1 Collated Anonymous Referee Report and Academic Editors' Response**

The 'letterpress' draft was submitted to Historic England in June 2017. This was then sent out for external refereeing and in September 2017, HE's Project Assurance Officer (Barney Sloane) circulated the 'Collated Anonymous Referee Report' to the Academic Editors and the Project Manager.

The Academic Editors replied to the Report in early November 2017. The referees' report and the Academic Editors' responses are provided in Appendix

1. As will be seen, the referees' comments are extremely positive, though numerous small improvements are recommended before publication.

The 'Collated Anonymous Referee Report' begins:

- *'This is a landmark publication not only of early medieval studies but of British archaeology as a whole. Expectations of this report will, therefore, inevitably be high, but it is believed that it will meet those expectations.'*

The report continues positively throughout and the referees advise:

- *'that the academic editors be given the time they feel that they need to review and revise even if this pushes the publication timetable back by a month or two. Some space to reflect would probably be helpful, especially in considering issues of focus and emphasis across multiple contributions, and it would be a shame to compromise revision, integration and polishing of the report by rushing the process'.*

## **8.2 The Edit-based Text**

The Academic Editors began the process of transforming the 'letterpress' draft into the agreed final manuscript as soon as the former was submitted. This is now known as the Edit-Based Text (EBT) and the Academic Editors are responsible for its updating, storage and security.

## **8.3 Editorial Work Tasks**

The arrangement of the final manuscript is provided in Appendix 2 (effectively the volume's contents page). This follows that of the draft 'letterpress' with one minor adjustment: the Introduction will not be a separate chapter and Chapter 1 will open Part One instead.

Appendix 3 breaks down the chapters into their constituent sub-chapters or sections, showing the authors involved, what work is recommended in the 'Collated Anonymous Referee Report', how the Academic Editors responded to these recommendations and their proposals for other revision and editorial work, who will undertake the work and, finally, which Editor will oversee each Work Task (tasks recommended by the referees are shown in red to distinguish these from additional tasks proposed by the Academic Editors).

Producing the final agreed manuscript will involve 68 Author days and 21 Editor days (89 days in total). The time required to complete Work Tasks recommended by the Referees and others recommended by the Academic Editors is as follows:

- 42.5 Author days and 18.75 Editor days are required to complete the 38 separate Work Tasks recommended in the 'Collated Anonymous Referee Report' (69% of total time);
- 25.7 Author days and 2 Editor days are required to complete the 36 Work Tasks recommended by the Academic Editors. Most of this work involves

the multiple authors checking their contributions and minor editing work (31% of total time).

The three Academic Editors will contribute a total of 75.75 days to the Editorial Work Tasks (85% of total):

- TD = 31 days (13.5 as Actioner + 17.5 as Editor)
- LW = 19.25 days (17.25 as Actioner + 2 as Editor)
- CF = 25.5 (23 days as Actioner + 2.5 days as Editor)

#### **8.4 Digital Catalogues (e-catalogues)**

The Editorial Work Task list includes 5 days for the updating and editing of the 10 e-catalogues prepared in Stage 2 to accompany the Digital Archive. Although the 'Collated Anonymous Referee Report' does not recommend further work on these resources (*'This should provide a model for how to make the fruits of similarly complex research projects fully and widely available in the future. There were no suggestions for how this could be improved'*), the Academic Editors feel strongly that this work is necessary to ensure the e-catalogues meet the same high standards as the publication.

The Academic Editors prepared a document proposing different options for this work, which the PM forwarded to Historic England with a cover letter. Since then, it has been decided to employ Ian Dennis of Cardiff University to produce the final catalogues, which has reduced the time and cost of this Work Task considerably (maximum £■■■■). The nature of the updating and editing is to be determined by Historic England as part of the Project Design approval process.

### **9 STAGE 3 (EDIT) – EDIT PRODUCTS AND TIMETABLE**

The main Products and Tasks involved in moving from the 'letterpress' draft to the agreed final manuscript are presented in Appendix 4. This work involves 132.6 person-days that, it is intended, will be undertaken between February and May/June 2018.

#### **9.1 Product 1: Edit Stage Set-up**

11.5 days for the Academic Editors and Project Managers to prepare for the EDIT Stage. This includes time for Barbican's old and new Project Managers to liaise over the project, the Academic Editors' response to the 'Collated Anonymous Referee Report' and the preparation of the Edit-based Text. Also included is the meeting at the Society of Antiquaries held in November 2017 for the PM and the AEs to meet for the first time and discuss the steps involved in producing this Project Design. This work was undertaken prior to the submission of the PD.

#### **9.2 Product 2: External Images - Obtaining Permissions**

3 days to obtain permissions to use 34 images from external sources, including the British Museum. Involved contacting the 13 institutions and companies to

request permission to use the images, to ascertain any fees involved, arrange image rights and citations. This work was undertaken as part of the preparation of the Project Design.

**9.3 Product 3: Draft Project Design Preparation**

11 days for the Academic Editors and Project Manager to prepare the draft Stage 3 (EDIT) Project Design. This work has been completed.

**9.4 Product 4: Final Project Design Preparation & Submission**

1 day for the Project Manager to produce the final Project Design and submit this to Historic England.

**9.5 Product 5: Editorial Tasks to produce Agreed Final Manuscript**

104.1 days for the Academic Editors, the Project Manager and 12 other authors to produce the agreed final manuscript.

The Product also includes time for communication between the stage members, a review meeting with Historic England, and project management.

**9.6 Product 6: Submission of Final MS to Historic England**

1 day for the Project Manager to prepare and submit all digital files related to the agreed final manuscript to Historic England.

**9.7 Product 7: Submission of Stage MoRPHE Report**

1 day for the Project Manager to prepare and submit the Stage 3 MoRPHE report to Historic England.

**9.8 Timetable**

The short timetable for completion of the EDIT Stage are is shown in Appendix 4.

**10 STAGE 3 BUDGET**

An overview of the budget requested to complete Stage 3 is shown in Appendix 4.

The total direct costs for Stage 3 amount to:

○ Barbican's overheads\* are:

○ VAT on these combined sums (at 20%) is:

The total overall cost of Stage 3 is:

£ [REDACTED]  
£ [REDACTED]  
£ [REDACTED]  
£ [REDACTED]

\* Barbican charges 10% overheads and VAT is chargeable on the work managed by them.

Revising the 10 e-catalogues and arranging permissions to use images from external sources, as well as the fees for reproducing them, were not originally intended to be part of the EDIT Stage. The justification for the additional work

on the e-catalogues is set out in section 8.4, while the images from external sources were moved to this Stage when it became clear that the Society of Antiquaries of London did not consider this task to be their responsibility as publisher of the volume or the e-book. The combined cost of these two tasks is £■■■■, or some 10% of the Stage 3 EDIT budget before overheads and VAT.

### 10.1 Overall budget by EDIT Products

The main Products and Tasks involved in moving from the ‘letterpress’ draft to the agreed final manuscript are presented in Appendix 4. The costs of each Product are as follows:

- Product 1: Edit Stage Set-up £■■■■
- Product 2: External Images - Obtaining Permissions £■■■■
- Product 3: Draft Project Design Preparation £■■■■
- Product 4: Final Project Design Preparation & Submission £■■■■
- Product 5: Editorial Tasks to produce Agreed Final Manuscript £■■■■
- Product 6: Submission of Final MS to Historic England £■■■■
- Product 7: Submission of Stage MoRPHE Report £■■■■

### 10.2 Product 5 - Editorial Tasks to produce Final MS

This is the most time-consuming and costly Product in the EDIT Stage (£■■■■, or 77% of the total cost pre-overheads). The fees for the 34 images from external sources are included here, which together currently amount to slightly less than £■■■■.

The ‘Editorial Work Tasks’ element accounts for £■■■■ of this Product’s cost (77% of Product 5 cost or 59% of Stage 3 cost pre-overheads and VAT). A detailed summary of the breakdown of the Editorial Tasks costs is presented in Appendix 5 (full details of costings by itemised Editorial Work Tasks can be provided).

The ‘Editorial Work Tasks’ costs relate to recommendations by the referee’s or the Academic Editors as follows:

- Referees’ recommendations = £■■■■ (68% of total Editorial Work Task costs);
- Academic Editors recommendations = £■■■■ (32% of total Editorial Work Task costs).

The ‘Editorial Work Tasks’ costs for each Chapter, Part, or the additional editorial tasks are as follows:

- Preliminary Matters £■■■■
- Foreword £■■■■
- Introduction £■■■■
- Chapter 1. From Discovery to Conservation £■■■■
- Chapter 2. Characterising the Objects £■■■■
- Chapter 3. Workshop Practice £■■■■
- Chapter 4. The Lives of Objects £■■■■

- Chapter 5. Styles of Display and Revelation £ [REDACTED]
- Chapter 6. Date and Origin £ [REDACTED]
- Chapter 7. The Historical Context £ [REDACTED]
- Chapter 8. The Archaeological Context £ [REDACTED]
- Chapter 9. Hoards and Hoarding £ [REDACTED]
- Chapter 10. What Does It Mean? £ [REDACTED]
- Afterword £ [REDACTED]
- Part Three: Glossary £ [REDACTED]
- Additional Editorial Tasks £ [REDACTED]

Chapter 9 is the most costly Chapter, reflecting the extensive work required to produce a new introduction as well as to integrate the Hardt and Fischer essays (recommended in the ‘Collated Anonymous Referee Report’ – see Appendix 1).

The two largest items in the ‘Additional Editorial Tasks’ element are the costs of editing the final manuscript prior to submission (£ [REDACTED]) and revising the e-catalogues (£ [REDACTED] – see section 8.4).

### 10.3 Overall budget by EDIT Year

The intention is to undertake and complete the Stage 3 work between February and May 2018, i.e. over two financial years (2017-18 and 2018-19). A 1.6% uplift has been added to all authors’ and editors’ daily rates for 2018-19.

Transfer of the Stage 3 budget from Historic England to Barbican Research Associates will occur after the Project Design has been approved. It is proposed that the agreed budget should be paid to Barbican in one instalment before the end of the 2017-18 financial year.

Barbican will reimburse the team members in stages on completion of Work Tasks. Details will be issued to team members confirming details of the work required, how much they will be paid, and when they can claim for their staged payments.

## 11 PROJECT TEAM STRUCTURE

### 11.1 Project Executive

As for the previous Stages, the Project Manager will be responsible for the successful completion of Stage 3, on time and within budget. The PM will work with the Academic Editors throughout the duration of Stage 3 and will report to Historic England as well as the Hoard Management Group.

### 11.2 Project team

*Project management and central services*

This will be continue to be run through Barbican Research Associates as before. The team members who fall within this strand are Peter Guest and Hilary Cool.

It is proposed that Peter Guest takes over as Project Manager for the EDIT Stage.

#### *Academic Editors*

The academic editors of the final volume are Tania Dickinson, Leslie Webster and Chris Fern.

#### *Authors*

12 individual contributors as listed in Appendix 3.

## **12 COMMUNICATION**

The definitions of the different components of the team remain as in the original project design. The various communication methods outlined originally have worked well and will continue as before. During Stage 3 it is anticipated that in addition to the email and telephone conversation communications within the team, additional use may be made of such techniques as Skype.

### **12.1 The secure website**

This has been in place since the summer of 2013 and continues to allow all team members to access all of the data.

### **12.2 Stage team meetings**

It is proposed that Stage 3 will involve 2 team meetings. The first of these has already taken place (see section 9.1). A second team meeting to review progress, involving the PM, the Academic Editors and HE's Project Assurance Officer (Barney Sloane), is proposed for April 2018.

### **12.3 Communication with the Executive**

As for the previous Stages, the Project Manager will report to Historic England as well as the Hoard Management Group. The PM will be available throughout the duration of Stage 3 to provide updates on progress and other matters.

## **13 PROJECT REVIEW**

As this is a very short Stage, it is proposed that progress will be formally reviewed once, close to the halfway point of the timetable (see section 10.2 above).

## **14 HEALTH AND SAFETY**

The project will continue to be run in accordance with the Health and Safety Policies of BMT, PMAG, the BM, and Barbican Research Associates Ltd. Copies of these have already been deposited with HE.

## **15 OWNERSHIP**

As in Stages 1 and 2, all the materials generated during this project will form part of the Staffordshire Hoard Project Archive. Barbican Research Associates will own the copyright, although Historic England and the Owners will be granted a 3rd party licence to use any element funded by Historic England. It is requested that the contract issued by Historic England to Barbican at the outset of Stage 3 should set out the specific IP and copyright details.

## **16 BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Cool, H.E.M. 2013. *Contextualising Metal-Detected Discoveries: Staffordshire Anglo-Saxon Hoard, Revised Project Design (Version 3, 18 July 2013)*. English Heritage Project Design for the Assessment phase, Project no. 5892.

Cool, H.E.M. 2015. *Contextualising Metal-Detected Discoveries: Staffordshire Anglo-Saxon Hoard, Stage 2 Project Design (Version 4, 9 January 2015)*. English Heritage Project Design for Research and Analysis phase, Project no. 5892.

Cool, H.E.M. 2017. *The Development and Progress of the Staffordshire Hoard Research Project*. Staffordshire Hoard Research Report 30.

## 5892. STAGE 3 (EDIT) PROJECT DESIGN: APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1: THE REFEREES' REPORT AND THE ACADEMIC EDITORS' RESPONSES (IN RED).

The Staffordshire Hoard: an Anglo-Saxon Treasure

*C. J. R. Fern, Tania M. Dickinson and Leslie Webster (eds)*

**Collated Anonymous Referee Report**

**Provided by Barney Sloane, Project Assurance Officer, Historic England (HE Project 5892)**

**September 2017**

This report is structured into four sections – an overall assessment of the work; a set of general observations on the monograph; a set of specific chapter-focused comments and recommendations; and a list of typographical/grammatical errors observed.

#### 1. Overall assessment

This is a landmark publication not only of early medieval studies but of British archaeology as a whole. Expectations of this report will, therefore, inevitably be high, but it is believed that it will meet those expectations. While there are inevitably some rough edges, this first-rate scholarly report fully meets its research objectives and will stand as a milestone in early medieval studies and an exemplar of how to publish complex assemblages. Subject to editorial revision as outlined below there is no hesitation whatsoever in recommending this for publication.

Presentation and discussion of the hoard itself (Chapters 2–7) strikes a good balance between interpretative narrative and selective citation of primary evidence in the letterpress and more detailed digital presentation of evidence and analytical results; the contextual chapters (8–10) skilfully and expertly evoke the politics, society, belief and culture of the world in which the objects in the hoard were made and used, and the assemblage itself gathered and deposited; and the Afterword (Chapter 11) is relevant and apposite.

There is an excellent balance throughout between narrative in text and supporting illustration, and the quality of illustration is outstanding. Narrative and argument flow well and easily, with for the most part just minor blockages and eddies to smooth out. The summary catalogue is invaluable, and the guide to digital resources straightforward.

The second element of the publication is digital, consisting of a database (that will eventually be available to users via the ADS) and an e-catalogue. The latter is conveniently and logically subdivided according to artefact types (pommels, the helmet, etc.); the numbering system is simple and intuitive. The online component as a whole was found to be easy to navigate, even for a first-time user. The e-catalogue contains an appropriate level of detail and is clearly presented, with high quality photographs and supplementary drawings, e.g. of Style II interlace, to aid the user's 'reading' of the objects. The database provides users with full access to conservation records, scientific analyses, etc. This should provide a model for how to make the fruits of similarly complex research projects fully and widely available in the future. There were no suggestions for how this could be improved, and the following comments refer only to the monograph.

The authors offer not only the wealth of analytical detail and high quality scholarship required by specialists, but also a stimulating and accessible narrative of the hoard's discovery, significance and

meaning that will appeal to a much wider readership. The fact that this epic project has been completed in a relatively short period of time makes the achievement all the greater. The authors are to be congratulated on producing a publication that will be much cited for decades to come and deserves to be admired for its high standards of clarity, presentation, and scholarship.

## 2. The monograph – general comments

The chief output of the project, the monograph, is logically structured, first addressing the hoard's discovery and composition, then examining its wider context, e.g. in relation to Anglo-Saxon history, material culture and hoarding practices generally; and finally, its meaning(s). A careful balance has, on the whole, been struck between description, analysis, interpretation, and wider discussion. The main authors present a clear line of argument, while recognising that other interpretations are possible and accommodating some divergence of opinion even amongst the contributors.

The overall structure admirably addresses the needs of a range of audiences. The narrative chapters (Ch. 1, 8, 9, 11) could be read and understood by a lay readership as fascinating, stand-alone accounts of the discovery of the hoard, its meaning and wider significance.

There is however a need for further editorial work to knit together and refine the narrative, to ensure consistency of approach, terminology and interpretation, and to weed out redundancy and repetition (especially the repeated references to the same bits of Bede and Beowulf). This is inevitable when so many contributors have worked to distil such a wealth and range of analysis, and it should be largely straightforward. Cross-referencing between authors is comparatively limited and Chapters 9 & 10 in particular would benefit from being more explicitly integrated into the rest of the volume; cross-references to other chapters and contributors would be an obvious way of achieving this. **All of these recommendations fully accepted; authors had no opportunity within the time-scale to see final versions of other contributions, so we knew there would be much more cross-referencing to be done.**

Some attention should also be given to the level of descriptive detail in, for example, discussion of the helmet decoration in Chapter 6: the importance of the material may warrant this, but given that the letterpress volume is backed by detailed on-line resources, and the volume itself is excellently illustrated, it should be possible to focus on the interpretative essentials in a way that may be less daunting to the non-specialist reader. **We shall exercise editorial authority to make this section more accessible.** Editors should bear in mind the need to explain or make clear technical or specialist terms when they are first introduced (by defining in text, cross-referencing or signposting, or referring to the glossary), and should bear in mind the expectations of audiences who may not be familiar with specialist literature. For example, discussion of the inscriptions assumes a considerable knowledge of previous debate, and does not offer a translation or identification of the texts until two-thirds of the way through: these should be offered or signposted immediately after the transliteration of the texts. **Fully agree.**

There is a lot of basic copy editing to be done to bring the script to the standard that the publishers will expect and to conform to their house style. One obvious issue is footnotes. SAL house style is for end notes numbered by chapter, but this text has a single run of footnotes across all chapters. **There was evidently some misunderstanding here, as we certainly didn't expect to see footnotes running across all chapters, which is numerically cumbersome. However, we would like to suggest that, if SAL is willing to consider this, we adopt separate runs of footnotes by chapter, rather than endnotes numbered by chapter, which are less convenient for the reader, perhaps especially for a non-specialist audience unused to academic presentation.** Design options for the heading/sub-heading/sub-sub-heading hierarchy will also need to be discussed. **When our original numbering**

system for the hierarchy of headings was deleted in the final stage before delivery, the resulting formatting ended up unsatisfactory in parts. We are keen to work with LP to achieve a pleasing, simple, and easily understood design for this. Incidentally, another effect of removing the original numbering has been that cross-referencing has become far less precise, and will accordingly require more work in the final stage, once the volume is paginated.

Historic England recommends that the academic editors be given the time they feel that they need to review and revise even if this pushes the publication timetable back by a month or two. Some space to reflect would probably be helpful, especially in considering issues of focus and emphasis across multiple contributions, and it would be a shame to compromise revision, integration and polishing of the report by rushing the process. **We are particularly grateful for this possibility of extension of the timetable, which will ensure that the quality of the final version will not be compromised by haste.**

There will clearly be a need for the editors and project manager to liaise closely with SAL's publications manager during the editorial revision stage. **We look forward to a close and productive working relationship with both.**

### **3. The monograph – Chapter-specific recommendations**

#### ***Title Page***

We suggest that for consistency, all authors' names should appear in full on the title page, and thereafter with initials and surname.

#### ***Prelims***

As well as corrections to the hierarchy of headings, there will be a need to renumber the figure and table lists, to accommodate additions.

#### ***Chapter 1 (henceforth Introduction)***

It seems strange to start Part One with Chapter 2. It would seem better to call the Introduction (currently Chapter 1) simply "Introduction" and start number chapters with "From discovery to conservation"? **We fully concur, and have already revised the headings in our base text to consist of an Introduction and an Afterword which bookend the renumbered 10 chapters which form the core of the book. There are also a few small additions to be made to text and footnotes, to improve clarity; these will include a footnote on the quantification of the Hoard, referring the reader to the detailed discussion in (new) Chapter 1.**

#### ***Chapter 2 (henceforth Chapter 1)***

In Chapter 2 an account of the 2012 fieldwork is needed if the reader is to have a proper understanding of the circumstances and context of recovery. This need not be lengthy, but it is essential for clarity: it is disconcerting for the reader to come across a later passing reference to set-piece fieldwork not otherwise discussed, and given some of the criticism of fieldwork, and speculation about the hoard site, omitting a formal fieldwork exercise from the report might simply fuel conspiracy theories. Otherwise, presentation and discussion of the fieldwork (pp. 10–19) needs substantial revision for clarity and relevance, focusing on what it tells us about the find spot. Text needs to be better integrated with Fig 2.9, which includes elements in the key which do not appear on the plan (eg resistivity survey area) and elements on the plan which do not appear on the key (eg

features identified from AP analysis). We whole-heartedly agree with all of this, and in particular, we think it very important that the text should include a clear brief account of the 2012 intervention. We welcome the very helpful offer from HC to help in revising this Chapter, and hope that she will lead on it.

The block colour in Fig 2.9 does not work well and conventions should be reviewed. Aerial photography and contextual analysis also needs to be better integrated. We would also suggest that a new 3-scale location map of the site is required, to include an inset situating the hoard findspot within Britain.

The discussion reads like a development-control brief for commercial investigation, listing sites, sources and landscape elements rather than assessing their significance. There is a strong case for rewriting to abandon the descriptive approach (after all, the reports are all available in archive/digital format) in favour of a summary overview of desk-top assessment and interventions followed by an interpretative synthesis of the findings. Completely agree. A brief summary of Della Hooke's conclusions about the immediate landscape at the time of deposition, properly referenced, would also be helpful. We have discussed this option, but think that, rather than trying to summarise DH's important and closely reasoned article, a simpler way of dealing with this is to indicate in a sentence the character of the landscape in the early medieval period, and to provide a reference to her *Ant J* article in the footnote.

The approach to the conservation aspects of the project will provide a model for how investigative conservation can play a key role in resolving fundamental research questions, when properly integrated with archaeological analysis.

It is therefore absolutely right that the conservation programme should be reported but it would be worth reviewing this section to see whether some descriptive detail might be summarised or focused. Agree.

The conclusion was heartily endorsed, it would be better said at the outset, or in the Afterword (currently Chapter 11). Leaving it where it is (p. 37) rather diminishes its impact and has the feel of an internal / grey literature report that hasn't been fully integrated. This could be worked into the beginning of this section, though essentially the same points are made there, only in different wording; it would not sit easily in the Afterword, which deals with the impact on A-S studies, future research and public engagement. As it stands, it rounds off the section neatly, and we would recommend retaining it here. Would it be worth including an image or two of investigative conservation in progress? It is said that there are no suitable ones, but further enquiry will be made.

### **Chapter 3 (henceforth Chapter 2)**

This chapter clearly sets out the structure of and rationale behind the catalogue, and the various categories of artefact. It does, however, contain a number of typos, syntactic errors and infelicities (see detailed list below). Some minor copy-editorial work is needed to resolve these. This has now been done; we are working on others throughout the volume.

How unique categories of find, e.g. the serpent mounts, should be interpreted is of course an open and fascinating question. Given the wider nature of the hoard, the suggestion that they derive from military gear of some kind is understandable and probably right, but it might be worth at least raising the possibility (especially given their fragility) that they derive from a kind of religious object

not previously found in the archaeological record but known to have existed from written sources, such as a portable pre-Christian shrine of some sort. **We found this comment enigmatic, and would welcome further specific information from the referee, which we might pursue during the edit phase. Otherwise we can slightly tweak the text to emphasize that other interpretations are available, though not supported by contemporary evidence.**

p. 64: The discussion of the role of the sword is useful, but the statement ‘Around 10% of the male population could be buried with a sword’ is meaningless. What is presumably meant is that, overall, around 10% of adult male graves in early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries contain swords. That is very different from arguing that 10% of males in the living population were equipped with swords. This needs to be re-worded and more thought should be given to what exactly is being argued here. **We shall address this**

p. 75: footnote 293 should reference Bayliss et al rather than Fern in Ch 7? **Now footnote 295: corrected**

p. 97: it would be sensible to define the terms Spangenhelm and Lammellenhelm or to include them in the glossary. **They will go in the revised glossary.** It is not certain that the Sutton Hoo helmet was worn by Redwald (later discussion of Sutton Hoo Mound 1 in the report is more circumspect) and here (as also in Chapter 4 p. 195) it might be sensible to be a little more critical about the sometimes cavalier characterisation of things as “royal” and “regalian”. **Agreed.**

**pp. 115-125: the *Palaeography of the Inscriptions* discussion requires some editorial work to make it more reader-friendly, not least because a translation of the inscription does not appear until 2 pages before the end.**

**pp. 128-143 *Objects associated with Christian ceremony and worship*. Three additions to bibliography and three minor tweaks to footnotes and text have been incorporated**

#### **Chapter 4 (henceforth Chapter 3)**

This chapter, while well laid-out and clear, lacks a clear statement of the questions that guided/drove the technical analysis, e.g. of the gold, garnets, etc. What did researchers hope that such analysis would reveal? This should be set out at the start of each section. **We think that what is needed is a short overall introduction which sets out these questions in the context of the wider research questions adumbrated in the Introduction (pp 3-4), indicates examples of this in practice, and includes reference to some unexpected outcomes from the NatGeo work**

**We shall also address the following points:**

p. 149: what is the evidence for a ‘low-yielding south Scandinavian source’ of gold?

p. 149, para 2 ‘But this was not lasting’ should be re-worded, e.g. ‘this influx of gold did not last, however’.

p. 159: the concluding sentence of the discussion of the garnets in its down-beat and provisional voice, is more appropriate to a provisional or grey-literature report than a final publication.

p. 194: Two different versions of the same paragraph are repeated.

#### **Chapter 5 (henceforth Chapter 4)**

**Minor points below agreed:**

p. 220, last para: What is meant by ‘playful acts’? Would ‘casual’ be better?

p. 222, last line: is it the origin of the site or of the name that cannot be dated with certainty?

**p. 221-2 We need to briefly address the point here, that the damage to the objects suggests that whatever the value accorded high craft skills and elaborate decoration in the objects’ original**

contexts, once they were removed (or even identified for recycling/de-commissioning) they were scrap with bullion/raw material value only. There's a potentially interesting contrast in attitude here to the argued value accorded heirloom weapons.

### **Chapter 6 (henceforth Chapter 5)**

The following 5 points have now been or will shortly be addressed:

The observation that the two main forms of Style II should now be understood as 'early' and 'late' represents a major shift in our understanding of early Anglo-Saxon art styles. However, figs. 4.80 and 7.6 do not really allow the different styles to be 'readily appreciated at a glance', at least by non-specialists. They would benefit from further annotation.

p. 223, para 1: line 7: 'spiritual' better than 'mental'?; line 8: discerned, rather than 'interpreted'; last line: Webster (2012) has argued that the purple hue of some garnets may also have connoted imperial power, as in the Roman world.

p. 224 para 1: the ambiguity of the 'victorious rider' image may have been deliberate, i.e. meant to depict neither a god nor a king, but rather a 'god king', cf. certain Scandinavian gold bracteates, as has been argued by Axboe and Hauck.

p. 241 Re the significance of the 'eye' motif, see Price & Mortimer (2014), 'An Eye for Odin? Divine role-playing the age of Sutton Hoo', *European J of Archaeology* 17(3)

p. 244, para 2 last line. This needs rewording, e.g.: ...furthermore strengthen the argument that ornamental metalwork had a major impact on early ms illumination'

p. 224 *Style and substance* opening. This needs minor rewriting and referencing to note broader theoretical discussions of Styles I and II.

pp. 246-267 *Ornament of the helmet and die-impressed sheet*: level of descriptive detail to be reduced.

### **Chapter 7 (henceforth Chapter 6)**

The discussion of the hoard's date and chronology is thorough, clear and convincing.

The ensuing points have either already been dealt with, or will be addressed

With regard to the development of cloisonné, Hawkes argued (in relation to the Monkton composite disc brooch, mentioned on p. 303) that by the middle decades of the seventh century, small, irregular pieces or 'chips' of garnet were used, with grozed or 'retouched' edges, indicating that the supply of large, fresh garnets was dwindling. Given the date of Hoard Phase 4, it would be good to see something here about how the evidence from the hoard either confirms or contradicts this apparent development; was this development later than we think?

p. 285: D. Bowsher pers comm is cited for Prittlewell – this should be updated to Blackmore et al in press

pp. 299-300. Footnote cross-references use the numbered heading/sub-heading structure and need to be revised.

p. 312. The discussion of the evidence for high-status residences needs to be re-worded: 'High-status residences are indicated by the exceptionally large timber buildings known from crop-marks at Hatton Rock.... None has produced direct dating evidence, but on analogy with other excavated sites, the largest buildings are likely to have been constructed in the seventh century.'

p. 315 The discussion of the distribution of gold & garnet metalwork and Style II needs to clarify the difference between the distribution of graves containing these objects – which is heavily focussed on

the SE -- and that of PAS finds, which is much wider. The implication – that such items were used (and potentially even made) in regions which did not practice furnished inhumation –needs to be spelled out.

p. 319: para 2 line 2: ‘for the two other ecclesiastical objects related to it’. This implies that the 3 objects were originally associated, i.e. made together, or used as part of a related complex of religious items. Is this deliberate? If so, that case needs to be made earlier. **Although these three objects are linked in different ways, there is nothing to suggest that all three were made together, or that they were used together as part of a related set, though that of course is conceivable. We therefore see no need to modify the text.**

### **Chapter 8 (henceforth Chapter 7)**

This presents an admirably lucid and concise summary by two leading historians of the political and religious contexts within which the hoard was assembled and deposited.

Whether the hoard is really like to reflect ‘pre-Christian ritual practices’ (336) is unlikely, however, as is made clear in the general discussion of hoarding practices elsewhere in early medieval Europe in Chapter 10. **To be dealt with by cross-reference.**

**pp. 337- 350 *The Church and Warfare* - bibliographical abbreviations etc to be checked**

### **Chapter 9 (henceforth Chapter 8)**

This is misnumbered as Chapter 10.

**p. 359 The implication here, that it isn’t possible to identify regional production/stylistic groupings in the material is at odds with the identification of such groupings elsewhere in the volume, and will be either modified, or dealt with by cross-referencing.**

### **Chapter 10 (henceforth Chapter 9)**

Chapter 10 is an essential element of the report, but as it stands is problematic and must be revised to make it more coherent. **Fully agree that this Chapter as it stands is inchoate and needs bringing together more effectively; perhaps our most time-consuming task in this stage.** Although each contribution is expert and informative, there is little clear or explicit linkage between them or with the wider questions posed by the hoard itself. This may well be because they are dealing with different times, places and contexts, but there are fundamental questions and issues in the project’s research agenda that should provide a unifying framework. Either the academic editors should draft an introduction and conclusion setting out the research agenda and issues that the contributors were asked to address and why, linking the three contributions and summarising conclusions; or the contributors should asked to revise to address a more obviously consistent research agenda (it may be that both options need to be considered). **We strongly believe that the appropriate solution is for the editors to write an introductory piece as indicated above; it will also briefly characterise the different backgrounds to Scandinavian, Continental and British hoarding to help non-specialist readers, explaining differences in theoretical starting points and in data, which have impact on conclusions.**

In all three contributions, but especially in those by Hardt and Fischer, there is a tendency to assume specialist and background knowledge, and the academic editors should look to address this.

**We take on board all of the following suggestions and will liaise with these authors as a priority.**

Hardt's contribution could benefit a map to show the places he mentions. The English of this section requires some copy-editorial attention. **We should also acknowledge the work of the translator by name in the volume; it is not at present known to us.** It would also be helpful if the conclusions of this section could refer us back to the Staffordshire hoard: what are the implications of the continental evidence for our understanding of the hoard? This needs to be explicitly addressed.

Guest's contribution could be refined to remove the "Bede and Beowulf" characterisations of Anglo-Saxon society and culture (all this is handled more expertly elsewhere in the volume); focus discussion of the dating of hoards more explicitly on those he is dealing with (in relation to the date of assembly and deposition of the Staffs Hoard these issues are handled in detail and explicitly elsewhere, and considerations relating to hoarding in a 5th-century British metal economy are not necessarily directly relevant to 7th-century England); and refine the distinction between the old and new interpretations late Roman vs post-Roman hoarding. This last is, of course, very important, but for a non-specialist reader it might be worth articulating more clearly the difference between hoarding in the face of Saxon threat in the late 4th century and hoarding in the face of economic and social insecurity in the 5th century, and why this matters. The terms "late Roman" and "post-Roman" are a bit problematic here – we are referring to British society before and after the formal withdrawal of Roman imperial military and administration – and it might be worth giving some thought to this.

p. 381 Might the relatively small numbers of hoards recovered from Gaul, Germany and Italy compared to Britain also be a reflection of the role played by metal-detecting in their discovery?

#### **Chapter 11 (henceforth Chapter 10)**

The editors should consider whether the volume should end with the compelling, elegantly written Chapter 11 ('What does it mean'), and present the necessarily drier 'Afterword' on the impact of the hoard, its role in public engagement quite separately from the volume's conclusion, so as to make absolutely clear its role as an 'Afterword' rather than a conclusion. **Agreed; see our comment above under Chapter 1**

**Glossary:** Attention also needs to be paid to the glossary: the tabulated format doesn't work well, the text is poorly-edited (things out of alphabetical order, inconsistent capitalisation) and there are errors (eg tremiss for tremissis) and omissions (eg cabochon, Insular). **The state of the glossary reflects the fact that it could not be completed in time, including its being sent for checking by the editors before submission. We fully agree that it needs more work.**

#### **4. Typographic/grammatical errors all now dealt with**

p. 9 para 2: provided that

p. 40 para 1: delete ? after 'might have owned it'.

Para 2, line 1: The Hoard is defined

Line 3: insert 'having been' before 'perhaps mistaken for'

Line 13: delete 'that', i.e. 'what appears to be missing, or might have been expected....

p. 68 para 2:

line 1: delete 'a pommel'

line 3: The wording needs attention here: 'In addition to its stylistic and formal similarities to...'. There is a stray ) here, and 'intimate details' is should be reworded. Something is missing here.

Shares details with what?

- p. 69 para 2, line 3: delete 'comparatively'
- p. 72 para 3: 'The strong similarity of many of the small gold mounts with those on....'
- p. 73, para 3 line 1: 'most common class'
- p. 77, para 2 line 8: replace 'also existed that had' with 'could have'
- line 10: reword 'very possible if not likely'
- para 3 line 2: 'not least in the latter's dating'
- p. 78 line 1: comma after 'deposited'
- p. 88 para 2 line 1: probable
- p. 102: para 3 line 1: 'confidently identified as deriving from....'
- p. 114, para 3 line 6: insert 'at' after 'outline'
- p. 147, last line: 'the goldsmith who was....'
- p. 174 para 3, last sentence: delete 'that existed'
- p. 175 para 3: perhaps 'contribute to the characterisation of the smith as 'other' and being at the margins of society' is better than 'antisocial'.
- p. 184 paras 1 & 2 largely repeat one another.
- p. 194 delete return after 'filigree,'
- p. 205 para 1, line 12: Re-write: The cloisons on the disc brooch found at Sutton have been scoured of their contents, but originally it appears that they contained inlays of red, blue, green and 'other colours'.
- p. 309 para 2, line 3: 'as the expression of a Mercian warrior culture', not 'effects'
- p. 312 para 3, lines 4-6. 'It had poorer access to imports...' [delete 'perhaps' and 'much']; delete 'and ideologies'
- p. 313 line one: delete 'just'
- para 2 lines 5: 'who is unlikely to have commissioned...'
- para 3 line 5: replace 'history' with 'written sources'
- p. 314 line 1: re-write as: It has long been suspected, for example, that the powerful kingdom of Northumbria engaged in the production of high-status metalwork.' 5
- p. 315 line 1 and para 2 line 1: 'Kentish southern England'. Is this a typo? Makes no sense. Kent did not in any sense exert a cultural hegemony over southern England. Just say 'England south of the Thames'.
- p. 318 bottom line: re-write: 'It is possible, even likely, that some of....'
- p. 337 para 2 line 3, 'adaption': should be adaptation?
- p. 351 This is incorrectly headed 'Chapter 10'; should be 'Chapter 9'
- para 2 line 1: premise
- p. 355 line 6: what does 'a commonly elite' status mean? p. 359 line 7: 'Contextless' – is this a word?
- p. 364 para 1 last sentence: the quotation is missing a reference/footnote.
- p. 413 para 2: 'it cannot be ruled out', rather than 'cannot be excluded'
- p. 442 line 1: 'differed from'

## APPENDIX 2: ARRANGEMENT OF THE FINAL MANUSCRIPT

### *'THE STAFFORDSHIRE HOARD: AN ANGLO-SAXON TREASURE'*

Introduction

#### PART ONE: THE HOARD

Chapter 1. From discovery to conservation

Chapter 2. Characterising the objects

Chapter 3. Workshop practice

Chapter 4. The lives of objects: wear, repair, modification and damage

Chapter 5. Styles of display and revelation

Chapter 6. Date and origin

#### PART TWO: THE BROADER CONTEXT

Chapter 7. The historical context: local, regional and national

Chapter 8. The archaeological context: matters of material and social significance

Chapter 9. Hoards and hoarding

Chapter 10. What does it mean?

Afterword: the impact of the hoard

#### PART THREE: CATALOGUE, GLOSSARY, BIBLIOGRAPHY AND DATABASE GUIDE

## APPENDIX 3: THE EDITORIAL WORK TASKS

(TASKS RECOMMENDED IN THE 'COLLATED ANONYMOUS REFEREE REPORT' SHOWN IN RED)

WORK TASK	CHAPTER/SECTION	AUTHORS	REFEREES' RECOMMENDATIONS	EDITORS' RESPONSES / WORK TASKS	ACTION	EDITOR
0.1	PRELIMINARY MATTERS			1) Sort out naming of authors/Title page 2) Amend chapters and chapter section headings 3) Check/update figure list 4) Check/update table list 5) Update Acknowledgements	1) TD 2) TD 3) CF 4) CF 5) TD/LW/CF	WT 13.4
0.2	FOREWORD	Historic England + owners		1) 1000-word Foreword to volume 2) French translation 3) German translation	1) HE 2) ? 3) ?	
0.3	INTRODUCTION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Setting the agenda</li> <li>The structure of the publication</li> </ul>	LW/TD/CF	1) Remove 'Chap 1' from Introduction	1) Done 2) Small additions to be made to text and footnotes to improve clarity; update to align with revised overall text	1) – 2) LW/TD/CF	WT 13.4
1.0	CHAPTER 1. FROM DISCOVERY TO CONSERVATION					
1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fieldwork and Excavation of 2009 and 2010</li> </ul>	AJ	1) Include account of 2012 season 2) Redraft fig. 1.9	1) Redraft introduction and 'fieldwork and excavation' sections, incorporating brief account of 2012 fieldwork; 2) Redraft figure 1.9 3) New 3-scale location map	1) HC+AJ  2) AJ 3) CF	PGu+TD /CF
1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acquisition, funding and project</li> </ul>	JB		Final checks / editing	JB	WT 13.4
1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The conservation programme</li> </ul>	PGr	1) Summarise some descriptive detail 2) Move concluding section	1) Summarise some descriptive detail 2) No action	1) CF+PGr	CF
1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reliability of the finds context</li> </ul>	CF		Final checks / editing	CF	WT 13.4
2.0	CHAPTER 2. CHARACTERISING THE OBJECTS	CF		Final checks / editing	CF	
2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fittings from weaponry</li> </ul>	CF	1) Include alternative interpretations of possible functions 2) Redraft discussion of sword (p.64)	1) Include alternative interpretations of possible functions 2) Redraft discussion of sword (p.64)	1) CF 2) CF	WT 13.4
2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Helmet parts</li> </ul>	CF/GS	1) Define the terms <i>Spangenhelm</i> and <i>Lammellenhelm</i> or include them in the glossary. 2) Revise discussion of 'royal' nature of helmet	1) Definitions of terms <i>Spangenhelm</i> and <i>Lammellenhelm</i> to be added to revised glossary. 2) Revise discussion of 'royal' nature of helmet	1)TD 2) CF+GS	WT 13.4
2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Christian objects</li> </ul>	CF/RG/LW	Move translations forwards	Revise <i>Palaeography of the Inscriptions</i> sub-section to make it more reader-friendly. Bring translations forward.	LW+RG	WT13.4
2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Miscellanea</li> </ul>	CF		Final checks / editing	1) CF	WT 13.4

WORK TASK	CHAPTER/SECTION	AUTHORS	REFEREES' RECOMMENDATIONS	EDITORS' RESPONSES / WORK TASKS	ACTION	EDITOR
3.0	CHAPTER 3. WORKSHOP PRACTICE	EB+CF	1) Include clear statement of the questions that guided/drove the technical analysis, e.g. of the gold, garnets, etc. What did researchers hope that such analysis would reveal? This should be set out at the start of each section. 2) Annotate fig. 3.80 to show early & late Style II more clearly	1) Include new short overall introduction setting out these questions in the context of the wider research questions, indicating examples of this in practice, and including reference to some unexpected outcomes from the NatGeo work. 2) Annotate fig. 3.80 to show early & late Style II more clearly	1) CF+EB 2) CF	CF
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Materials</li> </ul>		Minor comments	Address minor comments	CF	WT 13.4
3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manufacture</li> </ul>		Minor comments	Address minor comments	CF+NW	WT 13.4
4.0	CHAPTER 4. THE LIVES OF OBJECTS	CF	Minor comments	Address minor comments	CF	WT 13.4
5.0	CHAPTER 5. STYLES OF DISPLAY AND REVELATION	CF	Minor comments for Intro	Address minor comments	CF	WT 13.4
5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Style and substance</li> </ul>	CF		Final checks / editing	CF	
5.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Animal ornament</li> </ul>	CF	Minor comments	Address minor comments	CF	
5.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ornament of the helmet and die-impressed sheet</li> </ul>	GS	Reduce descriptive text and focus discussion	Reduce descriptive text and focus discussion	CF+GS	
5.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interlace</li> </ul>	CF		Final checks / editing	CF	
5.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scrollwork</li> </ul>	CF		Final checks / editing	CF	
5.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Early Insular style</li> </ul>	CF		Final checks / editing	CF	
5.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Geometric ornament and symbols</li> </ul>	CF		Final checks / editing	CF	
5.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conclusion</li> </ul>	CF		Final checks / editing	CF	
6.0	CHAPTER 6. DATE AND ORIGIN	CF	1) Minor comments for chapter 2) Annotate fig. 6.6 to show early & late Style II more clearly	1) Address minor comment 2) Annotate fig. 6.6 to show early & late Style II more clearly	1) CF 2) CF	WT 13.4
6.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dating the Hoard</li> </ul>	CF		Final checks / editing	CF	
6.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Origin</li> </ul>	CF		Final checks / editing	CF	
6.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conclusion</li> </ul>	CF		Final checks / editing	CF	
7.0	CHAPTER 7. THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT					
7.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The historical background</li> </ul>	BY		Minor revisions	BY	LW
7.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Church and warfare</li> </ul>	AT		Minor revisions	AT	LW
8.0	CHAPTER 8. THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT	JH		1) Discussion of regional production/stylistic groupings in the material on p. 359 to be amended, or dealt with by cross-referencing 2) Minor revisions	JH+CF	LW

WORK TASK	CHAPTER/SECTION	AUTHORS	REFEREES' RECOMMENDATIONS	EDITORS' RESPONSES / WORK TASKS	ACTION	EDITOR
9.0	CHAPTER 9. HOARDS AND HOARDING		1) Revise to improve coherence of chapter	1) New chapter introduction 2) New table summarising Scandinavian period terms/dates	1) LW+TD 2) CF	WT 13.4
9.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hoarding in Later Roman Britain and beyond</li> </ul>	PGu	Comments to text	Address comments	PGu	TD
9.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hoarding in mainland Germanic Europe</li> </ul>	MH	1) Make more accessible to general reader 2) Revise conclusions so refer back to the Staffordshire hoard 3) Map showing the places mentioned in text. 4) Revisit English	1) Revise so more accessible to general reader 2) Revise conclusions so refer back to the Staffordshire hoard 3) New map showing the places mentioned in text. 4) Revisit English	1) LW/PGu (+MH) 2) LW (+MH)  3) HC or CF  4) LW/PGu (+MH)	LW
9.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scandinavian hoarding</li> </ul>	SF	Make more accessible to general reader	Revise so more accessible to general reader	LW/PG (+SV)	LW
10.0	CHAPTER 10. WHAT DOES IT MEAN?	TD/CF/LW		Update chapter to fit revised overall text	TD/LW/CF	WT 13.4
10.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exceptionality of the hoard</li> </ul>					
10.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Towards a biography of the Staffordshire Hoard</li> </ul>					
10.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conclusion: multiple explanations and narratives</li> </ul>					
11.0	AFTERWORD : THE IMPACT OF THE HOARD	TD/CF/LW				
11.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on knowledge of the Anglo-Saxon world</li> </ul>			Final checks / editing	TD/CF/LW	WT 13.4
11.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Future research</li> </ul>			Final checks / editing	TD/CF/LW	WT 13.4
11.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on public engagement with the past</li> </ul>	JB		Final checks / editing	JB	LW
12.0	PART THREE					
12.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object inventory</li> </ul>			Final checks / editing	CF	WT 13.4
12.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Glossary</li> </ul>		Revise Glossary - tabulated format, arrangement of entries, omitted entries, edit text	Revise Glossary - tabulated format, arrangement of entries, omitted entries, edit text	TD+CF/LW	WT 13.4
12.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bibliography</li> </ul>				TD	
12.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guide to the use of the digital section</li> </ul>	HC		Final checks / editing	CF	WT 13.4
13.0	ADDITIONAL EDITORIAL TASKS					
13.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tables</li> </ul>			1) Replace Table 5.4 with new version 2) Check and correct content and captions, including new numbering. Cross-check with List of Tables.	1) TD 2) CF	WT 13.4

WORK TASK	CHAPTER/SECTION	AUTHORS	REFEREES' RECOMMENDATIONS	EDITORS' RESPONSES / WORK TASKS	ACTION	EDITOR
13.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Figures and Maps</li> </ul>		1) Complete composite Figures required for Chaps 7 and 9	1) Set 4 composite Figs – 7.4; 9.1; 9.4; 9.14 2) Minor changes to 'Map 1' and 'Map 2' 3) Check and correct content and captions, including new numbering 4) Cross-check with List of Figures.	HC HC CF  CF	WT 13.4
13.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Digital materials</li> </ul>			Check and make minor corrections, including rewording introductory page of each pdf catalogue.	CF+ID	
13.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final checking of text, header hierarchies, cross-referencing, footnotes, etc</li> </ul>		Integrate sections into coherent and consistent whole	Full read-through of final draft prior to submission to PM		TD
13.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create flat copies of all illustrations to publisher's specification</li> </ul>				CF	

Authors (named):

EB Ellie Blakelock  
 JB Jenni Butterworth  
 HC Hilary Cool  
 ID Ian Dennis  
 SF Svante Fischer  
 RG Richard Gameson  
 PGr Pieta Greaves  
 PGu Peter Guest  
 MH Matthias Hardt  
 JH John Hines  
 AJ Alex Jones  
 GS George Speake  
 AT Alan Thacker  
 NW Niamh Whitfield  
 BY Barbara Yorke

Editors:

TD Tania Dickinson  
 LW Leslie Webster  
 CF Chris Fern

Staff daily rates:

Ellie Blakelock  
 Jenni Butterworth  
 Hilary Cool (PM)  
 Hilary Cool (author)  
 Hilary Cool (illustration)  
 Ian Dennis  
 Tania Dickinson  
 Chris Fern  
 Peter Guest (PM)  
 Peter Guest (author)  
 Alex Jones (author)  
 Alex Jones (illustration)  
 Leslie Webster

2017-18

£  
£  
£  
£  
£  
£  
£  
£  
£  
£  
£  
£  
£  
£  
£

2018-19

£  
£  
£  
£  
£  
£

APPENDIX 4: THE STAGE 3 MAIN EDIT PRODUCTS AND TASKS – SUMMARIES OF TIME, COSTS AND TIMETABLE

PRODUCT	TASK/ACTION	ACTIONER TIME (DAYS)	COST	prior to Feb 18	Feb-18	Mar-18	Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18
<b>1</b>	<b>EDIT STAGE SET-UP</b>	<b>11.5</b>	████████						
1.1	PM hand-over + EDIT set-up	3	████████	████████					
1.2	EDIT set-up	4.5	████████	████████					
1.3	Editor / PM meeting, SAL 21/11/2017	4	████████	████████					
<b>2</b>	<b>EXTERNAL IMAGES - OBTAINING PERMISSIONS</b>	<b>3</b>	████████						
2.1	British Museum	1	████████	████████					
2.2	non-British Museum	2	████████	████████					
<b>3</b>	<b>DRAFT PROJECT DESIGN PREPARATION</b>	<b>11</b>	████████						
3.1	Preparation of PD	5	████████	████████					
3.2	Assistance in preparation of PD	6	████████	████████					
<b>4</b>	<b>FINAL PROJECT DESIGN PREPARATION &amp; SUBMISSION</b>	<b>1</b>	████████	████████					
<b>5</b>	<b>EDITORIAL TASKS TO PRODUCE FINAL MS</b>	<b>104.1</b>	████████						
5.1	Preparation & issuing of contracts etc	1	████████	████████					
5.2	Editorial Tasks (see separate Appendix 5)	97.25	████████	████████	████████	████████	████████	████████	
5.3	EDIT Stage meeting - Editors, PM + HE	4	████████	████████	████████	████████	████████	████████	
5.4	EDIT Stage management (1.5 days p.m.)	6	████████	████████	████████	████████	████████	████████	
5.5	EDIT Stage management	4.5	████████	████████	████████	████████	████████	████████	
	External images – fees		████████						
<b>6</b>	<b>SUBMISSION OF FINAL MS TO HE</b>	<b>1</b>	████████					████████	
<b>7</b>	<b>SUBMISSION OF FINAL MoRPHE REPORT</b>	<b>1</b>	████████						████████
		<b>132.6</b>	████████						

APPENDIX 5: THE EDITORIAL WORK TASKS – SUMMARY OF COSTS BY CHAPTER AND PARTS (THOSE RECOMMENDED IN THE ‘COLLATED ANONYMOUS REFEREE REPORT’ SHOWN IN RED)

WORK TASK		ACTIONER TIME (DAYS)	ACTIONER COST	EDITOR TIME (DAYS)	EDITOR COST	TOTAL COST
0.1	PRELIMINARY MATTERS	2.2	██████			██████
0.2	FOREWORD	2	██████			██████
0.3	INTRODUCTION	1.5	██████			██████
1	CHAPTER 1. FROM DISCOVERY TO CONSERVATION	5.75	██████	1.25	██████	██████
1.1	• Fieldwork and Excavation	4.5	██████	0.75	██████	██████
1.2	• Acquisition, funding and project	0.5	██████			██████
1.3	• The conservation programme	0.5	██████	0.5	██████	██████
1.4	• The reliability of the finds context	0.25	██████			██████
2	CHAPTER 2. CHARACTERISING THE OBJECTS	4.65	██████	0	██████	██████
2.0	• Characterising the objects	2	██████			██████
2.1	• Fittings from weaponry	0.5	██████			██████
2.2	• Helmet parts	0.9	██████			██████
2.3	• Christian objects	1.25	██████			██████
3	CHAPTER 3. WORKSHOP PRACTICE	1.75	██████	2	██████	██████
3.0	• Workshop practice	1.25	██████	2	██████	██████
3.1	• Materials	0.25	██████			██████
3.2	• Manufacture	0.25	██████			██████
4	CHAPTER 4. THE LIVES OF OBJECTS	1	██████			██████
5	CHAPTER 5. STYLES OF DISPLAY AND REVELATION	3.25	██████	0	██████	██████
5.0	• general edits	1.5	██████			██████
5.3	• Ornament of the helmet and die-impressed sheet	1.75	██████			██████
6	CHAPTER 6. DATE AND ORIGIN	2	██████			██████
7	CHAPTER 7. THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT	0.5	██████	1	██████	██████
8	CHAPTER 8. THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT	0.75	██████	0.5	██████	██████
9	CHAPTER 9. HOARDS AND HOARDING	23	██████	0	██████	██████
9.0	• Introduction	6.5	██████			██████
9.1	• Hoarding in Later Roman Britain and beyond	1	██████	0.5	██████	██████

9.2	• Hoarding in mainland Germanic Europe	10.5				
9.3	• Scandinavian hoarding	5				
10	CHAPTER 10. WHAT DOES IT MEAN?	1.5				
11	AFTERWORD	1.5		0.5		
12	PART THREE	6.5		0		
12.2	• Glossary	6.5				
13	ADDITIONAL EDITORIAL TASKS	10		15		
13.1	Tables	1				
13.2	Figures and Maps	2.5				
13.3	Digital Catalogues	5				
13.4	Final editing	0		15		
13.5	Preparation of files for submission to HE	1.5				
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>67.85</b>		<b>21.75</b>		