Hoards, Hoarders and other Broken Things
Catherine E. Karkov, School of Fine Art, History of Art and Cultural Studies, University of Leeds

Kevin Leahy & Roger Bland
The Staffordshire Hoard.
New Edition, London, The British Museum, 2014, 64pp., £5.99.
ISBN: 978-0-7141-2342-4

Carlee A. Bradbury, Karie Edwards, Debra Lustig, Katie Sickman, Courtney Weida.
The South Station Hoard: Imaging, Creating and Empowering Violent Remains.
Brooklyn, NY, Punctum Books, 2014, 171pp., $35.00 print (free e-book)
ISBN 9780692346563

Duane Rouselle & Jason Adams, issue eds.
Ontological Anarché: Beyond Materialism and Idealism
Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies 2013.2, 279 pp., $12.00.
ISBN 9780615947686

In the collaborative spirit exemplified by *Hoarders and* Hordes, this review engages both with the essays in this volume and with the three books listed above. Leahy and Bland's *The Staffordshire Hoard* (2014) is an expanded and updated version of their 2009 publication of the same title. It is an introduction to the Hoard aimed at a general readership. Bradbury, et al.'s *The South Station Hoard* is, in contrast, a record of a collaborative art and research project inspired by the discovery of the Staffordshire Hoard. It blends academic discourse with fiction, artistic practice, and pedagogical suggestions, reimagining the idea of the Hoard for the twenty-first century. The essays in Rouselle and Adams's *Ontological Anarché* trouble the boundaries between such things as history and fiction, idealism and materialism, law and chaos, the individual and the group through the (also troubled) relationship between ontology and anarchy. It may not be immediately apparent what ontology or anarchy have to do with either the Staffordshire or South Station Hoards, but in their questioning of inherited intellectual and scholarly traditions or paradigms, the essays in *Ontological Anarché* offer constructive ways in which we might think about both the Hoard and responses to it.

Let's begin with terminology. Both ontology and anarchy can be defined in multiple ways, but if we understand *arché* to refer to a guiding principle, order or authority, and ultimate foundational law, then *anarché* (or anarchy) would be the denial of any such principle, order, or authority. Yet anarchy is not chaos; anarchy craves its own sort of order, but one that is radical, temporary, in a constant state of flux and becoming. Ontology deals with material reality, being but also becoming. It is concerned with order and flux, things and beings, histories and categories, individuals and collectives. These are the themes that unite the three books under review with the essays in this volume of *postmedieval*. My own essay is structured around three interwoven oppositions: (1) the singular and the plural (or individual and community), (2) violence and authority, (3) desire (for things, for knowledge, for order) and denial.

The Staffordshire Hoard, the objects that make up the Hoard, and the individuals who interpret the Hoard speak with multiple, competing, sometimes contradictory voices. They speak individually as "I"—the Hoard, the thing, the author—and they speak collectively as "we"—the multiple things in the Hoard, the editors and authors of these books and essays, the impersonal voices of accepted ideas and historical paradigms. There is a creative tension at the point at which the I and the we come into contact, merge with, or struggle to remain distinct from each other, as Ben Tilghman and Nancy Thompson bring out so beautifully in their essay in the present volume. The Hoard is a community, a community that is anarchic but not chaotic. All these chattering voices seek an order at the same time that they seek to destroy another order. It is important that we listen to the voices in and of the Hoard, that we allow the Hoard and its community of things to speak together with and against each other, that we avoid the idea of the Hoard as a single thing with one historical meaning and one art historical or archaeological story to tell.

The Staffordshire Hoard of Anglo-Saxon metalwork, discovered by metal-detectorist Terry Herbert in July 2009, and subsequently excavated by Birmingham Archaeology, has captured the imagination of scholars and the general public (especially in the UK), and become something of a minor industry. You can now buy official and unofficial Staffordshire Hoard gifts, everything from tea towels and tote-bags to replicas of some of the items. Why has the Hoard so captured our interest and desire? There are multiple reasons—it's bling, it's old, it's a mystery, it's desirable, it materializes in the present an absent past, and contemporary culture has become obsessed with hoarding. Any or all of these, singly or in combination, may be at work at any one time. It's complicated. It pulls us to it. Books and articles, blogs, websites, and programs devoted to the Hoard and its discovery began to appear almost immediately after its discovery was made public. Leahy and Bland's informational booklet *The Staffordshire Hoard* (2009) and Caroline Alexander's more emotive book for National Geographic (2011), are chief amongst them. LOST GOLD OF THE DARK AGES the cover of Alexander's book proclaims in gold letters, a brilliant light shining out from the old, murky, sinister, and warlike period about which we seemingly know so little. Or, as the same author described it in an article in *National Geographic*, it's "Magical Mystery Treasure" (http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/2011/11/gold-hoard/alexander-text). It seems to have that effect on people. It has affect. Watching and listening to some of the "I"s emerging from the "we" of the hoard in 2009, Carlee Bradbury writes that she kept saying to our students, "This changes EVERYTHING!" (146).

But did it? Does it? It has given us new objects, new evidence, and of course historical knowledge changes with both, but in rising from the ground the Hoard has also obscured issues into which we ought to be looking more critically (labor, gender—I'll return to these at the end of this review), and it has also raised some of the same old specters: *Beowulf*, Beowulf, Sutton Hoo. The change promised by the Hoard is elusive, and in many instances the Hoard has simply served to reaffirm the existing order. But the Staffordshire Hoard also has an uncanny ability to slip through our fingers. It is continually changing, things we thought we knew about it disappear as objects literally change shape during cleaning and restoration. Where is the Hoard? What is the Hoard? How many objects shout for attention from within the Hoard? Why have we become so

fascinated and appalled by its violence? What violence does it do? What communities does it construct?

<div align="center">****</div>

Leahy and Bland's 2014 volume provides the *arché*, the ordering principle, with which the essays in this volume of *postmedieval* struggle. It provides the master narrative in the sense that it is an attempt to give an authoritative (though not definitive) account of the Hoard's discovery and history as far as it can be established. Its chapters summarize the story of the Hoard from its discovery through to its ongoing conservation before focusing in on specifics of its contents, individual objects, how its objects were made, its date and the circumstances surrounding its burial. There are also brief chapters providing information on Anglo-Saxon England and Sutton Hoo (like *Beowulf*, the Staffordshire Hoard is destined, rightly or wrongly, to be pulled into line with Sutton Hoo—things have gravity, as Levi R. Bryant notes in his essay reviewed below), the Treasure Act and Portable Antiquities Scheme, and finally the future of the Hoard. It is more personal than their 2009 version of the publication in that it fleshes out the stories of those involved in the Hoard's discovery. We learn more about the farmer, Fred Johnson, on whose land the hoard was discovered, for example. At the same time it feels less personal, albeit more probing, in its approach to the "I" of the hoard and the "we/I" of its objects, its community. Some of the mystery, excitement, and sheer energy of the original publication is gone. We know more now, but as a result the mystery of the treasure feels less magical.

"If I am interested in the "I" and the "we" of the Hoard, or its oscillation between singular and plural, it is in part because quantifying the Hoard has proven such a fraught, changeable process." We know more about how some objects fit together, multiple individuals becoming one, even if we are no more certain about how they/it functioned—the curious tripartite disc surmounted by a cylinder and a disc, for example (items K130, K1055, K545). Some mysterious creatures, like the wonderful seahorse, which once appeared to twist and turn as if in water, have revealed themselves to be more common objects, in the case of the seahorse a more static and symmetrical object formed of two beast-heads curved to confront each other. We also, presumably, have a more accurate count of things—92 as opposed to the earlier 69 sword pommel caps. Some objects have been recovered subsequent to the 2009 find, while others have become shape-shifters. The provisional count of the contents in 2009 was 1585, in 2014 it was "around 3600". (The Hoard website gives a more cautious "over 3500".) We know the weights of gold, of silver, of silver-gilt, and the number of garnets. High-resolution images lay bare details of manufacture, wear and damage—or wounding. The Hoard becomes less a spectacle and more clinical anatomy, although something of the original spectacle is kept alive on the website, which proclaims "see it," "see it," "see it." See it in Birmingham, in Stoke-on-Trent, in Lichfield, in Tamworth. See it on tour. See its "star-items," which include the seahorse still in its twisted shape on the Hoard website, but morphing magically into the confronting beast-head object on the Hoard's facebook page. We know now what this object looks like, but we remain uncertain about what exactly it is. It would have been mounted on something. What? How? It is tiny and delicate, so seemingly out of place on the battlefield. These are anarchic beasts. They speak with multiple and shifting voices, a feature of the Hoard that Tilghman and Thompson bring to life so convincingly. "We

glitter with lies; you will not know all our secrets" (page reference should be inserted here).

In *The Staffordshire Hoard*, the majority of the pictures of the objects are silhouetted against a black background and carefully lit, which both allows details to stand out and gives the impression of the gold and garnets emerging from the darkness of the earth. Perhaps we are meant to get a sense of their discoverer Terry Herbert's awe and wonder at their uncovery, though of course they have now been cleaned of much of their dirt. They are beautiful, brilliant, shining treasures for our consumption. They are also, as the book's sections on Anglo-Saxon England and Sutton Hoo make clear, warrior gear. They are objects surrounded by violence, meant to do violence, and have been violently treated themselves. Although the burials are completely different in nature (Sutton Hoo's elite, carefully planned and arranged ship-burial, versus Staffordshire's seemingly hastily hidden pile of loot), "the two finds complement each other, both representing the same warrior society" (59). Sutton Hoo contains treasures associated with one ruler, while the Staffordshire Hoard is probably made up of the ornaments of a band or bands of warriors, the retinue of someone of similar status to that of the king or prince in Sutton Hoo Mound 1. In "The Staffordshire Hoard: Its Implications for the Study of Seventh-Century Anglo-Saxon Warfare," posted on his blog *Historian on the Edge*, Guy Halsall (2015) models a number of scenarios for the size and nature of the war-band (at least the elite part of a war-band) to which the objects might have belonged, concluding that the Hoard should not surprise us, that it simply confirms some of what we already suspected, that Mercia was a center of wealth and power, and that a Mercian army might reasonably be estimated to have numbered well into the thousands. He also suggests that in some ways we might be thinking about the Hoard all wrong, that it might not have been such a big deal to those who deposited it, no matter how much it is to us today. If we think about the Hoard in terms of its monetary value at the time of its deposition, it might not really be as great as it seems since "equipping a reasonably sized army … could cost in excess of fifty Staffordshire Hoards." He also notes that some objects may represent significant recycling, so that a helmet might have been composed of bits and pieces taken from other helmets—warrior gear cobbled together rather than all shiny new bling.

Art historians tend to read the Hoard only in terms of its art-historical value, its status as desirable and beautiful loot representative of a lost warrior society. But it is representative of only one part of that society. Its objects are high-end items that tell us much about the elite, but only the elite of a military retinue. We still know very little about the lower echelons of an early Anglo-Saxon army, and they continue to haunt the Hoard and our approaches to it. We make choices about what we keep from the Hoard and what we discard, what has value and what is waste, our scholarly activities mirroring those that Brian Castriota examines in his article on the conservation of the Hoard in the present volume, "Mediating Meanings: Conservation and the Staffordshire Hoard". What is lost and gained by the questions we ask? How are meanings accrued? What are the intended or unintended Hoards that we construct? The Hoard is not a single thing but a community of very different objects that circulated within a larger community as, if not more, diverse as itself.

Karen Eileen Overbey discusses both the ephemeral and violent nature of the objects in the Staffordshire Hoard in her essay in this volume "Passing Time with the Staffordshire Hoard." Whether they were destined to be melted down and turned into

completely different objects, or whether they were meant to remain intact and be reassembled to form new composites, these objects were all on their way to becoming something else, just as they had been something else before they were the things that we now have before us. We now have but one instant in what would have been the fluid life of these Anglo-Saxon ornaments. The garnets, she notes, would have been known to the Anglo-Saxons as carbuncles, "live coals," or "burning flames." Light, life, destruction and terror, the fire that destroys and the fire that brings rebirth are thus a part of their very nature. They are both splendid and terrifying, like the warriors they adorned and who wielded them. But many of them are so small that they would have gone virtually unnoticed in the heat of battle. Moreover, the same techniques of manufacture, and the same gold, silver and garnets were used for items not obviously connected with battle, such as the brooches, necklaces, and other jewels that were worn by the Anglo-Saxon elite, both male and female.

This brings us to the question of gender. Like non-elite fighters, women haunt this Hoard and our approaches to it too. Violence and gender are at the heart of Bradley, et al., *The South Station Hoard*. This book and the project it documents reimagine the hoard as a collection of objects stolen from one group of 'tween' (or adolescent, pre-teen) girls by another and hidden in a locker in Boston's South Station. A nuclear accident, so the story goes, leaves the hoard buried for eight hundred years. In this rendering, gold and garnets are replaced by pink plastic and crystals, weapons by cell phones, by diaries, dolls, hair ornaments, and other such items. Anglo-Saxon battle becomes tween bullying.

The book is divided into chapters devoted to academic discourse, fictionalized records, and creative process, with an appendix of possible lesson plans. Carlee Bradbury provides an Introduction to the book and the project, outlining how and why this particular response to the Staffordshire Hoard came together, and what the project hopes to achieve. The book itself, she writes, "confronts the form of the traditional collection of scholarly essays with the intense visuality of an artist book" (11). It is followed by a visual catalogue of the discovery of the hoard and details of the objects that comprise it. Photographed against a dark background, the close-up images of objects do an excellent job of both mirroring the catalogue of objects in Leahy and Bland's *The Staffordshire Hoard* (or the photos available on the Staffordshire Hoard website) and of suggesting the iconic value the items themselves would have had as desirable objects of consumption. The graphic design, the images, the "fictional" and "real" records are all meant to work together as and in community, thus the book should not be approached as a series of individual chapters, but as co-existing parts of a larger project.

There are many questions that arise in reading this academic/fictional document/art work/project record. Why and how is Harvard still around, in this post-disaster future? How can gemstones have vanished beyond memory but not the plastic bling that the archaeologists hypothesize was meant to take their place? We can't read CDs from a couple of decades ago, so how can email and text messages be retrieved from cell phones eight hundred years later? Is there a trace of oversimplified feminism about all this—simply replace male with female and stir? There are clearly aspects of this project that might have been thought out more critically and in greater detail.

Nonetheless, as a collaborative project *The South Station Hoard* both insightfully mirrors aspects of the biography of the Staffordshire Hoard—assemblage, deposition, discovery, conservation and display—and provides a useful model for collaboration as

interdisciplinary practice in its own right. It brings the past into the present, allowing it to speak to issues that concern us today, and it does so in clear, jargon-free language that it is easy for the general public and students at all levels to understand. It reaches out effectively beyond the confines of academia, theoretical paradigms, and cultural or intellectual elites to make both the past and the present heard. Moreover, *The South Station Hoard* does valuable social work in examining a culture of bullying that is present not only in tween culture but also in higher education and the scholarly world. The latter is suggested by the competitiveness and territoriality of the fictional archaeologist who investigates the hoard: "Truly going to change the field—need to get there before the Cambridge goons. Paper needs to come fast … this project is mine" (45). One way to ensure that the arts and humanities (as well as universities and cultural institutions) remain viable is to engage with society and social issues in innovative and appealing ways, ways that are able to galvanize public support for universities and disciplines that follow something other than the business model (Docherty 2014). Another is to support one another in new forms of collectivity, new configurations of the "we."

The contributions to *Ontological Anarché: Beyond Materialism and Idealism* also focus on ambivalence and opposition, inherited ideas and other traditions. The volume, like the Staffordshire Hoard, contains multiple competing voices that are not reconciled and perhaps could not be. There is agreement, but also dissent. There is conflict or violence at the heart of many of the topics these essays cover—philosophical conflict, ideological violence, the conflicting or competing anarchies of postmodernity. Violence certainly surrounded the circumstances that led to the Hoard's deposition, and anarchy may have surrounded them as well, just as it surrounds the traditions and histories for or against which the essays in *Ontological Anarché* speak.

Ontological anarchy is a term originating in the writings of Hakim Bey. It is an anarchism rooted in the ontological nature of being, itself rooted in chaos, the "original undifferentiated oneness of being" (2003, 3) It is both being and becoming, and thus a vital ever-changing state and force. According to Bey, it developed rapidly into post-anarchy, that is, an anarchism that both addresses and critiques its own being and processes of production. The *anarché* (rather than anarchy) of the volume's title is never explicitly addressed, but is presumably used to draw attention to the ways in which this collection of anarchist writings refuses to accept the hierarchies inherent in or imposed by any *arché*. The volume's subtitle addresses the individual contributors' efforts to move beyond the materialism/idealism binary addressed in the German idealism of F.W.J. Schelling and G.W.F. Hegel. Elements of the argument that are particularly important for these essays are the ideas developed by Schelling in his *Naturphilosophie* that nature is much more than its scientific or material reality, and that the ideal has its origin in the material, and Hegel's notion that binaries such as the ideal and the material, or subject and object, or nature and freedom are transcended through being, an inclusive whole that always contains both sets of oppositions. Schelling's and Hegel's arguments were understood as speculative because they rejected established methods and established new ones, laying the foundations for the speculative materialism of today.

Two of the essays in the volume work to draw out the importance of Schelling and Hegel for the development of ontological and anarchic thought, as well as to reconcile some of the divisions between the two men and their philosophies. Ben Woodward's "Schellingian Thought for Ecological Politics" (86–108) outlines the value

of the ontological stratification developed in *Naturphilosophie* for contemporary ecological politics, especially as a useful way for theorizing the systematic yet fluid relationships between the human and the non-human. In his "Three Scandals in the Philosophy of F.W.J. Schelling: Ontology, Freedom, Mythology" (138–65), Jared McGeough argues that Schelling's critical response to Hegel helps to move us beyond the idealism/materialism binary, and in so doing, becomes a source for ontological anarchy.

But *Ontological* Anarchés is about much more than Schelling and Hegel. In their Introduction to the volume, "Anarchism's Other Scene: Materializing the Ideal and Idealizing the Material," Duane Rouselle (a Lacanian psychoanalyst) and Jason Adams (whose research centers on postanarchism) do an excellent job of setting out the multiple relationships (historical and philosophical) between ontologies and anarchies and the major issues explored and debated in the essays that follow. These include the interrelationship of anarchism and post-anarchism, mediation and representation, mediacy and immediacy, production and consumption. They introduce the problem of distinctions and the undermining of any *arché* through the ambivalent relationship between "lived" and "mediated" (or remediated) experience. Lived experience—watching a play in a theater, viewing the objects on display in a museum—they assert, is no less mediated than watching a performance online or viewing a virtual exhibition, indeed it is always mediated through technoculture, it is simply a matter of relation or degree. All experience, then, is both mediacy and immediacy, all production is also consumption. "Today the Spectacle is no longer opposed to the Spectator: the Spectator now participates in producing not *the* Spectacle, but one's own personal spectacle, networked with literally millions of other Spectator-Producers who are engaged in the same activity—instantly, interactively, and ubiquitously" (3). (I could not get this passage out of my head as I trolled through the many publications, webpages, reports and products surrounding the spectacle-spectator identity of the Staffordshire Hoard.) How, Rouselle and Adams ask, within such an environment do we create a genuinely radical ontology, one that is not merely a return of the sensate body or a reduction of the world to the human? This is a burning question in the epoch of the Anthropocene and the age of the posthuman when it has become so vital to the survival of the planet that we think beyond the human.

The individual essays in the volume are all rich and complex, and I cannot do them full justice in a review of this length, but I do want to bring out some of the ways in which they can fruitfully be brought into dialogue with both the essays in this volume of *postmedieval* and the other two books reviewed here. Levi R. Bryant's, "The Gravity of Things: an Introduction to Onto-cartography" (10–30), uses Einstein's theory of relativity to propose that things exist in gravity influencing the movements and becomings of individuals and collectives in time and space. Onto-cartography is a "map of the spatio-temporal gravitational fields produced by things and signs and how these fields constrain and afford possibilities of movement and becoming" (14). Energy flows through them. Bryant's example of such a field flowing with energy is fifteenth-century Cologne, a city whose infrastructure created (in Bryant's terms) a mass gravitational field through such things as the production, storage, and consumption of food, and communication technologies. Cologne attracted people, commerce, industry, all fueled by food, the energy that flowed through the city. That need for food in turn generated particular paths of supply and distribution. The size of the population was limited by the amount of

available energy, which was itself limited by cultivation techniques, pest control, preservation and storage, and so forth. The Hoard too, I would suggest, has a gravitational field that attracts people to it out of greed, desire, or interest—some of the same factors that led to its original assemblage. Energy flows through it in the form of labor—the physical labor of its original manufacture and the intellectual labor of its study and interpretation. It draws in ideas and other things, like *Beowulf* and Sutton Hoo. Both physical and intellectual labor are limited by technologies of production, conservation, methodology, and historical constructs.

In thinking about onto-cartography, Bryant also discusses its ability to work along multiple spatiotemporal networks. He notes, for example, that he is closer in communicative intimacy to individuals who are further away in Euclidean space, at the same time that he is closer in Euclidean space to those to whom he is communicatively more distant, such as the upper echelons of university administration. Similarly, the speculation and creative response to the Hoard demonstrated by the contributors to this volume of *postmedieval* and the participants in the *South Station Hoard* project may help to bring us spatially and temporally closer to the Hoard than does the archaeological historicism of Leahy and Bland's volume, at the same time that that response takes place in relation to its paradigmatic structure. Could we deploy Byrant's terrarism to allow for better becomings across the wider scholarly community and institution of the University? How might it help us as we strive to remove bullying, isolation, and violence from our work?

Onto-cartography, Bryant stresses, should not be exclusively a matter of intellectual pursuit, but should be practiced as "terrarism," that is, it should be in and of the earth where being and becoming take place. Bryant's terrarism has three dimensions: (1) the mapping of entities to define the gravitational fields and paths of movement they generate, (2) the deconstruction of relations or removal of entities that inhibit becoming or forms of movement, (3) the construction of networks that make possible better becomings or forms of movement. Bryant is concerned with entities such as greenhouse gas and malaria, but what implications might his idea have for the Hoard and the community of students and scholars drawn to it? What would it mean to map the technologies and movements of materials that became the Hoard as it emerged from the earth or as its materials were drawn to Anglo-Saxon England along the trade networks that stretched across Europe and beyond? Could we think of the Hoard in terms of its implications for the ecology of the period in which it was produced and in which it exists today?

Further on in *Ontological Anarché*, Hilan Bensusam's "*Polemos* Doesn't Stop Anywhere Short of the World: On Anarchaeology, Ontology, and Politics" (66–85) offers another way of thinking about these questions. Bensusan turns to the Heraclitan notion of *polemos* (a concept of war as both originator and annihilator), arguing for a "fire ontology," that is neither ground nor bedrock but ever on the move, spreading like contagion. It is a force of disruption that can appear anywhere, a fire that interconnects the flame and the inflammable. It's a matter of position, as the mediate and immediate is a matter of degree for Rouselle and Adams. Politics and ontology are on fire, each one shaping the other in a geology of constant interaction and change and a chronology of folds and layers. He uses the work of Jane Bennett, Felix Guatari, and Iain Hamilton Grant to flesh out this interconnection through an "anarcheology" of the ungrounded and

ungoverned. The disruption spreads further via the becoming of a Heraclitus who survived for millennia, producing a late oeuvre of writings on *arché* and *polemos*, fragments of which are revealed. Ultimately, "[t]here are no hierarchies (no-archés) other than the ones determined be existing alliances, by the current political configuration of things" (80).

Jason Harmon's "Ontological Anarché: Beyond Arché and Anarché" (109–20) turns to the work of Jean-Luc Nancy and his ideas about community, ideas that have helped to shape my own thinking about the Hoard in this review essay. For Harmon, Nancy provides useful semiotic tools for moving beyond the arché/anarché, or something/nothing, opposition. As *polemos* allows for the co-originality of creation and destruction, so Harmon argues that Nancy's notion of the community as "principled anarchy" allows for the co-originality of arché and anarché, both defined together in *being-with*. In the tendency for anarché to be set in a mirror relation to arché, Harmon finds a replication of the model of Hegelian and Heideggerian critique resting on the notion that chaos posits order, the negative the positive, and so forth. Principled anarchy, or community, or being-with, on the other hand, allows an archic-anarchy to emerge. In this model, arché is thought as a relation rather than a principle, foundation, or thing, and anarchy is dissimilarity rather than absence. Again, what Harmon elucidates is a fluid process of becoming, a co-originality of no-thing and some-thing. Again, such an idea is rich in its potential significance for the Hoard. The chaos of the Hoard and the anarchy that may have surrounded its collection and deposition exist in relation to the structural foundations of such things as social and political order, historical paradigms and contemporary methodologies, and do so not as static objects controlled by them. The "I" and the "w"e of the Hoard are and are not one. History and the Hoard, like the earth, can never be fully mastered.

There are so many anarchisms. There are so many Hoards.

****

There are so many voices in and around the Hoard. It is anarchic. Its survival is perhaps the result of anarchy. The mass of the Hoard creates a gravitational field that attracts us and pulls us into certain ways of thinking about it. Was it produced in relation to, or was it produced by and for a warrior society? Monasteries housed workshops that produced metalwork and jeweled objects. Billfrith, the anchorite and goldsmith who worked on the cover of the Lindisfarne Gospels, is perhaps the best known of these early Anglo-Saxon monastic goldsmiths, but Elizabeth Coatsworth and Michael Pinder note that *all* of the goldsmiths named in the later *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* are either clerics or worked in a monastic setting (2002, 208). The terror ornaments of the Hoard cannot be completely separated from the ideologies, economies, and ecologies that were part and parcel of these centers of peace, learning, and religion. Of course many, if not most Anglo-Saxon wars were fought at least nominally in the name of religion, and sacred items such as crosses and scriptural manuscripts were carried into battle, weapons in their own right. The crosses and possible book or shrine mounts of the Hoard may have been deployed in just this way. There is also some evidence to suggest that some metalwork was produced by women. At the double monastery of Hartlepool evidence for metalworking was found in the part of the monastery occupied by the women (Daniels 1988), so perhaps the Staffordshire Hoard is not as unremittingly masculine as it is taken to be. Some of the pieces in the Hoard may speak about men, but with women's voices. What if we see the

beliefs and ideologies that existed in relation to the Hoard, and exist in our contemporary approaches to it as systems or communities produced by (and co-original with) both *anarché* and *arché*?

In their respective co-authored essays in this volume Mittman and MacCormack, and Gurnon and Harris highlight the seemingly oppositional co-existing aspects of the Hoard, its beauty and destruction, and the way in which they work to make the fabulated warrior both glorious and terrifying—awe-inspiring. Their emphasis on *becoming* as opposed to *being* (and really this is an aspect of the Hoard noted in all the contributions to this volume) gains added depth when thought through the both-together, the co-originality of Jason Harman's "Ontological Anarché." How might Harman's understanding of Nancy's community complicate our notion of the Hoard, or the warrior retinue, or the community of metalworkers who produced the Hoard, or the community of scholars seeking its meaning? Nancy writes, "The community that becomes a *single thing* (body, mind, fatherland, Leader) … necessarily loses the *in* of being-*in*-common. Or it loses the *with* or the *together* that defines it. It yields its being together to a being *of* togetherness. The truth of community, on the contrary, resides in the retreat of such a being" (1991, xxxix). Community is unstable, fluid, articulated through its multiple individuals and ever-changing voices. What happens if we think more about the individuals of the hoard as individuals being-with, in community, rather than as a totalized community? And what of community as something more than just the human? Mittman and MacCormack's fabulated warriors simultaneously create and destroy such a vision. They may indeed be individual posthuman bio-technological teratological wonders, but this is also a masquerade. They appear to be other-worldly beings, visions of the gods of war, but they are ultimately human, and acting as a war-band. They are singular and they are plural, in com-munity. They reap a very human destruction in and on the world, as does the spectacle of nuclear disaster that haunts the *South Station Hoard*, but one that is also co-original with the emergence of another order.

Treasure and terror, creation and death, co-emerging in the concept and figure of war, in the *polemos* of Bensusan's immortal Heraclitus. Fire-ontology too allows us to think differently with and through the Hoard. The fire that interconnects the flames and the inflammable, that disrupts, that can appear anywhere, spreading like contagion, can speak not only to the ever-changing political configurations of Middle Saxon England, but also to the struggle against bullying, or against the rigid disciplinarity that both *Hoards and Hordes* and *The South Station Hoard* work against. Can we work with un-disciplinarity, with an anarchaeology that transcends rigid models and paradigms? Can we work in and as an ungrounded flow of becoming in which things float like Overbey's carbuncles in molten gold? This might be an undiscipline as praxis, as "terrarism."

References
Alexander, Caroline. *Lost Gold of the Dark Ages: War, Treasure, and the Mystery of the Saxons*. Washington, DC: National Geographic, 2011.
Alexander, Caroline. "Staffordshire Gold Hoard: Magical Mystery Treasure Buried in the English Countryside," *National Geographic* (November 2011). http://ngm.nationalgeographic.com/2011/11/gold-hoard/alexander-text, accessed April 5, 2016.

Bey, Hakim. *T.A.Z.: The Temporary Autonomous Zone, Ontological Anarchy, Poetic Terrorism*. Brooklyn: Autonomedia, 2003.

Coatsworth, Elizabeth & Michael Pinder. *The Art of the Anglo-Saxon Goldsmith*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2002.

Daniels, R. "The Anglo-Saxon Monastery at Church Close, Hartlepool, Cleveland." *Archaeological Journal* 148 (1988), 158–210.

Docherty, Thomas. *Universities at War*. London: SAGE, 2015.

Halsall, Guy. "The Staffordshire Hoard: Its implications for the Study of Seventh-Century Anglo-Saxon Warfare," *Historian on the Edge*. http://600transformer.blogspot.co.uk/2015/08/the-staffordshire-hoard-its.html, accessed April 5, 2016.

Leahy, Kevin & Roger Bland. *The Staffordshire Hoard*. London: The British Museum Press, 2009.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Inoperative Community*, trans. Peter Connor, et al. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991.

http://www.staffordshirehoard.org.uk