The Excavation of a settlement of the fourth and fifth centuries AD on Overton Down, West Overton, Wiltshire

Introduction

Location and associated archaeology

The excavation was undertaken as part of the Fyfod Project and its rationale exists only within that context (Fowler 1997; 2000).

The site, Overton Down Site XII (hereafter OD XII) lies on the south-east side of and partly across a slight re-entrant rising through the north side of the dry valley of Pickledean, West Overton (Maps 1 and 2; Figures FWP64.1 and FWP64.2; Plate FWP64.I). At the time of excavation it lay, and it still lies, in old grassland, part of the Fyfield Down National Nature Reserve. Having been carefully backfilled, it remains visible very much as it was in 1965 when it was surveyed (Figure FWP64.2).

It is placed in its archaeological context as part of the Down Barn area in Figure FWP64.2. This shows it to be part of a complex fully discussed in *LPP*, Chapter 6. This consists principally of the Overton Down South (ODS) settlement 150 m to the south east and, the same distance to the south west, the Down Barn Enclosure, with a probable small settlement, Overton Down Site XIII (OD XIII), across a trackway immediately to the west. It seems extremely likely that the excavated settlement, OD XII (Plate FWP64.II), is related in some way to one or more of those sites. In particular, it has to be considered seriously as a north west part of ODS, rather than a separate settlement, though there are considerable chronological rather than spatial difficulties with such an interpretation.

Initial interpretation

The site, with a selection of its considerable material equipment which makes it of some importance in its own right, has been displayed in the Roman Room at Devizes Museum for some 25 years (and renewed in 1995) in its guise, with the excavator's knowledge, of a small, isolated late Roman downland farmstead. This was, in the 1960s, and continues to be, a justifiable interpretation (Fowler 1966), but in the event it is not the interpretation finally preferred here in what is both a report and reassessment (*LPP*, Chapter 6).

Recognised as a discrete group of four, perhaps five, possible ‘building platforms’ during fieldwork, and surveyed in 1965, the site was initially interpreted as a small settlement. As early as 1966, however, it was reinterpreted, ‘heavy grazing of the area [then] having revealed several more probable sites of buildings indicating that there might be as many as a dozen structures scattered mainly in the corner of ‘Celtic’ fields over an area about a 100 yards square.’ (Fowler 1967, 26). Doubts about its smallness and isolation have been reinforced on two grounds.

As already mentioned, OD XII may be a north west part of Romano-British settlement ODS, the superficial, physical link with it having been flattened by cultivation and a race-horse training gallop between the two. It may also have extended north west across its re-entrant or, intriguingly, a similar small settlement may lie *c* 200 m to the west; for, whichever is the case, the fact is that a closely similar, tight-knit group of ‘building sites’, looking very like those of OD XII as found, were noted and sketch-surveyed (Figure FWP64.2) during another period of minimal grass length and optimal fieldwork conditions in August 1996.

The extent of the settlement is an important point both morphologically and in a local context; but, from the point of view of the Project's programme, the key point was that the original four ‘building

sites' were observed to be lying on top of 'Celtic' fields. Indeed, two of them were tucked into the north east corner of such fields, and a third, which appeared to be larger, was sited in a field above a lynchet *c* 1 m high (Figure FWP64.3). It has subsequently appeared that another building may have lain beside the large sarsen stone *c* 20m west of Building 1 (*SL*, 71–5, fig 40).

Excavation strategy

A decision to begin excavating was inspired primarily by the continuing need to date such fields, in this case by establishing a *terminus ante quem* for the fields by dating the first phase of the settlement. So the original intention was to use the settlement as a means of elucidating fields, though the chance to excavate a 'small' settlement completely was also in mind (Fowler 1967, 26) to illuminate settlement history, both locally and regionally (Fowler 1966).

OD XII was excavated between 1966 and 1968. Basically four areas were excavated using a hybrid open plan quadrant system, Areas 1 and 2 simultaneously, then 3 and 4 (Figure FWP64.4). Area 4 expanded several times as a reaction to what was being found; it degenerated into numerous successive, small cuttings on the south west and, even though most were eventually amalgamated, the methodology largely explains the unsatisfactory evidence (*see below*). Excavation continued and developed nevertheless because the settlement became of considerable interest in its own right, both for its nature, still ambivalent, and for the mid/late fourth–fifth century date of its main phases.

Buildings

Excavation examined four main buildings (Figure FWP64.4, 1, 2, 3, 4A), cut into the lynchets (Figures FWP64.6 and FWP64.7), and possibly a fifth (4B/C; Figure FWP64.4). On pottery (see *Pottery*) and coin evidence (FWP 95) occupation has been dated to the second half of the fourth century, probably continuing into the fifth, at least in Building 4A. Some glass definitely takes occupation into the fifth century (see *Glass*). The buildings were robbed for stone at a later, unknown, date. No material later than fifth century in date was found in the excavations apart from a single sherd (weighing 3g) of thirteenth–fourteenth century AD pottery, possibly a buckle (Figure FWP64.29, 16; FWP 39b, Cat No 17), and a post-medieval strap-end, all from the topsoil. The robbing of the site, possibly in the fifth or sixth century, is important to appreciate in assessing the following account, particularly as it was thought at the time of excavation, and has long been thought since, that one of the merits of the site was that it had lain undisturbed since its desertion. It has indeed lain undisturbed for a long time, perhaps as long as 1500 years, but strictly only since its robbing, not its desertion; and the former may have been some time after the latter, whereas we have previously assumed that the events were close in time. Furthermore, we now appreciate also that both duration and robbing, like the occupation itself, may have been processes rather than events.

There was evidence of two phases in Buildings 1 and 2, two or possibly three phases in Building 3, and certainly three phases in Building 4A. Construction took place in both timber and stone, but only in 4A is there clear evidence of an entire building constructed in timber. The small numbers of post-holes found beneath the stone phases of the other buildings may represent earlier fences or boundary markers. Only one or two courses of stonework survived. These walls, composed of unmortared, irregularly-shaped sarsens with some smaller flints, could not have stood to any great height, but must have been support walls to take a timber superstructure. In several places these walls rest in a trench or step cut into the chalk.

Relation of the buildings to the boundary

The most striking feature of this group of buildings was the very regular layout, which respected the position of an earlier boundary and, in the case of most of the buildings, also respected its alignment.

The boundary, running north east/south west, had originally been marked by a ditch; although this was filled in by at least the 330s AD and certainly before the buildings were constructed, the south east sides of the two largest buildings (Figure FWP64.4, 2, 4A) still respected its line. Their long axes lay at right-angles to it; the north west walls of both were *c* 12 m from it. Building 1 also lay close to the boundary, but was tucked diagonally into the corner of a lyncheted field, and aligned approximately north/south.

To the south west of Building 2 lay Building 3, and in a comparable position to the south west of Building 4A lay the possible building, 4B/C. Though the remains of both of these western buildings are complex and fragmentary, each appears to have one phase or component with its long axis parallel to or at right-angles to the former boundary ditch. Buildings 4A and 4B/C were separated by a fence, running parallel to the boundary.

Function of the buildings

The function of the buildings was suggested by their morphology. Building 1 was much smaller than the others and square rather then rectangular or sub-rectangular. The lack of occupation material, apart from the quern found *in situ*, suggests that this was a workshed possibly devoted to hand-milling. Another quernstone and many other quern fragments were reused in other buildings.

Building 2 was divided into one large and one small room, the former with a hearth. Parallels are found mainly in the south west, at Catsgore (Leech 1982), Bradley Hill (Leech 1981) and Gatcombe (Branigan 1977), and also at Hibaldstow, Lincolnshire (Frere 1977, 389). At all, two- and three-roomed buildings of this type have been identified as houses.

Building 3, like Building 1, appears to have been intended for working rather than occupation. The heavily-robbed nature of the remains makes it impossible to define the structural sequence with absolute certainty, but the interpretation offered here is of two stone-built phases, each involving some heating process. The walls of the Phase 1 building were fragmentary, but this structure incorporated a rectangular stone-lined kiln. The kiln from Phase 1 was overlain by the walls of the Phase 2 structure, a building with a stone floor and possibly an apsidal northern end. An oven with a clay superstructure also probably belonged to the second phase. Almost all of the finds from Building 3 were found in or beside the wall stones, indicating that the floor had been regularly swept. As excavated, the floor was far from complete, many of its individual flag-stones having been removed.

Building 4A appears to have had three distinct phases, two of timber and one of stone. The regular spacing of post-holes in the two timber phases (which are roughly equidistant, apart from wider gaps for entrances) demonstrates that the individual buildings were carefully planned and laid out. The surviving remains contained no trace of internal divisions or hearths, and probably represented a barn or other agricultural building.

Area 4B/C contained an oven with a clay superstructure adjacent to a floor of rammed chalk. It is possible that this area was bordered on three sides by sarsens, running roughly east/west, but in the absence of clear evidence, this should probably be regard as an open-air working area. The evidence is stronger for a structure south of this. Lengths of sarsen walls shared a long axis parallel to that of Building 4A, each resting in a construction trench. It is possible that this structure had an apsidal

east end. Similar structures have been recognised in agricultural settings at Catsgore (buildings 2.10 and 3.13; Leech 1982, 17–21) and Hibaldstow (Frere 1977, 389).

Site function

This group of buildings may represents a single unit, comprising house, barn, work-shed and work areas, possibly related to grain-processing, ie, storage, drying or parching, threshing and baking. The group as a whole can be paralleled at Gatcombe, where the south west part of the site was interpreted as a complex for the storage and processing of grain (Branigan 1977, fig 33).

The dating and phasing of the buildings will be discussed in greater detail below but it can be noted here that, if ODXII was, in fact, a specialised unit within a larger complex rather than a small settlement in its own right, then such a specialist grain-treatment facility could be seen as further evidence of the former, possibly even conveniently situated within a small area of contemporary arable fields (above). On the other hand, such an idea must be examined in relation to the settlement's time depth as well as its spatial patterning.

The Excavation

Stratigraphical note

In the following account ‘Areas’ are the four areas excavated. Building numbers follow those of the Areas. Stratigraphy, usually only *c* 0.30–0.40m deep over the site, was essentially very simple:

Layer 1 is the topsoil, here characteristically worm-sorted, stone-free humus *c* 0.25m thick.

Layer 2 is the worm-sorted detritus at the bottom of layer 1 added to any similar material which was *in situ* and not part of the already deposited layer 3.

Layer 3 is *in situ* occupation material lying directly on Chalk subsoil where such a layer was clearly distinguishable from the essentially post-depositional layer 2.

Layer 4 is Chalk subsoil.

Other layers and feature fillings are distinguished and described as appropriate, and as far as possible in relation to that four-layer sequence. They comprise principally an early lynchet and ditch and some other, small pre-settlement features. That the site had been robbed, at least of building materials, was recognised in plan at the time of excavation, obviously with Buildings 1, 3 and 4, but the nature of the robbing was not recognised in section. Nevertheless, while allowance must be made for some stratigraphical disturbance during robbing, it seemed that essentially layers 1 and 2, together the topsoil until the post-depositional creation of layer 2 by worms, were undisturbed since desertion, and in that sense are archaeological layers. Layer 2 in particular was treated as such, both at the time of excavation and in the preparation of this account by the various materials specialists, even though it is technically ‘the bottom of the topsoil’.

Area 1

Area 1 (See Fowler 1967)was completely excavated, ie, at the end of the excavation Building 1 (Figure FWP64.8) did not exist and the Area was simply an expanse of Chalk with empty features in it.

Features pre-dating the stone building

Features pre-dating the stone building include a pit and several post-holes (4 certain, 6 possible; Figure FWP64.9). Pit 3 (Figure FWP64.10), 0.46–0.61m deep, in the south east corner of the Area, contained the only cluster of early coins on the site. They occurred in a sealed stratigraphy where five, together with other objects, appeared to present a structured deposit (Figure FWP634.10). Four coins were in layer 3, in effect originally the upper part of the pit; at the top of the layer, a worn *Ass* of Marcus Aurelius *c* AD 164–5 (SF 117); and at the bottom of layer 3 a very worn *Ass* of *c* AD 141 (Faustina, wife of Antoninus Pius; SF 115), and two worn copies of Tetricus II (AD 170–3; SF 125, 126). At the bottom of the pit (Figure FWP64.10, layer 7, plan b) was an unworn *Quinarius* of Allectus (AD 293–6; SF135), a coin which probably indicates the date of the deposit fairly accurately. The other objects were, in layer 3, of iron (SF 116, 124, 133, 134, and nails), lead, pottery (third/fourth century), glass and animal bone, with similar material in layer 7 but without the lead and glass.

There can be little doubt that this was indeed a ceremonial deposit but its significance is uncertain. Buried fairly close to AD 300, it may well be a foundation burial to mark the start of new habitation on pasture which had formerly been arable land. That need in no way conflict with the tempting idea that the time span of the coins, mid-second to very late third century, was fairly exactly, as far as the evidence indicates, the *c* 150 years between the cessation of cultivation and the beginning of the fields' re-use for non-arable activity, which may have included habitation from Stage 1 onwards (see *Discussion*).

coins dating from the second century AD, emphasising that this feature represents some of the earliest activity on the site, possibly contemporary with the latest coin in it. Such dating evidence may also bear on the adjacent lynchet and its associated cultivation, and with both settlement ODS and the occupation beneath the Down Barn Enclosure. Pottery from the pit fill included sherds of late third–fourth-century date, so the whole may mark the first main occupation phase of the settlement, perhaps in the 330s–340s, rather than an earlier, isolated feature of an otherwise unrecorded second-century phase of occupation.

Whatever its date and that of the deposition of its contained material, the pit looks like a votive deposit, located in the corner of the field, marked out by the lynchets and the north east–south west ditch. Perhaps, alternatively, it was a 'foundation deposit' for the settlement: a thirty-year old coin of Allectus might well have been an appropriate object in such a deposit for an occupation starting, on other coin evidence, *c.* AD 330.

Two of the post-holes can be shown to pre-date the stone construction phase, since they were cut by the trench in which the north east part of the wall rested. The others cannot be linked with either phase. Pottery from post-hole (PH)3 included a late fourth-century rim sherd (see *Pottery; type R156*). The post-holes do not form the plan of any recognisable structure and they are not on the line of the boundary ditch, unlike the line of post-holes in Area 2. Their function may therefore be directly associated with that of the building or represent earlier occupation contemporary with the pit deposit.

Building 1

Building 1 (Figures FWP64.4, FWP64.8 and FWP64.20; Plate FWP64.III), represented by alignments of sarsen blocks, was aligned due north–south and did not respect the former boundary ditch. Its external measurement was 4.65m square, internal *c* 3.3m square. There were no internal divisions or hearths. The building had been robbed, the western half more extensively than the eastern.

Two separate trenches, underlying the east and south corners of the building (dashed lines on Figure FWP64.8) are probably best interpreted as cuts for the insertion of the wall stones. The trenches were a maximum of 0.30m deep.

The sarsens were nowhere more than two courses high, their upper surfaces perhaps marking the ground level when robbing removed visible stones but not buried ones. No tumble occurred on either side of the wall remains. Allowing for the ruination, the stonework was nevertheless probably never more than wall footings to take a timber superstructure. The north wall was an almost continuous line of sarsens with some flints, but a gap occurred at the south end of the east wall. This seems unlikely to represent an entrance, as access would be difficult down the slope of the lynchet which pre-dates the building. The scatter of flints and fragments of Old Red Sandstone tiles probably represented the remnants of the bedding layer on which the sarsens originally rested.

The south wall was represented by a short length of two courses of wall footings resting in a trench. The rest of the wall survived as a scatter of flints and sarsen fragments.

A similar scatter made up the west wall, although two possible post footings indicated a central entrance. These post footings consisted of circular arrangements of flints, each enclosing a circular void *c* 0.15m in diameter.

The complete lower stone of a rotary quern made of sarsen (SF123, Figure FWP64.33, 1; FWP 39b, Cat No 2) was found *in situ* adjacent to the north part of the east wall (Figure FWP64.8). Possibly the two large sarsens on its south were the remains of a bench against the wall. A parallel may be the quern bench of semi-circular shape found in building 12 at Gatcombe (Branigan 1977, 21, fig 4, pl 2C), in a complex of buildings possibly devoted to grain processing and baking. A rectangular quern bench was found at the fort of Vindolanda, in a barrack constructed *c* AD 275–300 (Bidwell 1985, fig 29, pl xiii, and see discussion there). The only other feature within the building was an arrangement of sarsens, forming three sides of a square west of the quern; these may have been a post footing.

The finds distribution plot (Figure FWP64.11) shows that the floor of this building had been kept clean. Objects of glass (SF 54, FWP 39b, Cat No 7), shale (SF35, Figure FWP64.37, 2; FWP 39b, Cat No 1), iron (SF114; FWP 39b, Cat No 30) and a copper alloy pin (SF111; FWP 39b, Cat No 29) pre-dated the walls or came from the construction trenches, but the majority of occupation material had been swept outside.

Dating

A whetstone (SF65, Figure FWP64.33, 9; FWP 39b, Cat No 20), and SF12, a coin of Valentinian (AD 367–75) came from layer 2 over the occupation material. There is no other coin evidence for the date of use of the building or for its abandonment. Pottery sherds from the pre-wall deposits and the stone construction were all at least fourth-century with the exception of a few sherds in the pre-wall deposits which dated to between AD 240 and AD 400.

Area 2

Area 2 (see Fowler 1967) was completely excavated down to Chalk subsoil overall, except for the ditch which was only sectioned as indicated.

Phase(?s) pre-dating the stone building

Of the post-holes in Area 2 (Figures FWP64.12 and FWP64.13), the majority preceded the stone-footed Building 2. A line of six post-holes (two certain, four possible) between the south east wall of the building and the former boundary ditch (Figures FWP64.13 and FWP64.14; Plate FWP64.V)

may either have been associated with the laying out of the stone building or, not necessarily an unrelated function, have been a fence or marked a boundary after the ditch immediately the east had been infilled. Down the centre of the filled-in ditch, and co-terminal with the east wall of Building 2 (Figure FWP64.12), was a line of large sarsens, probably also marking the boundary in a later phase or possibly the remains of an early phase of the building.

Four other post-holes, one certain and three possible, within the limits of the building may have been associated with the building itself (Figure FWP64.13). No further post-holes were found, so the Area contained no plausible evidence of a building earlier than Building 2.

A trench north east/south west under the north part of the south east wall of Building 2 was of maximum depth 0.38m and an irregular profile with an uneven base. It may have pre-dated the stone wall or could have been an eaves-drip gully formed during occupation. A gully outside the south part of this wall clearly pre-dated the building and the boundary ditch, which cut it.

Building 2

Building 2 (Figures FWP64.12 and FWP64.20; FWP64.Plates IV–VI), in common with the other buildings on the site, had been robbed, more heavily on the western side than on the east.

The building was rectangular, its long axis at right-angles to the former boundary ditch. The north west, gable wall was 12m from the centre of this ditch (*cf* Building 4A). Externally the building measured 10.2 x 9m, internally 7.8 x 6m. It was divided into two rooms. The larger, to the south west, was *c* 6 x 5.4m; the smaller *c* 6 x 1.8m.

Stone walls

The ground had been levelled for the construction of the building, and a cut into the natural Chalk had been made to take its north east corner. On all sides the walls rested on a layer of flints, 0.10–0.15m thick, perhaps no more than the then-existing layer 2. The east corner was the only place where two courses of sarsens survived, and in places the sarsens were missing altogether. A coin of Magnentius (AD 350–53; SF121) lay beneath the line of the wall halfway along its south western side but, while it may well provide a *terminus post quem*, its context is not conclusive in view of the certain robbing of, and possible dumping on, Building 2.

In a gap in the centre of the south east wall was a possible votive deposit. This was an oval scoop cut into Chalk, *c* 0.20m deep, filled with dark soil containing two coins (Valens, AD 364–67), fragments of glass and some animal bones. It was covered by a slightly heaped layer of sarsen chips (Figure FWP64.12, section), appearing as a small mound (FWP64.Plate VI). As it was not sealed by the sarsen wall's footings, it is not possible to tell if this represents a foundation offering or whether it was deposited during the use of the building.

Ritual deposition can be paralleled in houses at other rural sites. In building 1 at Bradley Hill, Somerset (Leech 1981, 183, fig 5), the small room with the infant burial mentioned above also contained a foundation deposit of a pot containing coins. A pit in the corner of building 19 at Gatcombe contained thirteen coins, and had been covered by an octagonal slab of pennant stone (Branigan 1977, 55, fig 11, pl 14A). At Catsgore, a small fenced enclosure outside one of the long walls of the house contained a pit filled with sand and covered by a stone slab (Leech 1982, 24–5).

The sarsens of the south west wall of Building 2 became larger towards the south corner, culminating in a long triangular sarsen which had fallen over westwards. The north west wall also contained some large stones, among which was an inverted lower stone of a worn rotary quern (SF110).

The plans of Buildings 1 and 4A might suggest that the entrance to Building 2 would lie in the north west wall. This might be represented by the gap towards the wall's north end or by the missing

south east corner, though the latter might have been the result of robbing. For the most part the north east wall consisted of a scatter of small stones on the slope of the lynchet.

The partition wall was least well-preserved at its north east end but, as the distributions of various materials indicate (Figure FWP64.15), it had acted as a real division in use. Through it was a central opening, without evidence of there having been a door.

Hearth

The hearth, situated in a corner of the larger room (Figure FWP64.12), consisted of an area of burning over a roughly oval pit with a maximum depth of 0.30m.

Floor

The floor level in the larger room consisted of 'a scatter of broken stone and baked clay roofing tiles and of large coarse potsherds laid horizontally, perhaps in imitation of a real floor' (Fowler 1967, 29). No such level was defined in the smaller room where the floor, detected as only a surface in excavation, seemed to have been of earth.

Occupation material in house

The latest occupation layer (layer 2: see stratigraphical note above) was marked by a layer of flints which dipped towards the centre of the structure. On top of the flints were tile fragments and a number of animal bones, mainly long bones. Many of the bones were concentrated around the hearth (Figure FWP64.12), but it was clear they were 'part of a mostly undisturbed occupation layer which covered the greater part of the interior. This was only *c* 2.5cm thick but was marked by a much deeper soil coloration' (Fowler 1967, 29). This interpretation, made before the excavation of the much-robbed Building 3 and much post-excavation analysis, would now be queried. It seems much more likely now that the somewhat curious spread of heterogeneous material across the 'occupation layer' was actually the debris left after the fairly thorough removal of flat stones, and perhaps other material such as the tiles, of the floor proper. This does not affect the contemporaneity of the material with the occupation, though it may have come to rest with any pre-flagstone floor material already on the site.

The finds distribution plot (Figure FWP64.15) shows a striking concentration of finds in the larger room and within or beside the walls. Apparently the floor of the smaller room was kept swept. The large concentration of finds in the other room probably is from occupation contemporaneous with the building but most came from layer 2 or from the base of the topsoil, technically and stratigraphically overlying the occupation represented by layer 3. Most of the finds may, therefore, relate to a phase or phases of robbing or dumping of rubbish after the building had gone out of use. The latter is distinctly possible, and there are hints elsewhere on the site that rubbish was being dumped in particular places (below). On balance, the interpretation preferred here is that the use of Building 2 was contemporary with the bulk of the material in it, but that the latest material in layer 2 represents a post-occupation phase as soil, plants and grasses, and possibly rubbish, accumulated on a slightly hollowed platform where Building 2 with a roof had stood. One can easily imagine Area 2 marked by a prominent clump of nettles in AD 410, at the edge of a thriving settlement.

Finds from occupation material (*sensu* layer 3) in Building 2's larger room included pottery, glass, lead, an iron hook and a number of coins, dating between AD 321 and 354 (SFs 5, 39, 61, 63, 58, 59, 72, 90, 96; FWP 39, Catalogue). Four coins in the north corner of the house, beside the gap in the wall, may be further evidence that the entrance was located there; two coins were near the hearth. The pottery from the occupation layers had a higher proportion of coarsewares than elsewhere on the site.

Finds from layer 2 flinty material over the layer 3 occupation material in the larger room included copper alloy objects, a small amount of glass and two coins, AD 341–46 and AD 364–67 (SFs 69, 71, 73, 75, 76, 77, 79, 81, 83, 84, 85; FWP 39, Catalogue). Most of these lie around the hearth, where the greatest concentration of animal bone and tile was found.

Eastern ditch and line of sarsens

The line of the ditch was marked by a line of large sarsens. Many of these appeared to have been originally set upright, and later to have fallen backwards or forwards. Such disarray may represent the (or one of the?) robbing or destruction phase of the site. No stones at all occurred in the ditch to the north east and some stones found overlying the ditch to the south west were small and flat.

The ditch had been deliberately filled with clay in the AD 330s, as indicated by Constantinian coins in the fill. Above this fill was a layer of red soil (possibly washed down from the lynchet), on top of which was a layer 50–80mm thick of flints. The large sarsens were set into this flint layer. Below the flints was a coin of Valentinian II (AD 367–75; SF94; FWP 95).

Interpretation and dating

Two- and three-roomed houses of fourth-century date are known at Catsgore (Leech 1982, 30–1), and other sites mainly in the south west, as mentioned in the introduction. At Catsgore, the largest room was heated, and was suggested as the living and eating area. The small rooms, usually unheated and often carefully paved, were interpreted as bedrooms, or in one case as a cold-store or dairy (Ellis 1984, 8–9).The strongest evidence that these were houses is provided by infant burials. In building 1 at Bradley Hill, Somerset (Leech 1981, 183, fig 5), one of the small rooms contained an infant burial; three were found in the smallest room in building 2 (*ibid*, 187, fig 7). The room interpreted as the dairy or cold-store at Catsgore contained five infant burials, four of them placed in the corners (*op cit*). At least two infant burials were found in the small room of building 5 at Gatcombe (Branigan 1977, fig 6).

Some of these buildings may have had other functions in addition to living accommodation. At Catsgore some of the larger examples could have been used partly for the storage of farm equipment, and buildings fronting the road may possibly have served as shops. At Gatcombe, buildings 12 and 16 were thought to have served as bakeries as well as houses, and building 5 contained evidence of smithing (*ibid*, 182–3).

Though the ditch itself is not independently dated at OD XII, it is clearly earlier than Building 2. As discussed below, it is suggested to be of first-century AD date, to do with field arrangements or laying out a large settlement. It was not part of OD XII physically, though clearly its line continued to be important, as Area 2 showed. So the line of the ditch probably served in some way as a boundary marker used in laying out building or perhaps in delimiting its plot of land (see below for comparison with a fenced boundary). It is even possible that the relationship was functionally closer, with Building 2 originally longer and its east wall actually over the infilled ditch. Some subsidence was recorded in ditch sections (Figure FWP64.14), allowing the further suggestion that, after subsidence, the east wall was rebuilt a little further west.

A *terminus post quem* for the building is given by a coin of Magnentius (SF121; FWP 95) found beneath its wall. The coin of Valens, AD 364–67 (SF98; FWP 95) found as a possible votive deposit under the pile of sarsen chips may date either the foundation or the occupation of the building. A coin of Valentinian II, AD 375–78 (SF109; FWP 95) was found in layer 2 amongst the stones of the wall at the north corner, interpretatively from the robbing or later phase. Generally, the coins from the occupation layer were pre–AD 350 and it seems reasonable to suggest occupation occurred around the middle of the fourth century. Diagnostic pottery sherds were rare although a few recovered from the post-holes were later than AD 350.

Area 3

Building 3

Very obviously robbed, Building 3 (Figures FWP64.16–20; Plate FWP64.VII) was that of which the disturbance to the fabric and, in places, the stratigraphy was the greatest. The remains of this building occupied a space 10.5m by at least 7.2m, but the exact size, shape and sequence of the phases is difficult to determine because of the extent of robbing. There were possibly two stone phases in addition to underlying post-holes, and the north east end of the building appeared to be curved.

The post-holes do not conform to any structure, and could have pre-dated the first stone phase or have been contemporary with it. A possible interpretation of the stone remains is of a rectangular building with a hearth aligned along its west wall, superseded by a smaller building, possibly with an apsidal end. The second phase had a stone floor and an oven at the north end. The two phases (Figure FWP64.17) were probably on slightly different alignments.

Post-holes

There were eight certain and three possible post-holes (Figure FWP64.16). Although several are on the line of the E wall of both phases, only two were certainly sealed by it. One certain and one possible post-hole underlie the stone floor of the second phase.

The following post-holes were roughly in an arc, from north to south, along the east side (Figure FWP64.16): 9, 10, 11, 12, 1, 2, 3, plus one possible post hole, PH11A. PH9 and PH11 were overlain by the wall of the second phase.

In the south corner of the building, beneath the sarsen floor of the second phase, was isolated post-hole, PH8. Under a patch of the same floor to the north is a possible post-hole, PH4; the base of this was very uneven, and the feature might have been a solution hollow in the chalk. Beyond the west edge of the building was another possible post-hole, PH7A.

Stone phase 1

The surviving walls of this phase (Figure FWP64.17) consisted mainly of a bedding layer of flints, overlain by some sarsens. The north east wall was represented by one group of flints and sarsens at the east corner, more flints and sarsens at the centre of the wall, and flints alone at the north corner. These flints continued to form the north part of the south east wall, the south end of which was represented by a line of four sarsens. Flints found overlying the fill of the hearth probably represented a survival of the robbed wall.

The south east wall was represented only by a patch of flints and two sarsens at the south end. No traces of a south west wall were recorded. The dimensions of the first phase building are therefore approximately 9.6 x 6.6m.

There is insufficient evidence to locate the entrance of either phase of the building. A door latch (SF328) was found outside the west corner, and a fragment of window came (SF324; Figure FWP64.32, 40; FWP 39b, Cat No 1) outside the centre of the south east wall. Both derived from layer 2.

Kiln: The maximum width of this feature (Figures FWP64.17 and FWP64.18) was 0.91m and the total length 3.3m. This length included a stone-lined rectangular pit, c 1.5 x 0.91m, in the southern half, and a shallower, unlined stokehole or flue in the north. The depth of the lined portion was

0.61m. Evidence that it had been a fire-pit was seen in the effect of heat on the upright sarsens of the lining, and the heavy deposits of carbon. The lowest fill was a sticky black layer 80mm deep containing iron objects; charcoal and soot were found amongst the stones of the lining. Several sarsens had tumbled into the fill. The much shallower north end had a different fill, which contained pottery. A brown clay layer at the base was overlain by a grey soil with small flints and an upper layer of brown soil with large flints. The fills were overlain by a layer of large flints, which appeared to have tumbled in from the west, presumably derived from the robbing of the wall.

Stone wall phase 2

The second stone phase (Figure FWP64.17), aligned with its long axis parallel to the former boundary ditch, measured roughly 9.6 x 5.4m. The north east end may possibly be apsidal (for parallels of buildings of this type in farming settlements, see discussion of Area 4B/C below).

The phase 2 walls, though more substantial than those of phase 1, were still fragmentary. There was an almost continuous line of sarsens along the south west wall, which was roughly 5.4m long and a maximum of 1.2m wide; and a further length of sarsens 2.1m at the southern end of the south east wall. These were the only lengths which were set on a layer of flints. There was a gap of 1.8m at the centre of the south east wall before a further scatter of three smallish sarsens, and the north east end of the building consisted of an arc of sarsens. In the central portion of the south west side there was a single line of smallish sarsens 3.6m in length; the southernmost of these appeared to overlie the east edge of the phase 1 kiln and were abutted by the west edge of the sarsen floor.

Floor: The floor was composed of large sarsens laid horizontally with small stones, including quern fragments, in the interstices; two separate spreads survived. The larger, an L-shaped area, comprised a strip roughly 1.2m wide adjacent to the south west wall and a sparser distribution of sarsens running northwards for a further 1.8m. The smaller spread was a rectangular area, 1.65m by 0.84m, beside the oven. The gap between the edge of the floor and the south west wall is probably a robber trench, and many of the finds from this area presumably derive from the robbing or, much more probably, from disturbance of deposits already there. Pottery from the trench was dated to the late third or fourth centuries, however, supporting the latter interpretation.

Oven: This consisted of two roughly circular pits joined by a central channel, the total length being 1.5m (Figures FWP64.17 and FWP64.18; Plate FWP64.VII). The larger, north east, pit appeared to have had a clay superstructure, while the smaller, south east, pit appeared to have been the fire-pit. The latter was joined by a shallow feature described which could have been a channel formed by raking out debris from the fire-pit. The larger pit was steep-sided, U-shaped, and 0.38m deep. The fill consisted of loose, fine, brown soil with some charcoal near the top; a large sarsen had tumbled into it. Some sarsens showed signs of burning and the area of floor adjacent to it was scattered with fragments of charcoal, coal and burnt clay, probably derived from the collapsed superstructure. The central channel was 0.23m in depth, as was the fire-pit. The latter had a shallow U-shaped profile and a fill of dark soil containing much charcoal and coal. The auxiliary flue or raking-out channel was irregularly-shaped, running into the fire-pit from the north east; it was an average of 0.15m deep, gradually becoming shallower towards the end. Charcoal was found in the fill until near the end.

Occupation material

There were very few finds under the sarsen floor or from the occupation material over it, as shown on the finds distribution plot (Figure FWP64.19). The concentration of finds beside and amongst the wall stones suggests that the stone floor had been regularly swept. The finds included two iron

shears, an iron buckle, a door latch, a copper alloy bracelet, and three unidentified coins (GFs 259, 263, 264, 272, 274, 278, 281, 282, 286, 309; FWP 39, Catalogue).

Layers overlying occupation material

Many finds, including the majority of the coins, came from layers overlying the building, rather than in occupation material *in situ*. Their contexts may either be the result of disturbance during robbing or the dumping of rubbish over the building after it had been robbed and gone out of use.

Interpretation

In this account, the term 'oven' has been used for those features with a clay superstructure ie, the phase 2 feature here, and feature E in Area 4B/C (below). The phase 1 stone-lined feature with no apparent superstructure has been called a 'kiln'.

Since there was no metalworking debris or signs of any other industrial process, the oven and kiln could well represent some process involving grain eg, drying it. It may be significant that three ox skulls were found in the building, possible parallels for the votive deposit of a horse skull in a corn drier at Catsgore (Leech 1982, 144, fig 55). It is not possible to say to which phase of the building the three ox skulls belonged. Pottery from the Area 3 showed a high proportion of samian sherds in comparison to elsewhere on the site.

Dating

Unfortunately the coins from this building are missing and there are no positive identifications for most of them. Provisional identification of some coins was, however, made at the time of excavation. One (SF304; FWP 95) from layer 2 within the building was provisionally assigned to Valens (AD 364–78), and another (SF317; FWP 95) from the layer overlying the robbed wall was identified as of Arcadius (AD 383–408). Pottery from phase 2 of the stone building was identified as New Forest and Oxfordshire colour-coated war of the late fourth century. In contrast, sherds from the lynchet were of first–second century AD date.

Area 4

Building 4A

This building (Figures FWP64.21–6; Plate FWP64.XII) is on the same alignment as Building 2 (Figure FWP64.4), and in a comparable position. From the centre of the boundary ditch to the west wall is 12.6m, *cf* 12m for Building 2. It is also roughly the same length as Building 2, but narrower.

Building 4 saw three phases, one in stone and two in timber. The only part of the sequence which it is possible to define with certainty is that the smaller of the two timber building pre-dates the stone phase. There were no direct stratigraphical relationships to tie in the larger timber building. In this account it is placed at the beginning of the sequence mainly for convenience, although there is some circumstantial evidence for suggesting it might be the earliest phase.

The regular spacing of post-holes along the north east walls of both timber phases was clear (Plate FWP64.VIII). The post-holes of the larger timber building were *c* 2.1m apart, those of the smaller building 1.5m apart (Figure FWP64.23). The two buildings shared the same north west and south west wall-lines; some of the post-holes were also reused. Post-holes occurred in positions consistent with the same spacings being carried through these walls with only minor irregularities, for which explanations can be offered. The south east walls of both phases were less regular, but again it is

possible to distinguish a similar sequential pattern, allowing for some additional post-holes in the wall of the smaller building and one gap in the larger.

Large timber building

The dimensions of the building were 11.1 x 6.6m, narrowing gradually to 6.3m at the eastern end.

The main structural post-holes were as follows (those also used in the smaller building are marked S): 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8(S), 9(S), 16A, 17(S), 18, 19, 21, 21B (Figures FWP64.22 and FWP64.23). Additional post-holes, PHs 15 and 21a, were possibly for strengthening corners on downward part of slope. If this scheme is correct, it would indicate a carefully laid out building. The only deviations from a rectangular form occurred along the north east and south east walls, which appeared to be following the lines of the lynchets, rather than being positioned parallel with, or at right-angles to, the former boundary ditch. This may be the reason why the position of PH1 did not conform with the 'standard' *c* 2.1 m spacing. Alternatively the post-hole may be out of position because of some practical difficulty of digging on the lynchet slope or in the region of the infilled ditch. The spacing of 4.2m between PHs 21b and 21 implies a missing post-hole. This was searched for during excavation, but no trace was found. Perhaps the gap was an entrance; if upright timber there were, it may have been supported on a post-pad rather than being in a post-hole; or possibly features in this area had been destroyed by the rabbit disturbance which had occurred discontinuously throughout the site.

The only remaining inconsistency was the spacing of 2.7m between PHs 21 and 19. The gap was wide enough to represent an entrance for wagons, but no other evidence of a doorway was noted and the position in the corner of the lynchet would be difficult for access. A simpler explanation could be that the north west wall was the baseline for setting out the building, and that an error in the spacing had developed by the time the boundary was reached. Otherwise there is no clear indication of where an entrance might have been. It will be argued below that the entrance to the smaller timber building was in the centre of the north west wall, and this may have been its position in the other phases.

No traces existed of internal divisions or post-holes for timbers to support the roof in either of the timber phases. It is possible that the latter might have rested on stone post-pads, features removed when the site was levelled for the construction of the stone building. It is doubtful, however, whether the construction cut for the stone walls (Figure FWP64.23) was sufficient to have removed internal features. An absence of internal supports implies a considerable degree of constructional skill in the roof, particularly in the larger timber building where the span was 6.3m. Either that has to be accepted – and why not? – or this whole interpretation is misconceived in envisaging a roofed building. The post-hole pattern of itself might just represent a wooden pen open to the sky. After all, the only internal feature, which could have belonged to either the larger or smaller timber building, was PH11 in the south east quadrant. A stock pen is not inconceivable in the circumstances but, taking the structural evidence in Area 4 as a whole and in its relational context with undoubted buildings, interpretation favours a building.

Small timber building

The building was 9 x 5.1m narrowing, possibly to 4.5m, at the east (Figure FWP64.23). The outline of this phase is more irregular than that of the larger timber building; in particular the north east wall narrows sharply at its mid-point, and the south west wall may also do so. The post-holes along the north east and south east walls were much smaller than those used in the rest of the building and in the other timber phase. This could mean simply that smaller timbers were used, but alternatively they could have been truncated by the cut for the walls of the stone phase.

Along the line of the north east wall the post-holes were regularly spaced at *c* 1.5m (PHs 7, 35, 34, 20, 30 and 31). From PH31 down the somewhat irregular line of the south east wall the same spacing continued to PHs 33 and 33a and a possible stake-hole at the south corner of the building. Extra timbers were apparently used at each end of this wall, represented by PHs 32 and 33b and a possible stake-hole.

The suggested scheme for the north east wall is that PHs 7 and 14 formed the corners, and that PHs 8 and 9, used in the larger building, also formed part of this phase. This would conform to the spacing of the north east wall, but allow an extra wide gap for a central entrance. The iron latch lifter (SF229) found beside PH8 encourages such an interpretation.

The scheme only holds good for the south east wall if it assumed that the wall bowed outward, then inward at its mid-point, and that two post-holes are missing. The proposed layout is nevertheless that the wall line bent outward from PH15a at a distance of 1.2m, then there were gaps of 1.68m to PH16 and 1.5m to PH17. PH17a may have been an addition to bring the wall back into line with the south corner of the building. There were no other post-holes between 17A and the corner, but a square arrangement of sarsen stones 1.5m from PH17a may have represented a post-pad with another formerly in the 3m gap having been removed. Another possible explanation for this irregular shape is given below (see *Phasing*).

That the timber building of this phase pre-dated the stone phase was clearly demonstrated by the fact that three of its post-holes of the north wall (PHs 20, 34 (FWP64.Figure 22) and 35) were overlain by sarsens of the wall footings.

Parallels: A poorly-preserved fourth-century post-hole building was found in complex 5 at Catsgore (Leech 1982, 25, fig 17). Its original phase was 29.5m long and possibly 19.7m wide, roughly the same size as the larger timber phase on OD XII. It was interpreted as a farm building, although it was noted that much larger timber halls are known in post-Roman contexts.

Stone phase

The ground was terraced for the construction of the stone building. The cut into the lynchet extended further along the north west side than the wall of the timber building. The cut was 10.8m long, curving around the north corner and extending a short distance down the north west side. It also continued down the south east side, not for the wall's full length but for 4.8m. The cut for the north west wall was not straight, but followed the irregular line of the post-holes of the smaller timber building. Its profile was as of a shallow U-shaped scoop, 0.15–0.23m deep and *c* 0.76m wide, with a fill of flints (Figure FWP64.21; original field section drawing no 334, FWP61).

The wall had been heavily robbed, only the footings remaining. These were mainly of flints but included a few large sarsens. This material extended almost the full length of the south east wall, but only for a length of 2.28m along the north east.

A possible stone feature within the building half-way along the south wall was represented by a right-angled arrangement of sarsens, measuring 1.5 x 1.38m. The stones appeared to be of the right size and in the right position to have been part of some sort of entrance arrangement. Alternatively they could have been the remains of such as a bench or storage bin, paralleled in other agricultural buildings of the period.

Phasing

Two reasons support a sequence of construction of, first, the large timber building, then the smaller timber one, and finally the stone building. They are:

1. The two timber phases are likely to have been consecutive; if the stone phase had intervened, it is difficult to imagine that some of the same post-holes would have been reused.
2. If the largest building had been the last phase, the interior would have contained not only the awkward step caused by the cut for the stone building but also a clutter of sarsen stones and flints.

The preferred sequence allows for an explanation of the irregular shape of the small timber building (phase 2). If the original building had partially decayed, timber from it could have been salvaged for a smaller version. The narrowing of the new building at its mid-point could be the result of fitting the walls to the available lengths of roof timbers; the increased number of small post-holes of the south east wall may indicate that only small timbers were available, thus requiring the additional posts on that side. The possible use of post-pads at the end of the south west wall may simply indicate that there were no timbers long enough to be sunk into post-holes.

Occupation material

Presumably the finds from Building 4A mainly reflect the latest phase of occupation, on the above sequence that of the stone-built phase. The finds distribution plot (Figure FWP64.26) shows most 'small finds' concentrated in the west half of the building, but this should be interpreted with caution. Layer 3 occupation material contained eleven 'small finds', including glass beads, a hook, a penannular brooch and four coins, dating between AD 364 and AD 375 (SFs 248, 249, 251, 255, 265, 256, 263, 266, 267, 257; FWP 39, Catalogue). There may be some significance in the fact that these all come from the walls or the interior of the western part, which parallels the situation in Building 2. Of the six finds from the west interior, five were personal ornaments; the concentration was mainly around the presumed position of the entrance. Of the finds from layer 2 occupation material, eight came from within the limits of the stone building, including four coins dating between AD 353 and AD 375 (SFs 181, 189, 195, 199, 201, 203, 278; FWP 39, Catalogue).

Other finds from layer 2 occupation (SFs 137, 140, 144, 145, 182; FWP 39, Catalogue) lay within the limit of the larger timber building, but if it had already (long?) gone out of use, then these probably represented residual material, from the pre-settlement field or early settlement phase, or post construction midden. Three of the finds were coins: Tetricus I (AD 270–73), Gratian (AD 379–83) and Constantine I (AD 337), all of which would be interpreted as pre-phase 1 timber building in date and redeposited during any one of three construction and at least one robbing phase. The extent of disturbance, up to and including the lower part of the topsoil, was taken as represented by a scatter of sarsens in the W half of the interior, probably the remains of a heavily robbed wall.

Finds from this phase

In the same west part of the phase 3 stone building, numerous objects were in layer 2 contexts of a flinty layer at the bottom of the topsoil and overlying occupation material. Early, middle and late fourth-century coins were all present along with objects of iron, glass, jet and copper alloy (SFs 157, 158, 187, 209, 210, 212, 216, 217, 219, 220, 221, 223, 225a and b, 229; FWP 39, Catalogue). Again, interpretation favours such as earlier than or contemporary with occupation and then disturbed during robbing, rather than material newly deposited during robbing. Alternatively, if rather more fancifully, the objects could have derived from deposition of rubbish through the entrance of the building after it had gone out of use. Whatever the explanation, the key indicator is taken as being seven worn or very worn coins of the House of Theodosius, suggesting that the phase 3 building was not abandoned until at earliest the early fifth century. Among the 'entrance cluster' were four coins of Theodosius (SFs 158, 217, 225a, 278), all worn except SF158, minted AD 395–402. Indeed all but two of the Theodosian coins within Building 4C were in that range of wear.

Marked spreads of objects north, east and south of Building 4A (Figure FWP64.26) suggested that middens may well have accumulated there. They could have been contemporary with any one or more of phases 1–3 on Area 4, or result from site clearance between those phases or from dumping in the area after the building had gone out of use. A less concentrated scatter of objects occurred in the north west of Area 4.

Large sarsens to south east

The right-angle of very large sarsens outside the southern corner of the building may represent clearance at some stage, but could be late Roman or post-Roman.

Large sarsen to west, beside fence

A large sarsen stone lies (it still does) roughly on the line of the south west wall of Building 4A, 3.3m west of PH10 and close to the line of a proposed fence (below). The sarsen rested on a smaller upright sarsen, set into PH37. This odd arrangement might have had some non-structural, possibly ritual significance, an idea perhaps supported by the adjacent presence of an unusual miniature 'Late Bronze Age' copper alloy votive axe (SF179; FWP 39b, Cat No 24; Robinson 1995). More prosaically, the stone arrangement might have been some sort of marker during construction.

Fence

Post-holes 22–8 (Figure FWP64.21) fairly unambiguously marked a fence-line. Material along it included, as well as the votive axe mentioned above, two coins (Valens AD 367–75, and Constantine II AD 330) and a number of iron and copper alloy objects (SFs 152, 208, 214, 269, 279 and 382; FWP 39, Catalogue).

A parallel for a fence within an agricultural settlement comes again from Catsgore, where a boundary ditch and bank between two farming complexes was replaced by a fence (Leech 1982, 22–4). In another complex on the same site, two ditch and bank boundaries were replaced by walls, apparently to save space (*ibid*, 18). The latter may be of relevance to the line of stones, perpetuating the line and possibly functions of an infilled ditched boundary, beside Building 2.

Dating

The pottery from Building 4A is more biased towards a late fourth-century date than elsewhere on the site. In particular sherds from layer 3 were fourth century while datable contents in layer 2 continued into the fifth century. Pottery from some of the post-holes was, in contrast, of second–third-century date, presumably because the holes had been dug into and through the ploughsoil in a field which had earlier been manured from domestic middens elsewhere (ODS?). Coins of the third century can presumably be likewise interpreted. This material together provides not only a *terminus post-quem* for the site of Buildings 4A but also independently indicates the phase of cultivation, here somewhat later, or continuing somewhat later, than suggested elsewhere. Allowing for such pre-settlement material, coin evidence from the occupation layers is nevertheless generally late fourth century in contrast to that from Building 2 where an earlier fourth century date is more likely. The wear on Theodosian coins suggests their use into the fifth century in the area of Building 4A.

Features in Area 4B/C: possible buildings

Oven and floor

That this was a working area comparable to Area 3 is clear from the oven or hearth labelled E (Figure FWP64.21). Again the complex lay shallowly under the turf, in a layer 2 which was at the bottom of the topsoil. The oven consisted of a roughly circular pit, 0.61m in diameter, with a straight flue leading into it from the south east. The flue had been covered while in use, as the sarsens overlying it were heavily burnt on their undersides. There was also a packing of baked clay between and over these sarsens. The upper edges of the pit were surrounded with burnt clay, suggesting there had been a clay superstructure.

Adjacent to the oven was a floor composed of chalk, slabs, sarsen chips and broken tile, at least 0.1cm in depth and sunk into the layer 2 flinty soil. It was an irregular oval, aligned roughly east/west but without evidence of walls and presumably an open air working area. It was, however, bordered on its west by a line of sarsens running roughly east/west and at least one large sarsen appeared to be set into layer 2 on its east. This would have created a sub-rectangular working area, roughly 5.4 x 3m, with a slightly round north east end. The chalk floor occupied an area 4.2 x 3m in the north east part, with the oven to the north west, and may have been used as a threshing floor.

Possible votive deposit

Near the oven was '... the crushed skull of a large (horse-sized?) animal .. ' (site notebook, p 36, not otherwise identified).This record suggests something similar to the ox-skulls found in Building 3, and votive offerings beside corn driers elsewhere, *cf* a horse skull placed with a corn drier in building 3.5, Catsgore, Somerset (Leech 1982, 144, fig 55).

Other finds

On the chalk floor around Oven E was a coin of the House of Theodosius (AD 395–402; SF200; FWP 95), three further coins (Helena AD 337–40, Gratian AD 378–83, and Constantine II AD 330–31); three iron objects, a quern fragment used in the floor, and a fragment of jet bead (SFs 204, 234, 242, 271, 275, 276, 284, 285; FWP 39, Catalogue).

Hearths A, B, C and D

A charred area *c* 0.61 x 0.46m on the floor immediately east of the flue of Oven E, contained charcoal and burnt clay. To the south and south east of the oven was a row of four features (A–D) in a line parallel to the fence. They were small areas of burnt materials and broken tile, either short-lived hearths or merely debris from the oven.

Possible building with apsidal end (Building 4B/C)

This possible building in the south east corner of Area 4 (Figure FWP64.4) was not recognised as such during excavation, though the presence of a building, again in layer 2, was inferred. Its nature and plan (Figures FWP64.4, FWP64.21 and FWP64.25) as tentatively suggested here are post-excavation creations.

The suggestion is based on two parallel rows of sarsens, each resting in an underlying trench or hollow up to 1.2m wide and 0.30m deep (Figure FWP64.21). At the end of the north row were an iron vessel base (SF294; Figure FWP64.31, 1; FWP 39b, Cat No 20), an almost complete pot (SF289; Type R128; Figure FWP64.35, 46), and a coin, possibly of Valens (AD 367–75; SF306; FWP 95). Along the south row were three unidentified coins, a piece of glass and an iron object (SFs 312, 314, 318, 319, 334; FWP 39, Catalogue).

At the east end of the rows was an arc of sarsens, the ends of which were aligned roughly with the two sarsen lines (Figure FWP64.21). This arc also at least in part overlay a shallow trench *c* 0.46m wide and 0.15m deep. Various objects again lay along the line of stones, this time in an arc: four unidentified coins (SFs 337, 346, 350, 351) were present as well as two fragments of copper alloy sheet (SF341; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 40, 47).

The whole suggests a building with external dimensions of 6.3 x 3.6m, apsidal at the south east end and possibly open ended at the north west. It orientation was parallel with Building 4A. Apsidal buildings are known elsewhere in rural settlements, but other examples are larger. At Hibaldstow in Lincolnshire, building D, 21 x 9m, had an apsidal rear wall and in its earliest phase had an open front facing on to a road (Frere 1977, 389). At Catsgore, Somerset, one fragment of apsidal wall was suggested to have been part of a large barn measuring 35 x 10m (Leech 1982, 17–18). Building 3.13 there measured 15 x 8m (*ibid*, 18–21). In its first phase, after *c* AD 315 to *c* AD 360, there were no internal features. In a second phase after an internal division, hearths and a drain were added, and it was interpreted as a house. Later an extension with a corn drier was added; the upper fill of this contained a coin of AD 388+. The combination of late Roman apsidal building and corn drier may thus parallel the possible building and adjacent oven on the edge of Area 4 at OD XII.

Dating

Coins from the floor area span the middle and late fourth century and it is unfortunate that those from the building are unavailable to be identified. Pottery from Area 4B/C is of the fourth century with some characteristics of the third. It is impossible to associate the building and floor area firmly with any specific buildings on the rest of the site through lack of precise dating evidence but, in general, the bias would seem to be more to Stages 3–4 rather than Stage 2 or earlier.

Discussion

Any interpretation of the site must take account of the chronology of the buildings as identified by the pottery and coin evidence. The earliest features on the site certainly pre-date the stone structures. These features include the lynchets, the pit in Area 1, a number of the post-holes in Areas 1 and 2, and possibly the boundary ditch which was filled in after AD 330. To this list might be added, on technical grounds of material in some post-holes, the large (phase 1) timber building in Area 4, but such an interpretation is firmly rejected.

The third century and earlier material dates the fields and their cultivation, and simultaneously provides a *terminus post quem* for the settlement. The excavation, then, achieved its initial and very specific objective. It not only proved that a settlement had been placed on former fields and demonstrated a *terminus ante quem* for the end of cultivation by dating the settlement to the fourth century; almost as a bonus, from material contained within the ploughsoil and lynchets themselves, it independently dated the cultivation to later first–second centuries. While other good evidence exists on the Downs for the dating of this Roman phase of cultivation to around AD 100 and in the second century, here there is also a hint, in Pit 3, Area 1, of third-century use of the fields. It may be indicating a general use then, masked or otherwise not apparent elsewhere, or the evidence may be telling us of purely local cultivation on the lower slopes around the Down Barn settlement node.

The earliest occupied stone building appears to be in Area 2. The coins there date before AD 350. It may be that the construction of this building and the initial filling of the ditch occurred at the same time. If this is so then the coin preserved under the sarsen line to the east (dating to AD 367–75) may indicate either a later attempt to extend the structure or a renewed need to mark the boundary. It is difficult to associate any other structures directly to this phase. It may be that phase 1 of Building 3 is a likely candidate but the coin evidence is sadly lacking and the pottery only represents later occupation of the building. The smaller timber building in Area 4A may have been

built at around this time, just prior to the construction of the stone phase and contemporary with the fence and the first use of Area 4B/C.

Later stone buildings on the site include phase 2 of Building 3 and the stone structure at 4A. With the exception of phase 1 Building 3, it is not clear to what extent occupation across the site was contemporary. It is for that reason that Building 1 and Area 4B/C remain outside any clear chronology. Certainly the pottery from the apsidal building in Area 4 seems earlier than the floor and oven but the difference is only slight and it seems likely that the whole of Area 4 was occupied at different times, while the specific functions for structures may have varied.

The outlying position of Building 1 and its late date in comparison to its nearest neighbour, Building 2, suggest it may have stood alone or been part of a larger, as yet unexcavated, context. Such an interpretation helps to sharpen our picture of the rest of the site. It may be that construction can be divided into distinct units, for example, Buildings 2 and 3 (phase 1), and Buildings 4A (?all phases), 3 (phase 2) and structure 4B/C. The overall layout of the site strongly suggests distinct, regularly planned units, rather as envisaged for the apparently earlier ODS settlement just 150m to the east. On OD XII, these units, palpably fourth century but perhaps extending earlier planning or property lines, were delineated by the boundary to the north-east and the trackway to the north west. A similarly structured pattern internal to ODS has produced only first–second century pottery. The cultivation evidence from the site of OD XII indicates that its arable, in part at least, lay alongside it on its north west. Such interpretation strongly suggests that OD XII was the smaller successor to ODS, being planted out on its fields instead of cereals when for reasons unknown, and apparently as part of a general trend, arable farming on the Downs declined. Yet, in the fourth century, OD XII, whatever the structural changes it enjoyed, was clearly involved in a busy agriculture involving arable and, without doubt, cereal cultivation.

Such an interpretation in necessarily tentative considering the lack of a clear sequence across the site. The reason for this may simply be that land and structures were continually being reused, whether as middens, storehouses, or as sources of stone. Essentially, behind the uncertain detail, the site as excavated was a small farmstead, at any one time from *c* AD 335 to into the fifth century, consisting of a cottage (initially Building 2, then ?timber Buildings 4A, phases 1 and 2) and appropriate farm buildings. The settlement, initially placed on the convenient platforms of old, abandoned field corners, expanded, contracted, and changed function, experiences common to most settlements in the area right through until the modern period.

The great majority of the coins were of fourth-century date but a few Tetrican and Carausian examples occurred, hinting perhaps at an early phase of occupation from *c* AD 300, associated with the indications of early timber structures detected on all four excavated Areas. The only associated cluster of early coins occurred in the sealed stratigraphy of Pit 3 in Area 1.

Overall, the coin evidence (FWP 95) indicates that the main occupation with stone-based buildings began around AD 335. It is possible to suggest five stages in the settlement's history, each, as it happens, about 35 years long.

Stage 1: *c.* Ad 300; timber structures on Areas 1, 2, and perhaps 3.

Stage 2: *c.* AD 335–70; first main occupation with stone-footed buildings 1, 2 and 3, plus Phase 1 of Building 4A.

Stage 3: *c*. 370–405; second phase of main occupation with Buildings 1 and 2 abandoned, Building 3 perhaps still in use and Building 4A, Phase 2 built.

Stage 4: *c*. AD 405–40; Building 4A, Phase 3 and perhaps Building 4B/C.

Stage 5: mid-fifth century; following desertion the whole site was extensively robbed of its stone and other materials, fittings and contents for a building or buildings nearby.

An uneasy sense is, however, left by such an interpretation. It simply seems unlikely that three different settlements – ODS, under Down Barn Enclosure and OD XII – could have existed within

the same 300m square, two of them only of the first–second centuries AD and one of them – the middle one as it happens – only of the fourth–fifth centuries. Surely all are manifestations, in different guises and at different times, of the same settlement complex? And furthermore, as two of the spatially closely-related settlements demonstrate, it was an internally-ordered complex, shaped by a rectilinear grid pattern perpetuated over some four centuries. A different interpretation, and that favoured here, would see what was picked out by field criteria as separate, that is 'settlement OD XII', as part of a more extensive settlement area occupied throughout the Roman period.

The particular part labelled 'OD XII', along with other parts for all we know, was the bit occupied in the fourth–fifth centuries, when the use of that piece of land within the settlement complex was changed from cultivation to habitation. This does not alter the view of the OD XII excavated evidence as that of a working farm unit, but it does change its context from that of an isolated farmstead to that of part of a larger settlement area. That it may, in such a context, be witnessing the fragmentation of settlement form as a rural phenomenon perhaps comparable with the well-known and contemporary urban process could, as research progresses, come to be seen as its most significant aspect.

Whether it be a single farmstead or an agricultural part of a larger settlement, of more obvious significance at the moment is the question of its terminal date. Clearly, however, we are not dealing with 'continuity' in any sense on the site, whatever the date that habitation continued to; for the site was abandoned and has not been reoccupied. Yet four points carry thoughts into the fifth century and perhaps beyond, spatially as well as chronologically.

Two of them concern the artefactual material itself. Where did it come from and to whom did it belong? In other words, whatever the physical nature of OD XII, what was its social status? Although in many respects a typical assemblage of late Roman material, the pottery includes wares from a range of sources, some from pots almost in the luxury class. Certainly the glass smacks of quality, not just peasant pieces acquirable by any farmworker in the earlier fifth century. And there remains the enigma of the material so representative of Roman life-style, *tegulae*, *imbrices*, *pilae*, painted wall plaster and architectural fragments. Were these actually installed on site, specifically in the two-bay cottage, Building 2, or were they bits and pieces, even souvenirs, lifted, perhaps even looted, from a nearby villa. Despite the extent and nature of the robbing of OD XII now coming into focus and enabling us alternatively to see such material as *in situ* debris of fairly thorough destruction, we are still inclined to the former view. It remains attractive to see the inhabitants expressing their relief at some sort of release from tenurial bonds on perhaps a villa estate in the late fourth century by removing some objects evocative of that former relationship from a now-deserted estate centre.

Secondly, the excavated material clearly has chronological implications. Some of it certainly shows that occupation of the site continued to AD 400 and into, perhaps well into, the fifth century: some coins, some glass, some of the metalwork, the rilled coarse pottery bowl are all indicative in this respect. Overall, examining the assemblage again in 1995–6, it struck the writer in general as possessing similar characteristics to the 'late Roman' assemblage from the subsequently excavated Cadbury Congresbury, Somerset (Rahtz *et al* 1993); a 'late Roman' assemblage which proved to be mid-fifth century and somewhat later. There seems to be no intrinsic obstacle, once rid of conventional wisdom that all Roman material 'dates' from pre-AD 410, in envisaging occupation continuing several decades into the fifth century, say for at least a generation, if only to allow for worn Theodosian coins to arrive on the site and be lost and for the inhabitants to acquire, use and break some rather superior Continental glass vessels.

In the third place, there is the question of the robbing of the site: in terms of structural stonework, it seems to have been fairly thorough. A parallel occurred at one of the nearest analogues, the Bradley Hill farmstead, Somerset, where robbing occurred after abandonment of buildings of a similar date (Leech 1981, 185, 187, 192). Where did the stones go to from OD XII? Are they elsewhere within the larger settlement complex on a different part of the settlement which took over when OD XII

had run its course? Are they in buildings just 100m away westwards across the re-entrant in another but later 'small' settlement unit? It is not known in fact where the stones were taken; they have disappeared from the record. Down Barn, the only complex of stone structures nearby, is not documented until the later eighteenth century (*LPP*, chapter 6). It may well, however, overlie earlier structures. And indeed, given the plenitude of stones in the immediate vicinity, it seems extraordinary that the OD XII buildings should have been robbed at all unless the material was reused at the time for new buildings nearby. Buildings or other structures, the clear implication is that somewhere nearby someone was constructing something in stone around the mid-fifth century or later.

That conclusion may well relate to the fourth point, the date of the Down Barn Enclosure (FWP 66). It is argued there that it lies between AD 400 and 1200. It is not in itself an inhabited site; its close association with an artificial pond indicates that it was an animal pen. It may well be one of the 'missing' Anglo-Saxon sheep-cotes and/or one of the unidentified medieval sheep-cotes (*LPP*, chapters 7, 16); but one cannot help wondering whether it began life as part of a changing, possibly fragmenting, settlement morphology in the later fifth–sixth centuries. It could so temptingly be a sheep enclosure for the probable settlement that succeeded OD XII somewhere in the Down Barn locality.

Finds

Coins: distribution and dating

A report on the coins was prepared as an MA dissertation at Durham University by D. Penton (1987). A copy of the Dissertation, donated by its author to this author, is with the paper archive at DM, as well as, presumably, in Durham University Library. A fuller version of the present document also occurs as FWP 95.

The Catalogue lists 136 coins which have been identified to ruler and mint, with other comments as appropriate. Penton gave each coin a 'Penton number'. The site finds number, with all but a few exceptions an SF number (meaning the coin was three-dimensionally recorded when found), is given, with the context of each coin in a separate list. The coin identifications and, therefore date, in the Catalogue are accepted in this summary for present purposes, though doubtless numismatic revision in some respects is now desirable; but the Dissertation should not be used as in any way authoritative about Site OD XII itself, its interpretation or the archaeology of the area.

Conclusions drawn from the coin data concerning the date and duration of the various phases of the site, and their significance in relation to the possible foundation deposit, have already been incorporated in the preceding discussion. This summary discusses the overall distribution of coins in relation to the Areas in a little more detail.

As we have seen the majority of the coins are of fourth century date but a few third-century, Tetrican and Carausian examples, occur. The only associated cluster of these earlier coins occurred in the structured deposit within Pit 3 in Area 1 indicating that the deposit was made fairly close to AD 300. Overall, the coin evidence indicates that the main occupation with stone-based buildings began around AD 340.

Area 1: in addition to those found in Pit 3 and the ditch, six coins were found in Area 1, all outside Building 1. The deepest, of late third-century date, might relate to the hint of an early timber structure.

Area 2: two similarly-dated coins (Carausius, Licinus) made a similar hint here but the coins' distribution was completely different: 37 of 52 from the whole Area were inside Building 2, the majority in the western half; only five were in the eastern bay. The date range was from the third to

the eighth decade of the fourth century, the most common (17), of 330–48 being around the hearth in the western, presumably living, area. Probably significantly, none of the four Theodosian coins (all worn) from this Area came from within the building, suggesting that the site around the abandoned house was being used as a rubbish dump by the last decade of the fourth century and later.

Area 3: all 29 coins were of the fourth century as far as is known. The majority were again within the building's outline.

Area 4: with little reliable stratigraphy in the eastern half of the Area where three structures (Building 4A, Phases 1, 2, 3) successively occupied the same site, secure contextual observations about the 71 coins are few. The area inside the three structures contained 29 coins, 21 of them from where the three occupied common ground. All eleven coins recorded 0.30m or more below the grass surface over the whole site were in the AD 348–78 bracket, six of the seven from the interior of the buildings being specifically AD 364–78; the seventh, and deepest, was 'Constantius II'. Above them, in the 0.20–0.30m depth below the turf, each of the five 1 inch (25mm) absolute depths distinguished by Penton from site records contained at least one coin of 388–402, so perhaps a residual stratigraphy remained amid the disturbance of rebuildings, stone-robbers and rabbits.

On the other hand, taking the 17 coins at '10 inches depth' (0.25m) over the site, all but one (SF139, a Theodosian issue of 383–7), lay outside the buildings' interior. This is the largest number of coins from any particular depth, and '10 inches' is just below the post-depositional, worm-sorted 'layer' of detritus at the bottom of the topsoil, characteristic of this and other downland sites. Of the sixteen coins, six belong to the first half of the fourth century or earlier and ten to the second half of the century or a little later; figures which are probably indicating where the main emphasis of the settlement's history lies. Exactly half, eight, lay in an area regarded on other grounds as being where rubbish was probably dumped on the north east of the buildings. Their date range was the half century up to *c*. 380. Such relative precision is not, however, matched by the other eight '10 inch depth coins', which range from late third to early fifth centuries with no particular spatial or chronological clustering. Altogether thirteen coins occurred in this 'rubbish area'. Nine of them were of the period 364–78, perhaps hinting that the dump might well have been of one or both of Phases 1 and/or 2 of building in Area 4 in the third quarter of the fourth century. In all ten Theodosian coins, the latest on the site, were found; eight occurred within the area of the three buildings, probably indicating the date of the third, or more probably the second, of them.

A smaller cluster of seven coins lay around the north western corner of the buildings; one of them is one of the only two Theodosian coins found outside the area of Buildings 4A (the other was in the area north of the subsequently recognised Building 4B/C). An even smaller group of five coins lay outside the south western corner of Buildings 4A. The seven coins further west, including the Theodosian SF 200, seemed to be casual losses in an open working zone.

The implications of the coin evidence for the chronological sequence of building and occupation on the site have already been discussed (see *Discussion*).

Copper alloy objects

by Andrew Hutcheson

A total of 47 objects of copper alloy from OD XII have been examined and catalogued. This appears to be a fairly typical assemblage from a fourth-century AD farming settlement. OD XII is comparable in the quality, quantity and range of items to Catsgore, Somerset (Leech 1982), except for the relative lack of brooches. Three copper alloy and five iron brooches were found and these all appear to be residual or, more likely, curated by the inhabitants.

Many of the stylistic and decorative elements seen in the copper alloy items here are closely paralleled by objects at Portchester Castle, Chichester and Poundbury, to the extent that it appears all these places were receiving some of their finer items of bronze from the same crafts school. This is particularly true for the ribbon strip bracelets which seem to have become particularly popular in the fourth century. The distribution of objects is given in Table FWP64.1.

Personal items

Eleven bracelets or bracelet fragments were examined (Figure FWP64.28, 1, 3, 4, 7–9; Cat nos 1–11). With the exception of three twisted wire bracelets, they are all of the ribbon-strip variety. These became common in the late third century AD and are stylistically remarkably uniform (Webster 1975, 209). One (Figure FWP64.28, 1; FWP 39b, Cat No 1) is complete and has a hook-and-eye catch, the most common form of fastening (*cf*, Portchester Castle; Webster 1975, 204, fig 111, 24; 208, fig 112, 44, and Poundbury cemetery; Farwell and Molleson 1993, fig 64, 2; fig 65, 8, 11, 12, 14). Four of the bracelets (Figure FWP64.28, 1, 3, 7, 8 (FWP 39b, Cat Nos 1, 2, 4, 5) are decorated with grouped incised lines separated by plain panels. Figure FWP64.28, 4 (FWP 39b, Cat No 3) has ring and cup decoration with triangular hollowing (*cf* Portchester; Webster 1975, fig 112, 35, Chichester; Down 1993, fig 28.1, 13 and Poundbury cemetery; Farwell and Molleson 1993, fig 65, 8 and 9).

Three Nauheim derivative brooches were found (Figure FWP64.28, 10, 11, 13; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 12–14) of first century AD or possibly slightly earlier date. All were recovered from layer 2 in Area 4. Nauheim derivative brooches occur on other essentially late Roman sites such as Portchester (Cunliffe 1975, 198–9) or Greyhound Yard, Dorchester (Henig 1993, 117). Some Romano-British metalwork may have had a long life or, perhaps more likely at OD XII, they may be losses in the early Roman fields.

A finger ring (Figure FWP64.28, 12; FWP 39b, Cat No 15) consists of a thick wire with incised transverse decoration. The ring has a face plate, possibly a mount or formerly bearing cast or incised decoration. An ear-ring (Figure FWP64.29, 22; FWP 39b, Cat No 16), of bent wire with overlapping terminals, one with a small drilled hole, has incised decoration below each terminal. This piece conforms to Allason-Jones' (1989) Type 3 and is very similar to a gold example found at Greyhound Yard, Dorchester (Henig 1993, fig 59, 1). This type of ear-ring has a very wide currency from the Bronze Age to the Saxon period; most Romano-British examples belong to the third century (Allason-Jones 1989, 5–6).

One buckle (Figure FWP64.29, 16; FWP 39b, Cat No 17), from the topsoil in Area 2, is almost square with a D-shaped profile on three sides. It may be medieval. A second buckle (Figure FWP64.30, 18; FWP 39b, Cat No 18) is also D-shaped with a hook. This is similar to a late fourth-century example from *Verulamium* (Frere 1984, 33–4, fig 11, 76). A fragment of buckle hook was also found in layer 1 in Area 2 (SF50; FWP 39b, Cat No 19).

Implements

A complete toilet set (Figure FWP64.29, 14; FWP 39b, Cat No 20) was discovered in a context which appears from the coin evidence to be probably of late fourth-century date. No close parallels have been found for the set itself which comprises a spoon, hook and 'nail cleaner' attached to a ring. However, the decorative motif on the 'nail cleaner' is almost identical to one found on a fragment from Portchester Castle thought to be part of a stylus (Webster 1975, fig114, 64).

Three spoon fragments (Figure FWP64.29, 15, 19, 20; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 21–3), a bowl and two handles, are of common late Roman type (*cf* Portchester (Webster 1975, fig113, 59)).

Miscellaneous objects

A miniature socketed bronze axe (SF179; FWP 39b, Cat No 24) came from Layer 2 in Area 4A. Its dating is uncertain. These objects have a long currency, from the Late Bronze Age through to the late Romano-British period. Examples have been recorded in south west England, of which 22 (including this example) are from Wiltshire. The OD XII axe has parallel vertical sides (Robinson 1995, fig 2, 23) and Robinson concludes that it is late Roman.

Two unusual fragments, probably from a single strip (Figure FWP64.28, 2, 6; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 25, 26), have flat rather than D-shaped sections and decoration consisting of stamped-out groups of holes.

Other objects include four pin fragments, including one with a partially twisted shaft (Figure FWP64.29, 21; FWP 39b, Cat No 27), a fragment of Early Iron Age (fifth/fourth century BC) 'swan neck' pin (Figure FWP64.28, 5; FWP 39b, Cat No 28), a strap end with incised decoration (Figure FWP64.29, 17; FWP 39b, Cat No 31), and two rings (SF89, SF132; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 32, 33), one with moulded transverse decoration (SF132; FWP 39b, Cat No 32).

List of illustrated objects

(Figure FWP64.28)

1. Ribbon strip bracelet; hook and eye catch; grouped incised transverse decoration. SF34, Area 2, layer 2 (?timber phase). FWP 39b, Cat No 1
2. Ribbon strip bracelet frag; punched hole decoration. Probably part of the same object as No 6. SF230, Area 4A, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 25
3. Ribbon strip bracelet frag; eye catch; faint incised transverse decoration near eye catch, two hollow dot impressions separated by incised transverse line on dorsal surface. SF244, Area 4B/C, layer 2, on line of 'fence'. FWP 39b, Cat No 2
4. Ribbon strip bracelet frag; incised ring and dot marks interspersed in zig-zag line pattern, triangular hollows on both sides of each ring and dot. SF257, Area 4, layer 3 on line of north wall of B4. FWP 39b, Cat No 3
5. Head of 'swan neck' pin. SF327, Area 4, Box 3. FWP 39b, Cat No 28
6. Ribbon strip bracelet frag; punched hole decoration. See No 2. SF280, Area 4A, floor. FWP 39b, Cat No 26
7. Ribbon strip bracelet (for child?) frag; faint incised transverse decoration on dorsal surface. SF303, Area 3, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 4
8. Ribbon strip bracelet; incised transverse decoration in groups of three, notched hollowing at one end of each group. SF305, Area 3, layer 1/2 (over Building 3). FWP 39b, Cat No 5
9. Twisted wire bracelet formed from two wires. SF321, Area 3, layer 2, inside Building 3. FWP 39b, Cat No 9
10. Single-coil spring brooch; markedly arched bow; pin missing, also part of catch-plate. Dorsal side of bow has moulded relief decoration consisting of two lines of rectangular dots running parallel down almost its entire length. SF226, Area 4A, layer 2, inside Building 4. FWP 39b, Cat No 12
11. Brooch; part of the pin and foot missing; three coil mock spring with internal chord; bow markedly arched. SF268, Area 4A, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 13
12. Finger ring with face plate; thick wire with incised transverse decoration. SF1, Area 2, layer 1. FWP 39b, Cat No 15

13. Brooch pin; four-coil; internal chord; bow and one coil missing (possibly same object as No 10?). SF223, Area 4, layer 2, outside Building 4. FWP 39b, Cat No 14

(Figure FWP64.29)

14. Toilet set attached to a ring.

    1) Spoon: handle with square section attached to ring by bent end; bowl shallow with flat border.

    2) Hook: single bar with square section bent to form loop.

    3) Nail cleaner: cut sheet with punched loop; decoration on one side.

    4) Ring: length of thick wire filed flat on two sides; ends bevelled and pressed together. SF227, Area 4A, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 20

15. Spoon handle with frag of bowl; C-shaped piece between handle and bowl. Moulded decoration at junction of handle and bowl and along top of handle nearest to bowl. SF189, Area 4A, layer 2, inside Building 4. FWP 39b, Cat No 22

16. Almost square buckle; D-shaped profile on three sides, circular on fourth where leather attached. SF53, Area 2, topsoil. FWP 39b, Cat No 17

17. Strap end; folded; external rivet holes and incised transverse and linear decoration. SF221, Area 4, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 31

18. D-shaped buckle with hook, strap attachment missing. SF40, Area 2, layer 2, ?occupation of Building 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 18

19. Spoon bowl: concave/convex sheet, cast as oval. Handle appears to have been cut off. SF75, Area 2, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 21

20. Spoon handle with small frag of bowl; C-shaped piece between handle and bowl. SF269, Area 4B/C, topsoil within Building 4. FWP 39b, Cat No 23

21. Pin frag; twisted along part of length. SF270, Area 4A, PH21b. FWP 39b, Cat No 27

22. Ear-ring, now oval; two overlapping terminals; incised decoration. One terminal flaring with a small drilled hole, other terminal is mutilated. Unstratified. FWP 39b, Cat No 16

Iron objects

by Andrew Hutcheson

There is an impressive assemblage of ironwork from OD XII but, as for the copper alloy, a number of objects were not available for examination. Many objects were only studied from their X-radiographs and some from archive drawings. The objects are now in Devizes Museum.

The distribution of iron objects (excluding nails) is given in Table FWP64.1. The numbers of objects are fairly evenly distributed between the four main areas. All four areas produced tools (including knives), but Area 3 contained a noticeable concentration of such items: three chisels, both identified pairs of shears and a cleaver. Both of the styli came from Area 4A.

Knives and tools

OD XII produced one cleaver and three knife blades, and two ambiguous blade fragments. The cleaver (Figure FWP64.30, 1; FWP 39b, Cat No 1) a Manning type 2b, the most common type of Romano-British cleaver; this is the sort of instrument often represented on the sides of altars as an

augerer's sacrificial knife (Manning 1985, 122). There are a number of good parallels, for instance, from Westbury, Wiltshire (Cunnington and Goddard 1934, pl liv, 3). The long-backed knives (Figure FWP64.30, 2, 4; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 2, 5) are of Manning type 17. There are parallels from the Antonine Fort at Newstead (Curle 1911, pl lx, 14) and from Portchester Castle (Cunliffe 1975, fig 126, 194). Manning states that this is not a common type but is long lived. A second knife (Figure FWP64.30, 3; FWP 39b, Cat No 4) appears to be of Manning's type 21 (*ibid*).

Two pairs of shears were examined. The first (Figure FWP64.30, 5; FWP 39b, Cat No 8) is half of a pair of Manning type 2 medium-sized shears (*ibid*). The size and the strength of the ring suggest a heavy duty function, such as sheep shearing or coarse cloth cutting. The single pair represented by two halves (Figure FWP64.30, 6; FWP 39b, Cat No 9) falls into the larger end of Manning's type 3, the small forms probably used for domestic activities. The latter example exhibits traces of magnetite plant pseudomorphs on the blade and loop, indicating that the shears were deposited in a surrounding matrix of straw.

Six chisels (Figure FWP64.30, 7, 8, 10; GF161, GF309, SF289; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 10–12) and a gouge (GF33; FWP 39b, Cat No 16) were examined. One of the chisels (Figure FWP64.30, 7; FWP 39b, Cat No 10) has traces of magnetite plant pseudomorphs, like the shears described above. All could have been used for a number of tasks including metalworking, woodworking and masonry. Three were probably not used for anything hard as two are too diminutive for anything but wood or leatherworking and one seems not to have been used. Gouges were mainly used in woodworking, although the typical examples are less substantial than this piece and have sockets rather than a thickened striking platform. A gouge from Hod Hill is similar (Manning 1985, pl 11, B48).

A identification of a single fragment as an iron pitchfork (Figure FWP64.30, 9; FWP 39b, Cat No 17) is tentative and based purely on the grounds of shape. It is rather small and may have been a hand tool. Rees lists a number of examples of Romano-British pitchforks but only one approaches the diminutive size of this object (Rees 1979, 734–7).

Domestic/household items

A fragment of an iron vessel (Figure FWP64.31, 11; FWP 39b, Cat No 20) is of unknown function. Unlike cauldrons, this fragment has legs and, therefore, was not likely to have been used in cooking.

Part of a strip with one rounded, perforated end (Figure FWP64.32, 33; FWP 39b, Cat No 21) is probably a bucket handle mount. A furniture handle (Figure FWP64.31, 16; FWP 39b, Cat No 26) was possibly for a wooden box (Manning 1985, 124).

Other iron finds include types which are generally common on domestic sites of the Romano-British period. They include two latch-lifters (Figure FWP64.31, 12, 13; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 22, 23), the latter being an exceptionally long and flat example of the type (*cf* a similar but shorter example from Chichester; Down 1993, fig 20.4–196); an unusual T-shaped lift-key (Figure FWP64.31, 14; FWP 39b, Cat No 24), with a complex arrangement of six teeth on two axes (*cf* Fishbourne; Cunliffe 1971, fig 58, no 26); part of a barb-spring padlock (Figure FWP64.31, 15; FWP 39b, Cat No 25) of a type uncommon on Romano-British sites (Manning 1985, 95; *cf* fourth-century example from Baldock; Stead and Rigby 1986, fig 68, 559–61); two styli (Figure FWP64.31, 17; FWP 39b, Cat No 27); and at least one large needle (Figure FWP64.31, 18; FWP 39b, Cat No 29) possibly used for sewing coarse or tough material.

Brooches

Two iron penannular brooches (Figure FWP64.32, 21, 22; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 36, 37) were found. Iron is an unusual material for a penannular brooch. Fowler (1960) did not include any iron examples in her corpus and neither of these brooches conform particularly well to any of her categories.

Three fragments of mid–late fist century AD brooches were examined. Two (Figure FWP64.32, 23, 24; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 38, 39) are too fragmentary to identify to type but are almost certainly Late Iron Age, possibly earlier. The third (GF174; FWP 39b, Cat No 40) is a Beckley type similar to an example from Cold Kitchen Hill (Cunnington and Goddard 1934, plate xxxv, 1) of Hull type La Tène 2Cb dated to the third century BC.

Horse/Ox furniture

Two fragments of snaffle bits (Figure FWP64.32, 25, 26; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 41, 42) are both from the two-link snaffle type which was the most common bit used in Roman Britain as, indeed it is today. Two unstratified ox-shoes (Figure FWP64.31, 27, 28; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 43, 44) are not certainly of Roman date though the animal bone evidence from OD XII suggest that some cattle were of an age to have been used as draught animals. Ox- and horse-shoes are not uncommon on late Romano-British sites.

Weapons

Interestingly, four spearheads were recovered. By comparison, larger farmsteads in the south of England have produced fewer (none from Catsgore (Leech 1982), one from Neatham (Millet and Graham 1986) and three at Ilchester (Leach 1982)). At Portchester, a military site, only six were recovered (Cunliffe 1975).

The four spearheads from OD XII fit into types within Manning's (1985) scheme. The two smaller spears (Figure FWP64.32, 29, 31; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 46, 48) are of Manning group 1, are probably throwing javelins or cavalry lances (1985, 163). The larger two (Figure FWP64.32, 30; unstratified; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 47, 45) are of group 4, probably intended for hand to hand fighting (*ibid*, 167). Despite their possible military origin it seems likely that these items represent hunting equipment.

Structural and architectural fittings

A large number of structural fittings and attaching tools were recovered, as well as 71 unidentified pieces of iron. In addition to almost 2000 nails – a huge total for a site of this nature – some 50 cleats and various small strips and staples, two swivel loops (Figure FWP64.32, 32; FWP 39b, Cat No 51), possibly parts of cauldron chains (Manning 1985, 138) of simple levering systems; a fragment of a drop-hinge with punched perforation (Figure FWP64.32, 36; FWP 39b, Cat No 49); a broken spike (Figure FWP64.31, 20; FWP 39b, Cat No 57) with hot punched perforation at the thicker end; and five other loops and a loop-headed object were recovered. *Discussion*

List of illustrated objects

(Figure FWP64.30)

1. Socketed cleaver; straight back, curving blade. SF310, Area 3, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 1
2. Tanged, long-backed knife, slight rib down back. SF260, Area 4A, Ditch. FWP 39b, Cat No 2
3. Tanged knife. SF208, Area 4A, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 4
4. Tanged knife. SF259, Area 4, Layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 5
5. Shears frag; part of blade and spring. SF297, Area 3, topsoil. FWP 39b, Cat No 8
6. Pair of shears; incomplete. SF322; SF333, Area 3, layer 2, outside Building 3. FWP 39b, Cat No 9

7. Mortise chisel; head sub-rectangular section, blade gently bevelled. SF291, Area 3, topsoil. FWP 39b, Cat No 10

8. Mortise chisel. SF316, Area 3, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 12

9. ?Pitchfork: single prong attached to tang, thickening at the intersection. SF42, Area 2, topsoil. FWP 39b, Cat No 17

10. Mortise chisel; head sub-rectangular in section, blade gently bevelled. SF283, Area 4B/C, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 11

(Figure FWP64.31)

11. Iron vessel; three fragments comprising base with tripod legs attached by single rivet. SF294, Area 4B/C, layer 2, on north wall of Building 5. FWP 39b, Cat No 20

12. Latch-lifter; exceptionally long and flat. SF285, Area 4B/C, layer 2, west of Hearth; FWP 39b, Cat No 23

13. Latch-lifter; flat handle with loop containing ring formed by nipping then turning over end during smithing. SF229, Area 4A, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 22

14. T-shaped slide-key; six teeth; key consists of two sections on opposing axes. SF302, Area 3, layer 2, inside Building 3. FWP 39b, Cat No 24

15. Barb spring bolt from simple padlock. SF7, Area 1, layer 2, outside north corner, Building 1. FWP 39b, Cat No 25

16. Thin bar; rectangular section; ?furniture handle, possibly for wooden box. SF20, Area 2, layer 2, outside Building 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 26

17. Stylus; rod flared at one end to form eraser; writing point missing. SF175, Area 4A, layer 2, in top of lynchet. FWP 39b, Cat No 27

18. Needle. SF296, Area 3, topsoil. FWP 39b, Cat No 29

19. Rod frag; bent at one end with spatulate bulb the other. SF366, Area 3, early occupation. FWP 39b, Cat No 31

20. Spike; rectangular sectioned bar tapering to broken point; rectangular perforation at thick end. SF277, Area 4, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 57

(Figure FWP64.32)

21. Penannular brooch; terminals bent at 90º to dominant plane; pin fragmentary but apparently straight and attached off centre. SF8, Area 2, layer 3, the ploughsoil in the lynchet preceding settlement. FWP 39b, Cat No 36

22. Penannular brooch; slightly flared terminals and straight pin attached off centre. SF190, Area 4A, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 37

23. Brooch fragment; spring and part of pin; spring appears to have been four coiled with external chord. GF55, Area 2, topsoil outside Building 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 38

24. Brooch frag; spring and part of pin. Unstratified. FWP 39b, Cat No 39

25. Snaffle bit; two bit link type; one bit link and one ring only. SF116, Area 1, Pit 3. FWP 39b, Cat No 41

26. Snaffle bit; one bit link only. SF259, Area 4A, layer 2, overlying wall of Building 4. FWP 39b, Cat No 42

27. ?Ox-shoe. SF52, Area 2, topsoil inside Building 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 43
28. Ox-shoe; remains of nails in four holes. SF421, Area 3, topsoil. FWP 39b, Cat No 44
29. Small socketed spearhead; Manning group 1. SF29, Area 1, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 46
30. Large socketed spearhead; Manning group 4. SF55, Area 2, layer 1. FWP 39b, Cat No 47
31. Small socketed spearhead; Manning group 1. SF160, Area 4A, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 48
32. Swivel loop; single rod, one end formed into loop, attached by twisting round stem twice. SF133, Area 1, Pit 3. FWP 39b, Cat No 51
33. Bucket handle mount; plate with pierced oval hole, broken at one end. SF13, Area 2, topsoil. FWP 39b, Cat No 21
34. Oval ring; single rod with overlapping ends. SF411, Area 3, topsoil. FWP 39b, Cat No 62
35. Cleat. GF52, Area 2, topsoil inside Building 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 78
36. Drop-hinge frag; end of long arm; bulbed head with punched perforation. SF234, Area 4, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 49
37. Cleat. GF15, Area 2, topsoil inside Building 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 84
38. Reinforcing strip or tie; complete plate rounded at both ends with two perforations containing small nails. SF345, Area 3, in kiln filling. FWP 39b, Cat No 99
39. Hobnail. GF95, Area 2, layer 2, outside Building 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 132

Lead Objects

by Andrew Hutcheson

Two pieces of lead were identified: one piece of sheet with a single small perforation, possibly from the lining of a tank (FWP 39b, Cat No 2); and a cross-shaped fragment of window came (Figure FWP64.32, 40; SF324; FWP 39b, Cat No 1, Area 3, layer 2, inside building 3).

Worked and Utilised Stone

by Nicholas A Wells, with geological identifications by Adrian Murray

A total of 197 fragments of stone, weighing 66,166 g, was recovered. These have been divided into two main categories, Building Material and Portable Objects and further sub-divided as follows:

Building Material: Sandstone roof tiles; other building material

Portable Objects: Quernstones; whetstones/honestones; miscellaneous

Table FWP64.2 lists the quantities of building material by area (together with the ceramic building material).

Building Material

Sandstone Roof Tiles

This is by far the largest category of stone fragments, consisting of roof tiles in various types of sandstone. None was complete, the only recordable dimension being thickness.

Only five of the 108 sandstone tile fragments had nail holes present. From the surviving fragments it seems that the tiles were rectangular, with one face worked flat, the other left relatively unworked. Four tiles exhibit further working; an inset cut into one side of the tile, while another has possible chamfering along one long (and possibly one short) edge. The mean thickness of the tiles is 18.5mm, with a total range from 13 to 24mm. Five fragments are burnt.

A further 24 tile fragments show evidence of extreme wearing on one or both faces. Five of these have angular striations on one of their worn faces. This group of tiles has the same average thickness as those mentioned above and may be broken roof tiles that have been reused as sharpening stones.

A total of 25 fragments of roof tile was found in Area 1, of which five are worn. No specific concentrations were observed, though 11 fragments were found in the trench beneath the north east of Building 1. Two fragments were further worked with an inset. One has an incomplete nail hole, diameter *c* 8mm.

The vast majority of the sandstone roof tile was found in Area 2, where 61 fragments, both worn and unworn, were recovered. Of these, 36 occurred in Layer 2, 10 of which are worn. Within this layer a concentration of 30 tiles was noted lying within the building. Four fragments from Layer 2 have nail-holes, their diameters ranging from 5 to 10mm. Two were further worked with an inset. Given the similar propensity for ceramic roof tile fragments in this layer (see *Ceramic Building Material*) it seems likely that Layer 2 may represent some form of dump deposit, perhaps to form a floor surface, both inside and beyond the structure.

Only nine fragments of roof tile were found in Area 3, of which four are worn. Six were in Layer 2, one of which has an incomplete nail-hole, *c* 7mm in diameter. The remaining tiles are unstratified or from the topsoil (Layer 1). Thirteen fragments were found in Area 4, of which three are worn. No nail-holes were evident.

Samples of the sandstone roof tiles revealed a number of different types, including red sandstone, probably Old Red Sandstone, metamorphosed red sandstone, fine micaceous sandstone and dark quartzite. All these types have a probable source in the north Devon area, although similar material can be found in southern and central Wales.

Other building material

Masonry appears to have been confined to Areas 1 and 2. An incomplete worked chalk block, 70mm thick, was found in Area 1 (pre-wall trenches). In the same context a large oolitic limestone block with one worked face was also excavated. Furthermore, in the same area (occupation layer) was what is possibly an oolitic limestone roof tile. Two yellow sandstone blocks were found in Area 2 (?timber phase), one worked on two faces. The most complete piece of masonry, however, is unstratified, being 280mm long and 68mm thick and again of oolitic limestone.

Portable objects

Quernstones

Two complete quern stones were found in OD XII (Figure FWP64.33, 1, 2; FWP 39b, Cat Nos 2, 3; *described from archive drawings only*). A further 11 quern fragments were found; six of quartzite of various types, three of sandstone and one each of greensand and lava. With the exception of one saddle quern fragment (Area 1, occupation layer), all are from rotary querns, but with the exception of the greensand fragment, which is from an upper stone, it is not possible to say whether the fragments are from upper or lower stones.

The greensand rotary quern fragment with its lead ‘plug’ (Figure FWP64.33, 3; FWP 39b, Cat No 4) is of particular interest, as it shows evidence of having been repaired; the lead keeping iron

clamps in position, holding the broken quern together (*cf* Anderson and Wacher 1980, 119; Buckley, forthcoming, no16). This fragment was found in Area 2 (PH2) and was latterly used as post-hole packing. Two further quern fragments were so used: one example from Area 4 (GF242, PH33; FWP 39b, Cat No 12) and one from Area 1 (GF136, PH2; FWP 39b, Cat No 9).

No specific concentrations of quern fragments has been observed; however, it should be noted that none was found in Area 3.

As for the stone building material, the quartzites and sandstones have a probable source in north Devon, although similar material can be found in southern and central Wales. The single example of arkosic material (feldspar-rich sandstone) is more likely to have come from the Permo-Triassic beds of Devon, although again similar material can be found in south Wales. The lava quern fragment is likely to have been imported from the Continent, probably from the Rhineland; such querns were imported in some quantity into England throughout the Roman period.

Whetstones/Honestones

Eleven whetstones (of which four are complete) have been identified (Figure FWP64.33, 4–9; 14–16, 7–9). All are in fine-grained sandstone, mostly micaceous, again with a probable north Devon/South Wales source. All are square or rectangular in section and worn on all sides. It seems that some are 'bone' shaped, with a thinner central section widening out at the ends, while others are simply squared off at the end. One is fashioned so as to be set on to a mount. Staining on its flat side indicates that this may have been iron.

No specific concentrations of whetstones have been observed, objects being distributed evenly over the whole site.

List of illustrated objects

(Figure FWP64.33)

1. Rotary quernstone, almost complete lower stone. SF123, Area 1, Building 1, layer 3, chalk floor. FWP 39b, Cat No 2. Plate FWP64.III
2. Rotary quernstone, almost complete, probably upper stone. SF110, Area 2, layer 1, in wall. FWP 39b, Cat No 3
3. Greensand rotary quern fragment, upper stone, with lead plug repair. SF424, Area 2, reused as packing in PH2. FWP 39b, Cat No 4
4. Small, flat, rectangular-sectioned whetstone, possibly a piece of reused roof tile; slight waisting on two long edges; fine micaceous sandstone. SF417, Area 2, topsoil. FWP 39b, Cat No 14
5. Small, rectangular-sectioned whetstone, both ends broken; slightly waisted on one edge; lateral wear grooves on two other faces; fine-grained sandstone. SF418, Area 3, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 15
6. Small, slightly tapering, square-sectioned whetstone; tapering to circular section, broken; fine-grained sandstone. SF86, Area 1, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 16
7. Tapering, rectangular-sectioned whetstone, marked waisting on one long edge and shallow lateral grooves on opposite edge; fine, micaceous sandstone. GF136, Area 1, Building 1 construction. FWP 39b, Cat No 18
8. Tapering whetstone, ?complete; subrectangular-sectioned at wider end, circular-sectioned at narrower end; 'waisting' at narrower end; fine-grained sandstone. SF357, Area 3, layer 2, inside Building 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 19

9. Rectangular-sectioned whetstone, both ends broken; fine-grained sandstone. SF65, Area 1, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 20

Pottery

by Rachael Seager Smith

The pottery from Areas 1–4 totals 11,370 sherds, weighing 118,086g. The assemblage is predominantly of late Roman date although the presence of at least small quantities of earlier Roman material is indicated by samian. One sherd of prehistoric, probably Late Bronze Age and one sherd of medieval pottery were also recognised.

Method

The assemblage has been analysed according to the guidelines set out in *The Analysis of Pottery* (Morris 1992). The pottery was recorded using the General Finds (GF) and where appropriate, the Small Finds (SF) Numbers assigned to the material at the time of excavation, grouped according to the Area/Building (1–4) from which they derive. No detailed fabric analysis was undertaken but in addition to a range of fabrics of known type or source, the assemblage was divided into broad fabric groups on the basis on the range, frequency and size of the predominant inclusions present and each was assigned a unique fabric code. The following terms are used to describe the frequency of inclusions present: rare – less than 2%; sparse – 3–7%; moderate – 10–15%; common – 20–25% and abundant – 30%+.

The whole assemblage from Areas/Buildings 1–4 was quantified using the number and weight (to the nearest whole gram) of sherds for each fabric type. Each sherd or group of related sherds was examined and assigned a form type with additional attributes recorded where appropriate. These include details of vessel form, size, percentage present, surface treatment, decoration and manufacturing technique recorded to identify and characterise the range and nature of the assemblage. Additional details, such as the presence of perforations, residues and evidence of reuse or repair, providing information about the ways in which the assemblage was used, were also noted.

A site-specific vessel type series was constructed for the assemblage although the New Forest and Oxfordshire wares present were cross-referenced to the published type series for these industries (Fulford 1975a; Young 1977). Each sherd or group of related sherds was given a unique number (a Pottery Record Number or PRN) and of the data recorded for them, selected attributes relating to the context and quantity of the fabrics and forms present, were subsequently computerised, using the data-handling system dBase IV.

In addition to the pottery assignable to Areas/Buildings 1–4, a further 13.5kg of pottery is classed as ‘unstratified’, mainly because the GF number marked on the sherds is no longer readable. This material is not included in any of the quantifications given in this report and no detailed analysis was undertaken. Rapid scanning of these sherds, to ensure that no new fabrics or forms were represented, indicates that this material is of a similar date range and character to the rest of the assemblage.

Condition

As a whole, the assemblage is very fragmentary and the surface condition of the majority of sherds is consistently poor. Few crisp fractures were noted, the edges of most sherds being very battered and rolled while the surfaces are abraded. Very few refits could be made and those that were observed, generally occurred between sherds from General Finds Numbers which formed parts of

the same deposit. The mean sherd weight for the assemblage as a whole is 10.4g, falling to 8.7g when the fabrics generally associated with large, heavy, thick-walled storage jar forms (Fabrics Q104, G100 and F102) are excluded.

The overall number and weight of sherds by fabric from each Area/Building is given in *Table* FWP64.3 while the assemblages from the individual Areas/Buildings are examined in more detail in FWP64.7. The correlation between fabrics types and vessel forms is shown in Tables FWP64.4 and FWP64.5 and the distribution of the major fabric types as percentages by area in Table FWP64.6.

Prehistoric Pottery

One sherd (5g) of prehistoric pottery was noted (PRN 12798). The sherd, a rim from a slack-shouldered necked jar, is probably of Late Bronze Age date and occurs in a fine flint-gritted fabric (Fabric F1). It was found in a floor deposit (GF231) associated with the stone construction phase of Building 4 and is certainly residual.

Fabric F1 Moderately hard, very fine grained micaceous fabric containing sparse crushed flint fragments <2mm across and rare iron oxides and fragments of carbonised plant material. Handmade. Unoxidised; dark grey–brown in colour.

Romano-British Pottery

Imported wares

Samian: A total of 142 sherds, 788g, of samian (Fabric E300) was identified. This represents 1.2% of the total number of sherds recovered. The mean sherd weight is below average at 5.5g and many of the sherds are very small and abraded although some are comparatively well-preserved. No attempt was made to assign these sherds to particular production centres but products from all three of the major source areas were recognised. Dr 18/31 and/or Dr 31 platters are the commonest recognisable forms but sherds from Dr 33 cups, Dr 37 and 38 bowls and Dr 45 mortaria were also noted. In general decorated forms were poorly represented but this might be at least partially due to the small size and severe surface abrasion typical of the majority of these sherds. Samian sherds are most numerous in Area 3 (ie, on top of the lynchet) but those with the highest mean sherd weight are from Area 1. The material is likely to be associated with the first–second century fields underlying the settlement.

Other imports: Other imported finewares are confined to five sherds (7g), of Rhenish ware (Fabric E120). These sherds, which date from c. AD 150 into the third century AD (Greene 1978, 19) or possibly even later (Millett 1986, 75) may all derive from a single, closed vessel. At least one Dressel 20 amphora (Fabric E256), used to transport olive oil from the southern Spain, is represented by two body sherds (38g). These vessels were widely traded across the western provinces of the Roman Empire from the 1st to at least the 3rd century AD (Peacock and Williams 1986, 136) and are perhaps the most common amphora type to have reached Roman Britain. The sherds of both these fabrics were found in Area/Building 3 and, again probably relate to the field system rather than to the OD XII settlement itself (Table FWP64.7).

British Finewares

British finewares of known source are confined to the products of the two major late Roman production centres of southern England, the New Forest and Oxfordshire industries. Six fabric types were recognised, two from the New Forest and four from the Oxfordshire region.

Fabric E160 New Forest parchment ware (Fulford 1975a, 26, fabrics 2a and 2b)

Fabric E162 New Forest colour-coated ware (*ibid*, 24-25, fabrics 1a and 1b)

Fabric E170 Oxfordshire red/brown colour-coated wares (Young 1977, 123)

Fabric E171 Oxfordshire white colour-coated ware (*ibid*, 117)

Fabric E172 Oxfordshire parchment ware (*ibid*, 81)

Fabric E173 Oxfordshire white ware (*ibid*, 56)

Oxfordshire products, accounting for 15% of the total number of sherds, were far more numerous than the New Forest wares which represented only 0.6% of the total. This equals a ratio of one New Forest sherd for every 24.6 Oxfordshire sherds. The colour-coated wares were the most common products from both centres. Although the paucity of New Forest wares may be due, in part, to the misidentification of small, badly abraded body sherds, the small quantity of New Forest wares follows the known distribution pattern of these products in Wiltshire (Swan 1973, fig 2), possibly due to the differing marketing patterns used and the closer proximity of the Oxfordshire kilns. No attempt was made to distinguish sherds of the 'local' late Roman colour-coated ware from the Oxfordshire colour-coated wares which they closely resemble. These 'local' wares have been identified at Cirencester and at variety of other sites in the region in levels post-dating *c* AD 350, (Rigby 1982b, fig 50, 212; Keely 1986, 160, fabric 105) and are almost certainly present among the OD XII assemblage, perhaps also contributing to the over-representation of Oxfordshire wares at this site.

The Oxfordshire and New Forest vessel forms present are listed below and their occurrence by area is tabulated in Table FWP64.4. A wide range of vessel forms was identified, but each one is represented by only a small number of examples. The majority are common types produced throughout the life of the Oxfordshire and New Forest industries. A small number of forms can however, be more precisely dated. These include the indented beakers with painted decoration (Type R166; Fulford 1975a 56, type 46) which can be dated to *c* AD 300–330/340 and the globular flagons/flasks (Type R177; *ibid*, 43–46, types 1–10) of fourth century date, from the New Forest. One Oxfordshire flagon (Type R150; Young 1977, 148, type C4) has a date range extending from *c* AD 240–350, but, with the exception of some of the mortaria forms, the remainder of the more datable Oxfordshire types are confined to the fourth century. These include a variety of cup, bowl and dish forms (Types R151, R157, R171, R176, R180 and R188; Young 1977, types P14, C81, C71, C110, C41 and C94 respectively). In addition, a necked bowl form (Type R153) is dated to *c* AD 325–400+ (Young 1977, 164–6, type C75) while a jug, a jar/jug and two bowl forms (Types R156, R165, R187 and R192; *ibid*, types C14, C13, C84 and C83 respectively) belong to the second half of the fourth century (*c* AD 350–400 +). One very unusual form, possibly part of a lamp (Type R137; Figure FWP64.36, 55; PRN 12733) was also present. No parallels have been found for this vessel.

With the exception of the samian Dr 45 sherds, the only mortaria identified among the assemblage were Oxfordshire products. Eight forms were identified, two occurring in the red/brown colour-coated ware (Fabric E170), three in white colour-coated ware (Fabric E171) and three in white ware (Fabric E173) fabrics. Two of the forms were produced throughout the life of the Oxfordshire industry (Types R182 and R164; Young 1977, 174, type C97 and 76, type M22) and four (Types R170, R175, R184 and R194) can be dated to *c* AD 240–300 (*ibid*, types WC5, WC4, M17 and

M18 respectively). One of the red/brown colour-coated forms (Type R179; *ibid*, 174, type C100) is of fourth century date, becoming more common and widely distributed as the century progressed, while a white colour-coated type (Type R162; *ibid*, 122, type WC7), although produced from *c* AD 240 onwards, only became common during the fourth century.

The colour-coats of the softer fired vessels from both these regions have not survived well but in general the surface treatments and decoration all occur within the range identified by Fulford (1975a) and Young (1977) for the appropriate fabric types. Rouletted decoration was especially common on products from both centres while painted line motifs were noted on some of the New Forest 'stonewares'. A small number of Oxfordshire sherds with barbotine scale decoration were noted, in addition to some vessels with impressed decoration. These include the linear 'comb-stamps', rosettes and demi-rosettes which only become common after the middle of the fourth century (Young 1977, 132).

Unassigned Finewares

Three other fineware fabrics were identified:

Fabric Q103 Very hard, wheelmade; dense, high-fired fabric, sparse frags off-white quartz or quartzite <0.5mm and rare iron oxides <1mm across. Wheelmade. Surfaces dark blue–grey, core brick red. Quartz/quartzite grains protrude through surface resulting in pimply texture, almost as if the sherds have been roughcast.

Fabric Q105 Unassigned colour-coated ware; fine-grained, well prepared clay matrix containing sparse white mica or microscopic quartz flecks <0.125mm and rare to sparse red and black iron oxides <2mm across. Wheelmade. Oxidised to uniform bright orange with a thick, evenly applied, matt brown colour-coat.

Fabric Q107 Colour-coated white ware; hard, fine-grained, close-textured fabric with sparse to moderate quartz sand, <0.25mm and iron oxides, most commonly red <1mm across. Wheelmade. White-firing, 'pipeclay' fabric with matt orange or red–brown colour-coat on both surfaces.

Both individually and as a group these three fabrics represent a very insignificant proportion of the assemblage. Their provenances are uncertain, although it is likely Fabric Q103 and Fabric Q107 are relatively local. Fabric Q103 occurs only in Areas/Buildings 1 and 2 while sherds of the other two fabrics are confined to Areas/Buildings 3 and 4 respectively. All Q107 sherds may derive from a single large beaker or jar with a broad band of rouletting around its girth. Most of the Q103 sherds indicate its use for small, closed vessels, probably beakers, although the rim of a small jar (Type R111; Figure FWP64.34, 22; PRN 10527–8), was found in the topsoil inside Building 2. Only one sherd, a beaker rim (Type R118; Figure FWP64.35, 32; PRN 12141) in Q105 was recognised and it is just possible that this is an imported ware.

Coarsewares

Eleven coarseware fabric types were identified, including two of known source. Seven further fabrics are 'catch-all' types and include the products of more than one source.

Fabric E101 Black Burnished ware (BB1); for fabric description see Williams 1977.

Fabric Q100 Sandy grey wares, all types including oxidised sherds of fabrics more commonly unoxidised.

Fabric Q101 Oxidised wares, all types.

Fabric Q102 Calcareous sandy ware; soft, gritty fabric with irregular voids, especially near surface. Inclusions: common sub-rounded quartz <0.75mm, sparse soft, off-white calcareous fragments, probably shell, from 0.5–6mm across and rare iron oxides <0.5mm. Wheelmade. Predominantly unoxidised, dull grey–brown.

Fabric Q104 Very coarse sandy ware; coarse, open-textured fabric containing common sub-rounded quartz <2mm and sparse iron oxides and soft, off-white non-calcareous particles both <0.75mm across. Handmade. Predominantly oxidised although irregularly fired and unoxidised examples also occur.

Fabric Q106 Tilford/Overwey ware (Portchester D ware; Fulford 1975b, 299)

Fabric G100 Grog-tempered wares; highly variable fabric group characterised by presence of grog as predominant inclusion type; range of other inclusions including quartz, iron oxides, crushed flint and carbonised plant material also noted in greater or lesser quantities. Handmade.

Fabric F100 Fine flint-gritted wares; group characterised by rare to sparse crushed flint fragments <2mm; variable quantities of quartz and rare iron oxides, both <0.5mm, may also be present, often in micaceous clay matrix. Handmade. Predominantly unoxidised although oxidised and irregularly fired sherds also noted.

Fabric F101 Coarse flint-gritted wares; group characterised by sparse to moderate crushed flint fragments <4mm across; other inclusions = sparse quartz <0.5mm and rare iron oxides or grog fragments often in very fine, dense micaceous clay matrix. Handmade. Predominantly unoxidised although oxidised and irregularly fired sherds also noted.

Fabric F102 Flint and grog-tempered coarseware; hard fabric, orange–brown to very dark grey containing moderate crushed flint and grog fragments both <4mm across, sparse quartz <0.5mm and rare iron oxides <0.5mm, in fine micaceous clay matrix. Handmade. Predominantly unoxidised although oxidised and irregularly fired sherds also occur.

Fabric C100 Calcareous wares; moderately hard, well-fired, containing moderate to common amounts poorly sorted crushed shell and/or limestone fragments < 4mm across and rare quartz and iron oxides <0.5mm across. Matrix of some sherds micaceous; voids often apparent especially near surface. Hand- and wheelmade examples. Predominantly unoxidised although oxidised and irregularly fired sherds also occur.

This group of fabrics overwhelmingly dominate the assemblage, together accounting for 82.5% of the total number recovered. Only two fabrics could be positively attributed to a known source; the Black Burnished ware from the Wareham/Poole Harbour region of Dorset and the Overwey/Tilford ware from the Farnham area of Surrey. Thirty-five broad vessel types were identified; the small sherd size characteristic of the assemblage making it impossible to define individual forms with any precision. The standard range of jar, storage jar, bowl/dish, jug, flagon, beaker and lid forms were all represented. The vessel forms are listed below and the correlation between fabrics and forms is shown in Table FWP64.5.

The Black Burnished ware is present in each of the four excavated areas. All the recognisable vessel forms are characteristic elements of the industry and although predominantly of late third–fourth century+ date (dropped flange bowls/dishes: Types R102 and R103; ‘dog-dishes’: Type R104; everted rim jars: Type R110), also include vessels, such as the incipient flanged bowls/dishes (Type R134) and at least some of the upright or slightly everted rim jars (Type R111), which are present from the mid second century onwards. These BB1 vessels are well-known in the area (Rigby 1982b, fig 45, 95, 96; fig 46, 115–23; Keely 1986, 171; Seager Smith forthcoming a, fig 99, 448, 449; fig 100, 463–7; fig 101, 481–9) and are amongst the most widely distributed of all the products of this industry. Less common, although both forms are known outside Dorset, are the ‘fish-dishes (Type

R105) and globular jars/bowls with everted rims (Type R134) which are of fourth–fifth century date. Both forms are confined to levels dated from *c* AD 350–450 at Greyhound Yard, Dorchester (Seager Smith and Davies 1993, 233). A similar globular bowl occurs in a late fourth–fifth-century group at Nettleton (Wedlake 1982, fig 111, 474).

At OD XII, the Dorset Black Burnished ware accounts for *c* 10% of all the sherds recovered (Table FWP64.3). This total represents very much a minimum figure but, on currently available evidence, it appears that the importance of Black Burnished ware in this assemblage is significantly less than at other sites of a comparable date in the area. By the fourth century, Black Burnished ware appears to have been the most commonly used coarseware fabric at Wanborough (Seager Smith forthcoming a, fabric 54) for example, while at the Beeches, Cirencester it dominates the pottery groups from all three periods at sites CQ and CX/CY and is second to the grey wares at site DF/DE (Keely 1986, 171–2). This group, however, includes local, imitation black burnished wares which makes the proportion of true Dorset products difficult to assess. However, a lower proportion of Black Burnished ware in the OD XII assemblage concurs with the theory that, outside their heartland in Dorset, the distribution of these wares is concentrated around major population centres and military sites, with a significant decrease in availability to the smaller, rural sites beyond (Lyne unpublished).

The Overwey/Tilford wares (Fabric Q106; Clark 1949) are perhaps better known as Portchester 'D' wares (Fulford 1975b, 299) and can be dated to *c* AD 325–420. The distribution of these wares mostly lies in a south and easterly direction from their heartland in Surrey but at least one sherd of this fabric has been identified among the assemblage collected from the Avebury area, along the line of the Kennet Valley foul sewer pipeline (Seager Smith 1996, fabric Q104) and small quantities of these wares may also occur at the Beeches, Cirencester (Keely 1986, 164, fabric 121). Examples have been noted as far west as the Chew Valley in Somerset, while very similar vessel forms in only subtly different fabrics mark the very latest Roman contexts at Lincoln and Leicester, for example (M Darling and R Pollard, pers comm). It is possible that these vessels represent the output of itinerant potters, using locally-available materials (M Lyne, pers comm) although the probable presence of Alice Holt greywares in the OD XII assemblage and in others from north Wiltshire, indicate links between the two areas.

The problems of differentiating the products of the numerous sandy grey ware industries of Roman Britain are well-known and, for this assemblage exacerbated by the low mean sherd weight and poor condition of the sherds. Consequently, except where especially distinctive (Fabrics Q102 and F102), the remainder of the coarseware assemblage which is dominated by sandy fabrics, was divided into broad, ‘catch-all’ fabric groups.

The sandy grey wares (Fabric Q100) are numerically dominant amongst the assemblage, representing 55% of the total number of sherds (Table FWP64.7). Fabrics vary from comparatively soft, coarse-grained, dark brownish–grey wares, often burnished and used to imitate Dorset Black Burnished ware forms, to much harder, fine-grained, blue–grey fabrics. Almost all the sandy grey wares are wheelmade, including those imitating the handmade Dorset BB1, although occasional handmade vessels were noted. These wares are clearly derived from a number of different sources which would include the kilns to the west of Swindon, known to have been in production from the early second century into the mid-fourth century (Anderson 1979).

These wares, commonly known as Whitehill Farm wares after the original kiln site west of Swindon, clearly played a significant role in the supply of coarseware pottery to *Corinium* during the mid-third and earlier fourth centuries, but declined after *c*. AD 350–360 (Rigby 1982b, fiche 1/5; Keely 1986, 162, 172–3, fabric 98). Several of the vessel forms present (Types R114, R117, R120, R121, R124, R131 and R132) find parallels among the greyware products of the New Forest (Fulford 1975a, 89–103), Oxfordshire (Young 1977, 202–30) and Alice Holt (Lyne and Jefferies 1979) industries, indicating that vessels from these centres may well be present at Overton Down.

The large bowls with heavy, moulded rims, often internally bevelled, (Type R130), for example, are typical New Forest products, made throughout the life of this industry, *c* AD 270–400, but do not appear to have been made at any of the other late Roman kilns in southern England (Fulford 1975a, 93–4, type 8). Small quantities of late Alice Holt greyware are known to occur in this area of north Wiltshire/south Gloucestershire (Rigby 1982b, fiche 1/5; Keely 1986, 163, fabric 99; Seager Smith forthcoming, fabric 100). The presence of probable glauconite in some of the Fabric Q100 sherds suggests that at least some of the greywares are from the Upper Greensand areas in north and west Wiltshire, where deposits of such glauconitic sand occur. Kiln furniture and possible greyware wasters have been found at Westbury (Rodgers and Roddham 1991, 5), which is located on the Upper Greensand and it is likely that other kiln sites have yet to be identified in these areas.

The oxidised sandy coarsewares (Fabric Q101) represent 8% of the total number of sherds recovered (Table FWP64.6). These fabrics form part of the standard range of wares found on Roman sites of all periods, providing a range of medium-quality wares between the coarse, storage and food preparation vessels and the fine tablewares. However, the mean sherd weight of this group is well below that of the assemblage as a whole (5.6g compared with 10.4g) and the majority of sherds show severe surface abrasion. All the sherds in this group were wheelmade. Although the output of fine and coarse oxidised wares never formed more than a subsidiary part of the production of the Oxfordshire potters (Young 1977, 189–91, fig 70), at least some of the Fabric Q101 sherds may derived from this region. Other products might include Severn Valley wares (Webster 1976, 18), which also occur in late Roman Cirencester (Rigby 1982b, fiche 1/5 D09; Keely 1986, 164, fabrics 106–10). This industry, beginning in the mid first century AD, continued to flourish until the mid-fourth century AD and there is some evidence to indicate the continued production of a more limited range of forms throughout the fourth century (Hassall and Rhodes 1974). More locally, kilns at Purton to the west of Swindon are known to have been involved in the production of oxidised coarsewares from the late second into the third century (Anderson 1980).

The widest range of vessel forms occurred among the sandy grey wares but comparatively few forms were recognised among the oxidised wares (Table FWP64.5). A standard range of jar, bowl and dish forms was present, together with a small group of miscellaneous types such as jugs/flagons, colanders, beakers and lids. Individual elements within the two sandy coarseware fabric groups are not closely datable. The local industries located to the west of Swindon are poorly published and little is understood about their development or the chronology of individual vessel types produced there. The date-range of the majority of coarseware forms produced by the New Forest, Oxfordshire and Alice Holt industries span the entire production period at these centres, *c* AD 240–400+, while the recognition of the products from other sources is hampered by the problems of distinguishing between the multiplicity of coarseware fabrics. Conservatism of form is a feature common to all coarsewares fabrics and presumably reflects the functional and utilitarian nature of these vessels. While the majority of sherds in these groups are probably of late third–fourth century+ date, the possibility of earlier, second–third century, material being present cannot be excluded.

The grog-tempered wares (Fabric G100) also contain the products of more than one source. All the sherds of the grog with flint tempered fabric (Fabric F102) recognised in Area/Building 4, are likely to be derived from a single vessel and should probably be considered as a variation within the grog-tempered fabric tradition. Together, Fabrics G100 and F102 account for approximately 6% of the total number of sherds from Areas/Buildings 1–4. The overall mean sherd weight is very high (24.9g) and reflects the predominant use of these fabrics for large, thick-walled storage jar forms (Types R112; Figure FWP64.35, 25; PRN 12782).

Grog-tempered, thick-walled jars span a wide date range from at least the later first century AD onwards and were produced at a range of centres such as the Savernake kilns and possible Pewsey and Ower from the immediate post-Conquest period until the mid second century at least (Annable 1962, 142–45; Hodder 1974, 67–84; Swan 1973, 36–47; Rigby 1982a, 154). The bead rim jar (Type R122) at OD XII may be from Savernake, being a very common form in these fabrics (Annable

1962, 153, type 4). Large jars were also made in a grog-tempered fabric at Purton during the later second and third centuries AD (Anderson 1980, fabric 2).

Grog-tempered wares do not figure largely in other late Roman assemblages from the area (eg, Rigby 1982b; Keely 1986; Wedlake 1982) but it is unlikely that all the OD XII sherds are residual. The paucity of these wares at other sites may well be related to the comparatively small number of recognised large thick-walled storage jars, reflecting possible functional and/or status differences. Grog-tempered fabrics, especially for large jar forms, are well-known in Hampshire and south-east Wiltshire (Fulford 1975b, 286–91, fabric A) from the late third century onwards, while the return to coarse, handmade fabrics after the breakdown of the wheelthrown pottery industry at the end of the Roman period is a widespread, if over generalised, view. At OD XII, sherds from a dropped flanged bowl (Type R103; Figure FWP64.34, 8; PRN 11702), from Layer 1/2 overlying Building 3 and an everted rim jar (Type R111), found in Layer 2 inside Building 4A are both typical late third–fourth century + forms. Other grog-tempered ware forms recognised comprise a jar with a flared rim and a long sloping shoulder (Type R133; Figure FWP64.36, 52; PRN12403), from Layer 2 inside Building 4A and a thin-walled sherd from a colander (Type R117) found in the topsoil outside this building.

The very coarse, predominantly oxidised sandy fabric (Fabric Q104) was used exclusively for large jar forms (Types R112; Figure FWP64.34, 23 (PRN 11031) and R114; Figure FWP64.35, 28; PRN 12791)). The fabric is unprovenanced but similar vessels were made by the New Forest (Fulford 1975a, type 40) and Alice Holt (Lyne and Jefferies 1979, class 10) potters in greyware fabrics from *c* AD 260 onwards. In Dorset, a coarser, predominantly oxidised version of Black Burnished ware with very visible clay pellets/shale fragments was used for large jars with 'rope-rims' which, like the Type R114 jars, are often perforated around the shoulder/neck and/or base (Seager Smith and Davies 1993, 233, type 12; Seager Smith forthcoming b, fabric Q107). These vessels generally occur in deposits dated to the fourth century+ and may have served some specialist function. These jar forms also occur in very late Roman levels at Nettleton (Wedlake 1982, fig 111, 460–2).

The calcareous wares (Fabric C100) represent just 1% of the all the sherds recovered (Table FWP64.3) and include an almost complete flanged bowl (Type R128; Figure FWP64.35, 46; PRN 13456) from the area of the southern extension of Building 4. At least two individual fabric types can be identified, one containing considerable quantities of crushed shell, the other limestone fragments, sometimes oolitic. Similar fabrics occur on most fourth century sites in central southern Britain. Production centres are known at Harrold, Bedfordshire (Swan 1984, fiche 1.207–10), Lakenheath, Suffolk (*ibid*, fiche 5.606–7) while others may have been located in Northamptonshire (Sanders 1979, 47). Suitable areas for more local supply might include the Corallian limestone areas to the west of Calne, some 15–20km distant from Overton Down, and the Cotswold region. A restricted range of forms were produced in these wares (Table FWP64.3) and all the forms present at OD XII are well known from at other sites in the area (eg, Rigby 1982b, 1/5 D10; Keely 1986, 163, fig 111, 203). Sherds of this fabric type have also been found in the Avebury area (Seager Smith 1996) and at the Hermitage in Swindon (Seager Smith in prep). The absence of shell-tempered wares from the make-up levels at the Beeches, Cirencester suggests that these fabrics only appear, in this area at least, after the middle of the fourth century AD (Keely 1986, 163).

The remaining coarsewares, the calcareous sandy fabric (Fabrics Q102) found only in Area/Building 1 and the flint-tempered wares (Fabrics F100 and F101) represent only very minor components of the assemblage. Only one identifiable rim sherd was present, a small fragment from a shallow, straight-sided 'dog-dish', found in the occupation layer of Building 1 although a tiny rim fragment from an unidentifiable jar form was also noted in this deposit (Table FWP64.3). These fabrics are probably derived from comparatively local sources; their date range is uncertain.

Comments on the range of surface treatments and decoration present among the coarseware assemblage are limited by the degree of surface abrasion apparent on many of the sherds. The majority of vessels are roughly finished, with unevenly smoothed, wiped or unaltered surfaces.

Some attempts at burnishing occur but rarely to an even finish or a high gloss. Finger-smearing occurs on the exterior surface of the large storage jars in the very coarse, predominantly oxidised sandy ware (Fabric Q104), while heavy wiping occurs on the inside (eg Figure FWP64.35, 23; PRN 11031). Among the Dorset BB1, the surface finishes characteristic of the late third–fourth century+ wares (Seager Smith and Davies 1993, 257) were apparent and often used as an aid in the distinction between the true Dorset BB1 products and the local imitations. Closely-spaced horizontal rilling was apparent on the exterior surface of the majority of the calcareous ware (Fabric C100) sherds (eg Figure FWP64.36, 50; PRN 13465) and on a small proportion of the sandy grey wares. Horizontal bands of multiple, closely-spaced incised or combed wavy lines were also noted on some of the sandy grey ware sherds. This form of decoration is a characteristic feature of the north Wiltshire colour-coated wares produced during the first half of the second century (Anderson 1978, 380–3) and may have been copied from them. Other decoration on coarsewares was limited to a small range of burnished line motifs, most commonly obtuse-angled lattice or interlocking hoops, which can be paralleled among the products of the late Roman pottery industries (Fulford 1975a; Young 1977; Lyne and Jefferies 1979; Seager Smith and Davies 1993, 256).

Distribution across the site

The number and weight of sherds of each fabric type present in the various deposits, feature groups and structural elements of Buildings 1–4 are shown in Table FWP64.7 while a generalised correlation of the vessels forms present in each fabric is shown in Tables FWP64.4 and FWP64.5. Full details are contained in FWP39. The proportion of the various fabric types (expressed as a percentage of the total number of sherds) for the assemblage as a whole and for the individual Areas, remains remarkably consistent as can be seen from Table FWP64.6. Few specific patterns of deposition or distribution were observed, either for the assemblage as a whole or when considered by individual Area. Minor variations do, of course occur; these are described for each Area below.

Area/Building 1: The 1338 sherds (11613g), from this Area account for 11.8% of the total. The mean sherd weight for this material is 8.7g, below that of the assemblage as a whole (10.4g). One notable feature of the Area 1 assemblage is the absence of New Forest fabrics. This might be due, at least in part, to the smaller assemblage recovered, as these wares were never common at OD XII. Using the ratio of one New Forest sherd to every 24.6 Oxfordshire sherds applicable to the assemblage as a whole, Oxfordshire wares occur in Area 1 in sufficient quantities for only eight New Forest sherds to be present.

No significant horizontal clustering of the material is apparent from the presently available stratigraphic evidence, although the majority of sherds were found in the upper three layers; 21% from the topsoil, 47% from Layer 2 and a further 21% from the Occupation Layer. Not surprisingly all the sherds of samian, Oxfordshire white-ware, the calcareous sandy coarseware and the flint-gritted fabrics present in Area 1 were recovered from these three deposits while Oxfordshire parchment ware and the calcareous coarsewares only occurred in the Topsoil and Layer 2.

Far smaller quantities of material, totalling only 7.5% of the sherds, were recovered from the structural elements of Building 1 (Table FWP64.7). Comparatively little of this material is closely datable although a rim sherd from an Oxfordshire red/brown colour coated jug (Type R156; *c* AD 350–400+ (Young 1977, 150), was found in PH3 and part of a necked bowl (Type R153; *c* AD 325–400+ (*ibid*, 164–6) was found in the stone construction deposits (GF118). Sherds from the Pre-wall and Pre-wall trench deposits were much larger than the average for Area 1 (mean sherd weights of 16.9g and 17.2g respectively) but otherwise the character of this material does not differ markedly from the rest of the Area 1 assemblage. The rim of an Oxfordshire flagon (Type R152), dated *c* AD 240–400+ (Young 1977, 148) was found in one of the pre-wall trenches, while the coarsewares include everted rim and other jar types, dropped flange bowls, dog-dishes and part of a

Black Burnished ware fish-dish, a type generally dated from *c* AD 350 onwards (Seager Smith and Davies 1993, 233). This was found in one of the Pre-wall deposits.

Only 22 sherds, 211g, were recovered from the lynchet soils. This equals approximately 2% of all the sherds from Area 1 and 3% of the total number (802 sherds) from all four areas assigned to the lynchet soils. Oxfordshire colour-coated ware sherds and part of a Black Burnished ware dog-dish was present but the remainder of the sherds were undiagnostic coarsewares.

The mean sherd weight of the material from the ditch, which represents 1.5% of the Area 1 sherds, is only 7.2g and all the sherds are very abraded. Sherds of Oxfordshire colour-coated ware and a small fragment from a necked jar (Type R111) in a sandy greyware fabric were present but the remainder were all undiagnostic.

Thirteen sherds, 153g, were found in the pit in Area 1. The mean sherd weight of this material is above average at 11.7g. Only two datable sherds were recovered, part of a Black Burnished ware everted rim jar (Type R110) from its upper filling and an Oxfordshire brown colour-coated ware beaker rim (Type R154) from the middle filling but neither of these forms can be dated more closely within the late third–fourth centuries+.

Area/Building 2: A total of 4227 sherds (42777g; 37.2% of sherds), could be assigned to this area. This is the largest assemblage recovered from any of the four excavated areas. The mean sherd weight is 10.1g, marginally below that for the assemblage as a whole (10.4g).

In general, the proportions of the various fabrics conform well to the expected pattern (Table FWP64.7). It is, however, notable for its comparatively high proportion of the sandy, grog and flint-gritted fabrics (Fabrics Q104, G100 and F102) predominantly used for the large storage jar forms. Of the 518 sherds of these fabrics, the majority were found in the topsoil, Layer 2 and the Layer 2 occupation deposits both inside and outside the building, with significant numbers of grog-tempered sherds from the lynchet soils. There is little direct evidence to suggest that such vessels were used more frequently or extensively in Area 2 and, in this Area, the mean sherd weight for these fabrics is actually lower than that in the other areas (25g, compared with 34g, 29g and 41g for Areas 1, 3 and 4 respectively).

Again, the majority of the Area 2 sherds were from the upper layers (26% of the total assemblage being from the Topsoil, 4% from Layer 1, 20% from Layer 2 and 25% from the Layer 2 occupation deposits). In total, 3202 sherds were recovered from these layers; 48% (1540 sherds) from deposits deemed to belong inside the building (including layers overlying the walls, partition etc), 38% (1232 sherds) from deposits outside the building while the remaining 13% (430 sherds) were unlocated.

Comparatively little material was associated with the structural components of Building 2. Only 18 sherds, 144g, were found among the outer sarsens and walls of the stone construction phase. The only datable material consisted of body sherds of Oxfordshire ware and one rim sherd from a sandy greyware flanged bowl. A further 156 sherds, 1870g, were found in layers 'under the walls'. In addition to samian, Oxfordshire colour-coated ware was the only other fineware but none of the sherds present were closely datable. Fragments of dropped flanged bowls (Types R102 and R103), bowls with moulded or rolled rims (Types R115 and R116) and jug or handled jar (Type R123) were present among the sandy greywares while a sherd from a large grog-tempered storage jar (Type R112) and one sherd of calcareous coarseware (Fabric C100) were recognised. Sixteen sherds, 344g, were found in the post-holes representing a possible timber construction phase. These include small sherds from two Oxfordshire forms; both are of fourth century date, but one (Type R165) probably post-dates *c* AD 350. Two fourth-century forms (Types R153 and R162) were recognised among the material from Layer 3. The coarsewares included rim fragments from a dropped flange bowl and a 'dog-dish', also late third–fourth-century+ types, but the presence of samian indicates the possibility that other earlier material is also present.

The pit contained only 27 sherds, 344g. The 15 sherds of the very coarse, predominantly oxidised ware (Fabric Q104) present, some of which have pre-firing perforations, are all from the base and lower part of a single vessel. The other sherds were all very small and abraded; a rim fragment from a 'dog-dish' was noted while the Oxfordshire white-colour coated ware sherd was from a mortaria.

A total of 618 sherds, 4051g, was assigned to the lynchet soils. This equals 15% of all the sherds from Area 2 and 77% of all those assigned to lynchet soils in the assemblage as a whole. A wide range of fabrics and vessel forms occurred among this material and, not surprisingly, their mean sherd weight is very low, only 6.5g.

Excavated sections through the ditch in Area 2 produced 77 sherds, 691g. Only two identifiable rim forms were noted, one from a large grog-tempered jar (Type R112) and the other from a greyware jug or handled jar (Type R123). Sherds of Oxfordshire red/brown and white colour-coated ware were noted but the presence of the samian indicates that earlier material may also be present.

Area/Building 3: A total of 2248 sherds, 25656g, was recovered. This equals 21.5% of the total number of sherds recovered; the mean sherd weight is 10.5g.

Samian appears to be concentrated in Area 3 (Table FWP64.7); 72 sherds were recognised which represents just over half the total number present in the assemblage as a whole. Here, the mean sherd weight for this fabric is 6g, higher than that for Areas 2 (4.9g) and 4 (3.8g), although lower than for Area 1 (9.8g) but this latter figure is probably related to the small number of samian sherds found these (only six). Samian sherds occur in all Area 3 deposits, with the exception of the lynchet soils, the ditch filling and Layer 3. Layer 2 was especially prolific (29 sherds), while eight sherds were associated with the Phase 1 occupation deposits and a single sherd was found in the Phase 2 stone construction deposits. The percentage of Black Burnished ware sherds present in Area 3 is also notably greater than among the collections from the other Areas, although a corresponding drop in the percentage of the sandy grey coarsewares offsets this difference. A higher than average percentage of the oxidised sandy coarsewares was also present in Area 3; it is also notable that all the sherds of Rhenish ware and the Dressel 20 amphora were found in this area.

In this area, 26% of all the sherds were found in the Topsoil, 18% in Layer 1/2 and 45% in Layer 2, although in this deposit the mean sherd weight is well below the Area 3 average at only 7.5g. In Area 3, the location of these deposits to areas inside and outside the structure is not as clear-cut as it was for Area 1. However, for the Layer 2 material at least, the distribution appears to be much more even with 35% of the sherds being from inside the building and 38% from outside it although the remaining 29% of sherds were unlocated. A wide range of fabrics, including samian and form types were recovered from these layers and no discrete groups were apparent within them. One of the Dressel 20 amphora sherds was found in the Topsoil, the other in Layer 2 inside the building. Two the Rhenish ware sherds were also from Layer 2 but were found outside the building.

Fifteen sherds, 118g, were found in a ?robber trench in Area 3. These include one fragment of samian and three very small sherds of Rhenish ware. Two sherds from a Dorset Black Burnished ware dropped flange bowl, a late third–fourth-century+ form, were noted and it may be significant that these sherds are by far the largest among this group (excluding these two, the mean sherd weight for the rest of the material from this feature is only 2.4g). All the other sherds are chronologically undiagnostic plain bodies.

A total of 73 sherds, 1105g, was associated with the Phase 2 stone construction of Building 3. The mean sherd weight for this group is comparatively high (15g). New Forest and Oxfordshire colour-coated wares are present and these include a sherd from a fourth-century mortaria (Type R179), a type which becomes increasingly common as the century progresses. Part of a greyware ‘dog-dish’ was identified but the majority of other coarseware sherds are undiagnostic plain bodies or bases. One sherd from a greyware bead rim jar was noted and this, together with the samian sherd may well be residual.

Material associated with the first phase of occupation in Building 3 amounted to a total of 169 sherds, 1377g. Twelve sherds, 42g, were found in the central hearth (GF310); one unidentifiable rim sherd of Oxfordshire red colour-coated ware was noted, the other are all undiagnostic fragments of the three most common coarseware fabrics. Although a larger number of sherds (108 sherds, 756g) were found in the layers under the floor, very little of this material is chronologically diagnostic. Late Roman material includes three calcareous coarseware sherds, New Forest colour-coated ware sherds, one probably from an indented beaker, fragments from an Oxfordshire colour-coated ware beaker (Type R154) and a wall-sided, carinated bowl (Type R157) and part of a sandy greyware 'dog-dish'. Four sherds of samian were also present, including a small rim sherd from a Dr 33 cup. The remaining sherds were from the west hearth but again the dating evidence is not conclusive. The beaker rim of unassigned colour-coated ware (Fabric Q105) and comparatively large sherds from a samian Dr38 bowl and a Dr18/31R or 31R platter were present among this material. The four Oxfordshire sherds present are all small and undiagnostic bodies; a 'dog-dish' was noted among the Black Burnished wares, a necked jar with a flared rim (Type R129) among the sandy greywares while dropped flanged bowls were recorded in both these fabrics.

Only very small quantities of material were found in the other features and deposits in Area 3. Seven sherds, 36g, were found in Layer 3 outside the building. One sherd from a greyware dropped flange bowl was present but the others were all undiagnostic. Twelve sherds, 53g, including a small rim sherd from a grog-tempered bead rim jar, probably of first–second century date, could be assigned to the lynchet soils. One thick-walled, body sherd of coarse, predominantly oxidised ware (Fabric Q104) was found in the Ditch. Two of the Black Burnished ware sherds recorded as SF370 join together and are from the shoulder area of an everted rim jar; the third is a rim fragment from a dropped flange bowl (Type R103). Both these vessels are of late third–fourth-century+ date, the date of the jar sherds being indicated by their characteristic surface finish.

Area 4: Overall, 3356 sherds, 38037g, were found in Area 4, including the single prehistoric sherd noted above. These sherds represent 29.5% of the total number recovered and their mean sherd weight is 11.3g. However, the Area 4 assemblage has been sub-divided so that the material from and around Buildings 4A, 4B/C and the southern extension to Building 4B/C can be considered separately and compared with each other and the collections from Areas/Buildings 1–3.

The percentages of the major fabric types from each of these three areas broadly correspond with the expected pattern (Tables FWP64.7). The high percentage of other finewares from Building 4B/C is accounted for by the sherds, probably from a single vessel, of the white 'pipeclay' colour-coated ware (Fabric Q107). The fabrics used predominantly for large, thick-walled jars (Fabrics Q104, G100 and F102) are comparatively poorly represented in Area 4A, despite the additional presence of the flint with grog-gritted ware (Fabric F102) The only other notable feature of the Area 4 assemblages is the higher proportions of Overwey/Tilford ware (Fabric Q106) and the calcareous coarsewares (Fabric C100) present. Both these fabrics are of fourth-century+ date and their frequency in Area 4 *might* suggest some difference in the chronology of the activity in this area of the site. The lack of discrete groupings discernible within the assemblage, however, means that this is impossible to prove, at least without extensive further analysis outside the scope of the present project.

Building 4A: Over half (55%) of the Area 4 sherds were derived from Building 4A (1855 sherds, 20647g. The mean sherd weight is 11g.

Only 10% of these sherds were found in the Topsoil. Of these, over two-thirds occurred in areas outside the limits of the building itself. By far the largest number of sherds from a single deposit were recovered from a flinty layer which was mostly but not entirely located outside the building. The 718 sherds, 7817g, from this layer represent 39% of the sherds from Area 4A. A further 397

sherds, 4358g, were found in Layer 2. These represent 21% of the assemblage and approximately half of them were found inside the building. Small quantities of samian were found in all three of these layers.

Thirty sherds, 341g, were found in the post-holes. These include four body sherds of Oxfordshire colour-coated ware and Black Burnished ware rim sherds from a 'dog-dish' and an incipient dropped flange bowl (Type R134), a mid second–third century form.

A total of 42 sherds, 255g, were found among the walls of stone construction (Phase 2). Sherds from a narrow-mouthed jar (Type R119) and an incipient flange bowl (Type R134) occurred among the sandy greywares but the Oxfordshire ware sherds were all plain bodies. Sherds of the fourth-century fabrics (Fabric Q106 and C100) were also present. However, the mean sherd weight of these sherds is only 6g and all of them could have fallen among the stones from the layers above. A rim sherd from a Black Burnished ware dropped flange bowl was the only featured sherd to be found among the 23 sherds, 475g, from the inner post-holes of the Phase 1 timber construction.

All the datable material from Layer 3 belongs to the late third–fourth centuries+ although in character this assemblage appears to differ little from the rest of the Area 4A material. Finewares were restricted to New Forest and Oxfordshire types; recognisable forms consisted of an internally flanged bowl (Type R127) from the New Forest and a necked bowl (Type R153), which can be dated to *c* AD 350–400+ (Young 1977, 164–6), from the Oxfordshire region. Dropped flanged bowl forms occur in Black Burnished ware and the sandy greyware fabrics in addition to a range of other bowl/dish (Types R101 and R104), jar (Types R111, R121, R126 and R131) and miscellaneous forms (Type R106) in this latter group. Sherds of the fourth-century+ fabrics (Fabrics Q106 and C100) were also well-represented.

The three sherds recorded as SF286 are all small and abraded and each one is of a different fabric type.

Building 4B/C: A total of 952 sherds, 10784g, was found in this area. This represents 28% of all the Area 4 sherds. The mean sherd weight of material from this structure is also 11g.

A total of 112 sherds, 1251g, or 11% of the assemblage from this area were found in the Topsoil, predominantly from areas outside the building. A further 11% (110 sherds, 1856g) were derived from Layer 2. Most of the sherds assigned to this area were from the structural elements of the building (526 sherds, 6086g), which are considered together here. With the exception of the two sherds of samian and the prehistoric sherd described above which was found in the floor of this building, all the datable material is of late third–fourth-century date, with strong fourth century+ elements. Of the seven Oxfordshire forms identified (Types R157, R159, R176, R179, R182, R189 and R192), five are more closely datable with the lifespan of the industry; one (Type R184) to *c* AD 240–300, three (Types R157, R176 and R179) to the fourth century, the latter form becoming increasingly common as the century progressed, while the remaining one (Type R192) is of mid to late fourth-century date. Other vessel forms include Black Burnished ware dropped flange bowls and 'dog-dishes' (Types R103 and R104), jars with collared and hooked rims (Types R121 and R131) and a dropped flange bowl (Type R128) in the calcareous coarseware fabric and a wide range of jar (Types R110, R111, R113, R119, R121 and R123), bowl (Type R103, R115 and R125) and dish (Types R101 and R104) types in the sandy greywares. Fourth-century+ material, including sherds of Overwey/Tilford ware, dated from *c* AD 325–420 and Oxfordshire mortaria fragments (Types R162 and R179) from forms which become increasingly common as the fourth century progresses, also occurred in the soil on the line of the 'fence' in this area.

Southern Extension to Building 4B/C: Only 548 sherds, 6601g, or 16% of all the Area 4 sherds, were associated with this structure. The mean sherd weight equals 12g. The most notable element of

the assemblage from this area is the almost complete dropped flanged bowl (SF289) found in Layer 2. This form can be paralleled among the calcite-gritted wares from Shakenoak (Brodribb et al 1971, fig 39, 377–9) but it is not common at OD XII, the only other example occurring among the material from Structure 4B/C itself.

Comment

The difficulties of dating the assemblage with any precision are apparent from the above discussion. None of the pottery types present are as well known or dated as the Oxfordshire and Dorset Black Burnished ware industries and even these industries are inherently conservative during the later third and fourth centuries. There appear to be few changes in the repertoire of the Oxford potters during the fourth century and relatively few of the vessel types can be attributed to the period after *c* AD 350 (Young 1977, 134).

Similarly, the characteristically 'late Roman' Black Burnished ware forms (the 'dog-dishes', dropped flange bowls and everted rim jars) all begin in the later third century and continue well into the fourth, if not the fifth century. The north Wiltshire kilns are poorly published and the chronology of their products little understood and, with the exception of Cirencester (Rigby 1982 a and b; Keely 1986), few stratified deposits from occupation sites to which these wares were distributed have been published either.

Fourth century+ material, such as the Overwey/Tilford ware (Fabric Q106), the calcareous coarsewares (Fabric C100) and the very coarse, predominantly oxidised sandy ware (Fabric Q104), is undoubtedly present at OD XII. However, these three fabrics account for only a very small proportion of the assemblage (3.6%; 417 sherds).

The high level of 'residuality' in the assemblage, hinted at by the samian and some of the grog-tempered wares, especially the bead rim jars, can be taken to reflect the fact that OD XII overlies earlier fields. It lends support to our theory of settlement shift which is further suggested, though not by any means shown conclusively, by the overall nature of the pottery assemblage. The distribution of the various wares and variation in mean sherd weight trends towards the presence of a greater proportion of 'residual' wares in the general site layers and lynchet soils with lower than average mean sherd sizes. Contexts associated with the construction phases of the buildings, and with cut features such as post-holes, tend to produce larger sherds overall and any datable pottery tends to be later (third–fourth century+) rather than earlier. The matter is clearly complicated by the subsequent robbing of the stone buildings and later ploughing but there is a suggestion here that much of the earlier Roman wares relate to manuring of fields from nearby settlement while the later material is more likely to be associated with *in situ* settlement represented by OD XII.

Vessel Forms

New Forest wares (Fulford (1975a) types given in brackets)

Colour-coated wares:

Type R161 Indented beakers (type 27). c. AD 270–400+.

Type R166 Indented beakers; painted decoration between indents (type 42). *c* AD 300–330/340.

Type R173 Small cups (type 53). *c* AD 270–400+.

Type R177 Flagons/flasks; globular bodies narrow necks; precise details of form uncertain (types 1–10). 4th century.

Parchment ware:

Type R127/R185 Externally carinated open bowl; plain rim, internal flange below rim (type 89). *c* AD 270–400+ (Figure FWP64.35, 45; PRN 11705)

Oxfordshire wares (Young (1977) types given in brackets)

Red and brown colour-coated wares:

Type R107 Red and brown colour-coated ware rim frags too small to assign to specific form; mostly from bowls. *c* AD 240–400+.

Type R137 Closed form (interior not well-finished and colour-coat only patchy here), ?lamp. Survives as *c* 75% of a wheelmade ?disc, up to 50mm of vessel wall preserved. Sherd perforated by two opposing, roughly circular holes, made before vessel fired; stump of 'handle' or, less probably, 'foot', angled towards centre of vessel, applied to exterior surface over third perforation. Further traces of applied clay, opposite the first, along broken edge, insufficient to ascertain whether this covered fourth perforation (Figure FWP64.36, 55; PRN 12733).

Type R150 Flagon; wide disc rim (type C4). *c* AD 240–350.

Type R152 Long necked flagon; flange half-way down neck, single handle (type C8). Most common Oxfordshire flagon type. *c* AD 240–400+.

Type R153 Necked bowls; out-turned rim, full, curved body. Rouletting common at neck and base of vessel wall (type C75). *c* AD 325–400+.

Type R154 Beakers; long, sloping necks, globular bodies (type C22). Most common Oxfordshire beaker type. Type number also used for beaker sherds which cannot be assigned to more specific type. *c* AD 240–400+.

Type R155 Indented beakers (type C20, 152). *c* AD 270–400+.

Type R156 Jug; pulley-wheel rim (type C14). *c* AD 350–400+.

Type R157 Wall-sided carinated bowl; beaded rim; sometimes rouletted (type C81). Fourth century.

Type R158 Globular bowl; everted rim; often rouletted (type C74). No dating evidence.

Type R159 Flanged bowl copying samian Dr 38 (type C51). Very common Oxfordshire form. *c* AD 240–400+.

Type R160 Narrow-necked jar; out-turned rim, may be grooved on upper or outer surface (type C16). *c* AD 270–400+.

Type R163 Shallow bowl; beaded rim, copying samian Dr 31 (type C45). *c* AD 270–400+.

Type R165 Large handled jar/jug; rounded rim (type C13). *c* AD 350–400+.

Type R169 Wide-mouthed, necked jar (Young 1977, 152, type C18). c. AD 270–400+.

Type R171 Deep, round bodied open bowl; double bead rim, sometimes rouletted (type C71). *c* AD 300–400+.

Type R174 Shallow bowl; wide rim rolled under at tip, copying samian Dr 36 (type C47). *c* AD 270–400+.

Type R176 Small, hemispherical cup; footing base (type C110). *c* AD ?300–400+.

Type R178 Shallow bowl; wide rim, upturned at tip; probably based on samian Dr 36 and Curle 15 (type C49). *c* AD 240–400+.

Type R179 Mortaria; upright rim, angular flange (type C100). Fourth century; type became more common as century progressed.

Type R180 Shallow, straight-sided dish; sometimes grooved beneath the rim (type C94). Fourth century.

Type R182 Mortaria copying samian Dr 45 (type C97). *c* AD 240–400+.

Type R186 Round-bodied open bowl, probably based on samian Dr 37; often rouletted (type C55). *c* AD 240–400+.

Type R187 Wall-sided carinated bowl; beaded rim, cordon mid-way down wall (type C84). Second half fourth century.

Type R188 Shallow bowl/platter; hammerhead rim (type C41). *c* AD 300–400+.

Type R189 Flagon; expanded pulley-wheel rim (type C3). *c* AD 270–400+.

Type R192 Wall-sided carinated bowl; beaded rim, impressed decoration (type C83). Mid–late fourth century.

White colour-coated ware:

Type R162 Mortarium; upstanding rim, squat flange folded close to body; body and flange may be grooved (type WC7). From *c* AD 240 onwards but only became popular during fourth century.

Type R167 Necked jar; upright or slightly everted rim (type WC2). *c* AD 240–400+.

Type R170 Mortarium; upstanding rim, wide flat flange, rounded at tip (type WC5). *c* AD 240–300.

Type R175 Mortarium; upstanding rim, wide flat flange, hooked at tip (type WC4). *c* AD 240–300.

Type R181 Wall-sided carinated bowl (type WC3). *c* AD 240–400+.

Parchment ware:

Type R151 Shallow dish; simple up-turned rim, grooved exterior (type P14). *c* AD 300–400+.

Type R172/R183 Wall-sided bowl; moulded at rim and carination (type P24). *c* AD 240–400+.

White ware:

Type R164 Mortarium; upstanding rim, squat flange folded close to body; body and flange may be grooved (type M22). *c* AD 240–400+.

Type R168 Shallow bowl; out-turned rim; ?based on samian Dr 36 (type W52). *c* AD 240–400+.

Type R184 Mortarium; upstanding rim, wide flat flange, hooked at tip (type M17). *c* AD 240–300.

Type R194 Mortarium; upstanding rim, wide flat flange, rounded at tip (type M18). *c* AD 240–300.

Other fabric types

Type R100 Rim frags too small to assign to specific type. Mostly from various necked jar types.

Type R101 Upright, very slightly beaded rim, sometimes with groove beneath, from open/very wide-mouthed form with slightly rounded walls. ?Shallow dish or platter. Only small frags.

Type R102 Straight-sided bowl/dish; small, rounded and very slightly dropped flange. Precise details of profile vary (Figure FWP64.34, 2, 3; PRNs 10269, 10945).

Type R103 More 'developed' version of Type R102: straight-sided bowls/dishes; wider, flatter flange, dropped significantly below level of rim. Precise details of profile vary considerably (Figure FWP64.34, 4–10; PRNs 11727, 13078, 11983, 10835, 11702, 10286, 11982). The dropped flanged bowl/dish is one commonest and widely distributed forms produced by the Dorset Black Burnished ware industry during the late third–fourth centuries+ (Seager Smith and Davies 1993, 235, type 25). It was copied by all the major industries in southern Britain at this time (Fulford 1975a, 92, types 5 and 6; Young 1977, 220, type R47; Lyne and Jefferies 1979, 46, class 5B) as well as many of the more minor ones including that located to the west of Swindon (Anderson 1979, fig 8, 11).

Type R104 Shallow dishes; circular plan; straight or slightly convex sides and flat bases. 'Dog-dishes'. Rims usually plain but some are beaded while others have shallow groove beneath rim (Figure FWP64.34, 11; PRN 12083). Form is present among products of the Dorset Black Burnished ware industry probably from late first century AD onwards (Gilliam 1976, 73–7), with significant increase in numbers from late second century. Becomes abundant in all areas of Roman Britain during late third–fourth centuries + and was widely copied in a variety of coarseware fabrics at almost all production centres dating to this period.

Type R105 Shallow dishes; oval plan; plain rims, straight or slightly convex sides, flat base. 'Fish-dishes' (Figure FWP64.34, 12; PRN 10283). Small, 'ear-shaped' strap handles at narrow ends diagnostic; small frags may be mis-identified as Type R104. Black Burnished ware examples confined to levels dated *c* AD 350–450 at Greyhound Yard, Dorchester (Seager Smith and Davies 1993, 233, type 21); examples in sandy greyware fabrics from Cirencester dated late third–fourth century+ (Keely 1986, fig 109, 143, 146–9).

Type R106 Lids; all forms (Figure FWP64.34, 13; PRN 12244). Widely produced throughout Roman period (eg, Fulford 1975a, 98, type 23; Young 1977, 199, type O56, 226, type R76).

Type R108 Small–medium sized jars; sharply out-bent rim, little or no neck. Characteristic 'kink' (?left by a shaping tool during manufacture) on underside of out-bent rim (Figure FWP64.34, 14; PRN 10280). Noted among sandy greywares from Hermitage, Swindon (Seager Smith in prep).

Type R109 Open bowl; triangular, sometimes slightly flattened, rim; very slight grooves on upper surface of some rims, exterior may be ribbed (Figure FWP64.34, 15; PRN 10898).

Type R110 Jars; everted rims; external diameter of rim equal to or greater than greatest diameter of body (Figure FWP64.34, 16, 17; PRNs 10946, 10886). Characteristic Black Burnished ware form (Seager Smith and Davies 1993, 231, type 3) of late third–fourth centuries+; frequently copied at all major production centres (Fulford 1975a, 100, type 30; Young 1977, 216, type 27; Lyne and Jefferies 1979, 42, class 3B).

Type R111 High-shouldered, necked jars; upright or slightly everted rims, terminals of which often beaded or slightly hooked. Some examples have slight groove or offset at junction of shoulder and neck (Figure FWP64.34, 18–22; PRNs 10259, 10952,

12037, 11715, 10527–8). May include examples and imitations of second–third century Black Burnished ware forms (vessels with rim diameter less than greatest diameter of body: Seager Smith and Davies 1993, 231, type 2). Similar vessels produced at Whitehill Farm (Anderson 1979, fig 8, 5) and Purton (Anderson 1980, type 2) to the west of Swindon, in New Forest (Fulford 1975a, 100, type 30.3 and 30.4) and Oxford region (Young 1977, 216, type R26).

Type R112 Large, thick-walled jars; heavy rolled rims; precise details of rim profile vary even within single vessel (Figure FWP64.34, 23–4; PRNs 11031, 12399; Figure FWP64.35, 25; PRN 12782). Produced in wide variety of fabrics from grog-tempered Savernake wares of first–second centuries to sandy greywares of late third–fourth centuries (ie, Fulford 1975a, 103, type 40; Lyne and Jefferies 1979, 51, class 10).

Type R113 Jars; relatively restricted neck, out-bent rim, exterior surface of which grooved or moulded (Figure FWP64.35, 26, 27; PRNs 12607, 12300). Similar forms produced in Oxfordshire region in variety of fabrics, including sandy greywares *c* AD 300–400+ (Young 1977, types R23, O11, W34). Examples of form occur in Period III deposits at the Beeches, Cirencester (Keely 1986, fig 111, 198 and 200.)

Type R114 Large, moderately thick-walled jars; rolled rim, pinched during manufacture giving rope-like appearance (Figure FWP64.35, 28; PRN 12791). Common late Roman form produced by variety of centres including New Forest (Fulford 1975a, type 40) and Wareham/Poole Harbour Black Burnished ware industry (Seager Smith and Davies 1993, type 12). Similar vessels, although with distinctive features, also form part of repertoire of later Alice Holt industry (Lyne and Jefferies 1979, class 10, fig 41) but not among products of Oxfordshire region (Young 1977).

Type R115 Large wall-sided bowl; moulded at internally bevelled rim (Figure FWP64.35, 29; PRN 11306). No precise parallels although broadly similar forms occur among products of New Forest (Fulford 1975a, type 82) and Oxfordshire (Young 1977, type R73) industries.

Type R116 Bowl; a high, rounded shoulder, short upright neck, rolled rim (Figure FWP64.35, 30; PRN 11020/10403). Similar vessels produced at Purton (Anderson 1980, types 3 and 4); some Oxfordshire reduced ware colanders have similar rims (Young 1977, fig 84, 80.3).

Type R117 Colanders; all forms (Figure FWP64.36, 57; PRN 10405). Also used for body or base sherds with multiple, small, closely-spaced, prefiring perforations. Strainers produced in reduced ware fabrics by Oxfordshire potters mid first–third centuries (Young 1977, type R80); also present among products of Alice Holt industry where became more important after *c* AD 270 (Lyne and Jefferies 1979, class 5C).

Type R118 Small jars or beakers (and ?jugs); narrow mouths, long sloping shoulders/necks; rim beaded, sometimes slightly flattened top, one or more shallow, incised grooves beneath (Figure FWP64.35, 31, 32; PRNs 10860, 12141).

Type R119 Narrow-mouthed jars, beakers and/or jugs; long sloping neck, a simple rim, expanded externally. At least one example has traces of applied handle immediately beneath rim (Figure FWP64.35, 33, 34; PRNs 10427, 12038).

Type R120 Bowl; inturned rim with roughly triangular cross-section, upper surface flattened. Incised grooves on exterior beneath rim (Figure FWP64.35, 35; PRN 11306). Comparable vessels produced in New Forest *c* AD 270–350 (Fulford 1975a, type 7.1); some strainers made in Alice Holt/Farnham area have very similar rims (Lyne and Jefferies 1979, fig 33, 5C.2 and 5C.3).

Type R121 Jars; everted, collared rim with slight inward cupping. Exterior may be horizontally rilled (Figure FWP64.35, 36; PRN 10470). Similar to Types R113, but without moulding on rim outer, and R131 but not undercut. Parallels among sandy greywares of New Forest (Fulford 1975a, type 30.1) and Alice Holt (Lyne and Jefferies 1979, fig 29, 3C.2–5) industries including Overwey/Tilford group. Similar vessels in shell-tempered ware occur at the Hermitage (Seager Smith in prep) and in contexts dated *c* AD 325–400 at Wanborough (Seager Smith forthcoming a). Common form at the Beeches, Cirencester (Keely 1986, fig 111, 194, 195, 197,199).

Type R122 High-shouldered bead rim jars; precise details of profile and rim vary considerably. Bead rim bowls may be included in this category especially if sherds are small or badly abraded (Figure FWP64.35, 37; PRN 12726).

Type R123 Jugs or handled jars; rim externally expanded to give collar-like effect; may be plain or grooved in centre of exterior surface give pulley-wheel type rim. Neck constricted and cylindrical, body globular. Upper attachment of one or more handles level with or immediately beneath rim (Figure FWP64.35, 38, 39; PRNs 10746, 12424).

Type R124 Narrow-mouthed jars with a short neck and a squared rim. Precise details differ but the upper and outer edge of the rim is generally grooved; the groove(s) in the upper surface possibly acting as a lid seat. Body shape is uncertain but likely to be fairly globular (Figure FWP64.35, 40, 41; PRNs 12003, 10873). This form can be paralleled among the greyware products of the three major late Roman pottery industries in southern Britain where it was produced from c. AD 240–400+ (Fulford 1975a, types 31–35; Young 1977, type R17; Lyne and Jefferies 1979, class 1A).

Type R125 High-shouldered necked bowls; out-bent rim, sometimes slightly hooked (Figure FWP64.35, 42, 43; PRNs 11624, 11490). Similar to some vessels produced at Purton (Anderson 1980, 57, type 3).

Type R126 Small jar or large beaker; simple flared rim, terminal of which slightly beaded. Body shape uncertain, likely to be bag-shaped (Figure FWP64.35, 44; PRN 11512).

Type R 127 Carinated bowl; plain rim, internal flange, New Forest parchment ware (E160) (Fulford 1975a, type 89).

Type R128 Straight-sided bowl/dish; downward drooping flange, triangular cross-section. Exterior may be horizontally rilled (Figure FWP64.35, 46; PRN 13456). Parallels among calcite-gritted wares from period A.3a (*c* AD 250–350) at Shakenoak (Brodribb *et al* 1971, fig 39, 377–9) and in period III contexts at the Beeches (Keely 1986, fig 107, 107, 109).

Type R129 Narrow-mouthed jar (?); exaggerated flared and flanged rim, flange rising above level of rim providing deep lid seat (Figure FWP64.35, 47; PRN 12139). Similar rim in imitation black burnished ware fabric occurs at the Beeches (Keely 1986, fig 110, 171).

Type R130 Large bowl; heavy, moulded rim, generally internally bevelled to provide lid seat (Figure FWP64.35, 48; PRN 12261). Typical New Forest product, produced throughout life of industry, *c* AD 270–400 (Fulford 1975a, 93–4, type 8) not known from any other late Roman kiln sites in south.

Type R131 Jars; everted, almost triangular, undercut or 'hooked' rim. Exterior frequently covered by closely-spaced horizontal rilling (Figure FWP64.35, 49; PRN 13260; Figure FWP64.35, 50; PRN 13465). Parallels among sandy greywares of New Forest (Fulford 1975a, type 30.3) and Alice Holt (Lyne and Jefferies 1979, fig 29, 3C.1, 7–9, 11, 18) including Overwey/Tilford group. Similar vessels in shell-tempered ware

occur at the Hermitage (Seager Smith in prep) and in variety of fabrics at the Beeches (Keely 1986, fig 111, 196, 197, 201–9).

Type R132 Wide-mouthed, necked bowl; flat, reeded rim. Type represented among New Forest (types 9 and 10) dated *c* AD 300–350 (Fulford 1975a, 94, fig 31) and Alice Holt products (class 5E) dated *c* AD 220–350 (Lyne and Jefferies 1979, 47, fig 35).

Type R133 Jar; simple flared rim, long, sloping shoulder. Interior slope of rim provides lid seat (Figure FWP64.36, 51, 52; PRNs 12322, 12403).

Type R134 Straight-sided (occasionally chamfered) bowls/dishes; flat, grooved flange. 'Incipient dropped flange' bowls/dishes.

Type R135 Round-bodied jar/bowl; everted rim (Figure FWP64.36, 53; PRN 12556). Characteristically late Roman Black Burnished ware form. Parallels in fourth century + contexts at Poundbury (Davies and Hawkes 1987, fig 88, 41) and Worgret (Herne 1992, fig 14, 56), in late third–early fourth century collapse deposits at the Dorchester Bath House site (Andrews forthcoming) and in a Period 10 deposit (*c* AD 350–450) at Greyhound Yard, Dorchester (Seager Smith and Davies 1993, fig 149, 309) and elsewhere.

Type R136 Long necked carinated bowl; bead rim (Figure FWP64.36, 54: PRN 12767).

Medieval Pottery

One small sherd (3g) of thirteenth–fourteenth century medieval pottery, was found in the topsoil overlying Area/Building 1 (GF64). The fabric is a moderately coarse sandy ware with an off-white or pale green glaze on the exterior surface (Fabric Q400), probably from an Oxfordshire source.

Fabric Q400 Hard, moderately coarse fabric containing moderate amounts of sub-rounded quartz, <1mm across and rare iron oxides <0.5mm. Wheelmade. Oxidised; off-white to pinkish-buff with an off-white or pale green glaze on exterior.

List of illustrated vessels

(Figure FWP64.34)

1. Type R101, fabric Q100. PRN 11297, GF9, Area 2, layer 3, top of lynchet. Same context as no 35.
2. Type R102, fabric Q100. PRN 10269, GF121, Area 1, pre-Building 1, boundary ditch.
3. Type R102, fabric E101. PRN 10945, GF95, Area 2, layer 2, outside Building 2.
4. Type R103, fabric E101; traces of burnished decoration (intersecting arcs) on exterior. PRN 11727, GF260, Area 3, layer 1/2, over Building 3.
5. Type R103, fabric E101. PRN 13078, GF166, Area 4A, in lynchet.
6. Type R103, fabric Q100. PRN 11983, GF291, Area 3, layer 1/2, over Building 3.
7. Type R103, fabric Q100. PRN 10835, GF74, Area 2, layer 2, inside Building 2.
8. Type R103, fabric G100. PRN 11702, GF260, Area 3, layer 1/2, over Building 3/ in wall stones.
9. R103, fabric E100. PRN 10286, GF134, Area 1, layer 4, pre-Building 1/ B1 construction. Same context as no 12.

10. Type R103, fabric Q100. PRN 11982, GF291, Area 3, layer 1/2, over Building 3.

11. Type R104, plain rim, fabric Q100. PRN 12083, GF311, Area 3, layer 3, Building 3, floor.

12. Type R105, fabric E100. PRN 10283, GF134, Area 1, layer 4, pre-Building 1/ B1 construction. Same context as no 9.

13. Type R106, externally thickened, flattened knob, fabric Q100. PRN 12244, GF167, Area 4 B/C, topsoil.

14. Type R108, fabric Q100. PRN 10280, GF118, Area 1, layer 4, pre-Building 1/ B1 construction.

15. Type R109, fabric Q100. PRN 10898, GF81, Area 2, layer 2 outside Building 2.

16. Type R110, fabric E101. PRN 10946, GF95, Area 2, layer 2, outside Building 2.

17. Type R110, fabric E101. PRN 10886, GF81, Area 2, layer 2, outside Building 2.

18. Type R111, fabric Q100. PRN 10259, GF104, Area 1, layer 4, pre-Building 1/ B1 construction, in trench.

19. Type R111, fabric Q100. PRN 10952, GF95, Area 2, layer 2, outside Building 2.

20. Type R111, fabric Q100. PRN 12037, GF324, Area 3, layer 1/2, over Building 2.

21. Type R111, fabric Q101. PRN 11715, GF260, Area 3, layer 1/2, over Building 2.

22. Type R111, fabric Q103. PRN 10527-8, GF52, Area 2, layer 1.

23. Type R112; rim finger-impressed on exterior; fingered also inside at rim/body junction, fabric Q104. PRN 11031, GF119, Area 2, layer 1A, inside Building 2.

24. Type R112, fabric F102. PRN 12399, GF162, Area 4A, layer 2, occupation of Building 2.

Figure FWP64.35

25. Type R112, fabric G100. PRN 12782, GF230, Area 4A, layer 2, Building 4, floor layer. Same context as no 54.

26. Type R113, fabric Q101. PRNs 10317, 10385; GF2, Area 2, layer 2, Building 2, occupation/ GF15, Area 2, layer 1, topsoil.

27. Type R113, fabric Q106. PRN 12607, GF175, Area 4A, layer 2.

28. Type R114, fabric Q104. PRNs 12300, 12791, GF221, Area 4B/C, topsoil/ GF231, Area 4A, Building 4, floor layer.

29. Type R115, fabric Q100. PRNs 11019, 10401, GF15, Area 2, layer 1 / GF117, Area 2, layer 2, outside Building 2, ?occupation. Same contexts as no 30.

30. Type R116, fabric Q100. PRNs 11020, 10403; GF15, Area 2, layer 1 / GF117, Area 2, layer 2, outside Building 2, ?occupation. Same contexts as no 29.

31. Type R118, fabric Q101. PRN 10860, GF77, Area 2, layer 2. Same context as no 41.

32. Type R118, fabric Q105. PRN 12141, GF294, Area 3, Building 3, early phase.

33. Type R119, fabric Q100. PRN 10427, GF17, Area 2, layer 1.

34. Type R119, fabric Q100. PRN12038, GF324, Area 3, layer 1/2.

35. Type R120, fabric Q100; two horizontal incised grooves on exterior. PRN 11306, GF9, Area 2, layer 3, top of lynchet. Same context as no 1.

36. Type R121, fabric Q100. PRN 10470, GF31, Area 2, layer 1.

37. Type R122, fabric G100. PRN 12726, GF210, Area 4A, layer 2.

38. Type R123, fabric Q100. PRN 10746, GF45, Area 2, layer 2, Building 2, walls.

39. Type R123, Q100. PRN 12424, GF162, Area 4A, layer 2, occupation inside Building 4.

40. Type R124, fabric Q100. PRN 12003, GF293, Area 3, layer 1/2.

41. Type R124, fabric Q100. PRN 10873, GF77, Area 2, layer 2. Same context as no. 31.

42. Type R125, fabric Q100. PRN 11624, GF302, Area 3, topsoil.

43. Type R125, fabric Q101. PRN 11490, GF254, Area 3, topsoil.

44. Type R126, fabric Q100. PRN 11512, GF254, Area 3, topsoil.

45. Type R127, New Forest parchment ware (E160), PRNs 11705, 11965, GF260/291, Area 3, layer 1/2, topsoil.

46. Type R128, exterior surface rilled, fabric C100. PRN 13456, SF289, GF257, Area 4B/C, layer 2.

47. Type R129, fabric Q100. PRN 12139, GF304, Area 3, Building 3, layer 3, ?in hearth.

48. Type R130, impressed decoration on exterior of rim, fabric Q100. PRN 12261, GF173, Area 4A, topsoil.

49. Type R131, exterior surface rilled, fabric Q100. PRN 13260, GF184, Area 4, layer 3, inside Building 4.

Figure FWP64.36

50. Type R131, exterior surface rilled, fabric C100. PRN 13465, GF267, Area 3, ditch filling (ditch unlocated).

51. Type R133, fabric Q100, PRNs 12322, 13056, GF221/227, Area 4B/C, topsoil.

52. Type R133, fabric G100. PRN 12403, GF162, Area 4, layer 2, Building 4, occupation.

53. Type R135, Black Burnished ware (E101). PRN 12556, GF174, Area 4A, layer 2.

54. Type R136, fabric Q100. PRN 12767, GF230, Area 4A, layer 2, Building 4, floor layer. Same context as no 25.

55. Type R137, Oxfordshire colour-coated ware (E170). PRN 12733, GF210, Area 4A, layer 2.

56. Lower part of globular-bodied jar or flagon, fabric Q101. PRN 11933, GF281, Area 3, layer 2, outside Building 3.

57. Colander base, fabric Q100. PRN 10405, GF15, Area 2, topsoil.

Ceramic Building Material

by Nicholas A Wells

A total of 379 fragments of ceramic building material (CBM), weighing 20,081g, was examined. Despite the quantity, no complete tiles were recovered, though it was possible to partially reconstruct a few. In all, 93% (by number) was found in stratified contexts.

Methods

All CBM fragments were quantified by number and weight according to form, dimensions (where surviving complete) and fabric. Details of diagnostic fragments were recorded, as was the presence of any distinguishing features, such as decoration. Material from stratified contexts was then analysed spatially (by area), the ultimate aim being to recover the distribution of certain forms. No attempt at a detailed fabric analysis has been attempted although they have been defined on a fairly broad level, with the aim of discerning some general correlation between fabric and form.

The CBM is described here according to Brodribb's (1987) classification listed according to Brodribb's established classifications. Table FWP64.2 list all the CBM by area.

Tegulae

Four fragments of *tegulae* were identified, one unstratified. None was complete, although a fragment in Layer 2 (Area 2) possibly exhibits a cut-away.

Pedalites

Four fragments of possible *pedalites*, one unstratified, were identified. One exhibits comb-incised keying. Another, found in Area 2, has two shallow lateral incisions which may also result from keying.

Box flue tiles

Two fragments of box flue tile were found, one of which, found in Area 4, exhibits comb-incised keying. The other, from Area 2, has no further embellishment, but may possibly be an half-box flue.

Distribution and discussion

No CBM form is concentrated in any particular area. However 68% of the total was recovered from Area 2. In this area, most was found in Layer 2, both within and outside the structure. All material was fragmented and highly abraded, a feature common in all areas.

This distribution is mirrored by the ceramic assemblage (see *Pottery*) and of sandstone roof tiles (see *Worked and utilised stone*). The highly abraded nature of all this material suggests that it had a previous use and, the CBM does not seem to have been used on site as roof tile/bricks. It is probable that much of the CBM recovered from OD XII, and possibly also the stone roof tiles, was deliberately dumped, probably as hardcore, to provide the basis for a floor and/or hard-standing inside and outside the buildings. The source for the material could easily have been the earlier settlement associated with the underlying fields.

If this is the case, Area 3 is likely to have had an earthen floor, as only four fragments of CBM were recovered there. Area 1 had material distributed evenly throughout, while Area 4 had a smaller quantity of material (37 pieces), mostly concentrated in Layer 2.

Ceramic objects

by Nicholas A. Wells

Fourteen ceramic objects were identified, all fashioned from pottery sherds. These comprise mostly discs or counters, with one spindlewhorl.

Counters

Thirteen sherds of pottery show evidence of having been smoothed and shaped to form circular discs, probably for use as counters/gaming pieces (Crummy 1983, 93–4). Nine are in Oxfordshire colour-coated ware (fabric E170), three in coarse sandy greywares and one in Black Burnished ware. Diameters range from 14mm to 34mm; there is a tendency for the Oxfordshire ware counters to be smaller, with four examples less than 20mm in diameter. The greyware and BB1 counters range from 22mm to 34mm in diameter. The counters came from all areas of the site.

Spindlewhorl

A spindlewhorl manufactured from a grog tempered pot sherd was found in Pit 3 in Area 1 (Figure FWP64.37, 1; FWP 39b, Cat No 14). It is 25mm in diameter and 7mm thick, with a central perforation 5mm in diameter.

Daub

by Nicholas A Wells

A total of 54 fragments of daub (1324g), was recovered from excavations at OD XII. By far the largest amount was found within layers of Area 3, where 29 fragments (1048g), was recovered. The daub here was predominantly buff coloured with very frequent, moderately coarse to coarse (<5mm) calcareous and calcined flint inclusions. The only daub to show any degree of application was found in Area 4. Here 12 fragments (154g) of a brown calcareous daub show one long face with a short side – evidently from the corner of a room. The back of the face is striated lengthways from which it seems that the daub was applied to a wooden beam. What appears to be an incomplete nail-hole is present. Perhaps significantly, only one fragment of daub was found in Area 2.

Shale and jet objects

by Lorraine Mepham

One shale spindlewhorl (Figure FWP64.37, 2; FWP 39b, Cat No 1) and one jet bead (Figure FWP64.37, 4; FWP 39b, Cat No 2) were recovered from OD XII. The spindlewhorl is biconical; this object came from the occupation layer in Area 1. The jet bead, of annular form, was a topsoil find in Area 4.

Worked bone

by Nicholas A Wells

Two objects of worked bone were recovered. The first is the tip of a decorated hair pin (Figure FWP64.37, 3; FWP 39b, Cat No 1), comparable with Crummy's type 2 pins from Colchester (1983, no 441), a type which has a wide date range throughout the Romano-British period. The pin came

from a ditch fill in Area 2. The second object is a small length of curved strip, width 7mm, possibly from a bracelet; this came from the first phase occupation layers in Area 3.

Glass beads

by Nicholas A Wells

A total of seven glass beads was found. All are of typical Roman form and fall into three broad groups, as defined by Guido (1978).

Short cylinder beads

Four opaque green, short cut cylinder beads were found (Figure FWP64.37, 5; FWP 39b, Cat No 2). They range in length from 3mm to 5.5mm and are 4–5mm in diameter, with a central perforation.

Long cylinder bead

One bead is of long cylinder type (Figure FWP64.37, 6; FWP 39b, Cat No 5), 9mm in length and 3mm in diameter, with a central perforation.

Long polygonal beads

The remaining two beads, both translucent sea-green in colour, are long polygonal types (Figure FWP64.37, 7, FWP 39b, Cat No 6). These are, respectively, 10mm and 9mm in length, with diameters of 5mm and 4.5mm.

Five of the beads were found within Area 4, two from Layer 3 within Building 4 and three from the flinty layer to the south east (Layer 2). This group comprises three of the short cut cylinders, the long cylinder and one of the polygonal beads; some or all of these may have derived from the same item of jewellery. It may be noted that a jet bead was also found within Area 4, this one from the topsoil (see *Shale and jet objects*). The other two glass beads came from, respectively, Area 3 (topsoil) and Area 1 (Layer 2).

(Figure FWP64.37)

Miscellaneous illustrated objects

1. Spindlewhorl made from a pottery sherd, grog-tempered fabric. GF143, Area 1, Pit 3. FWP 39b, Cat No 14
2. Biconical shale spindlewhorl, complete. SF35, Area 1, Building 1, occupation. FWP 39b, Cat No 1
3. Decorated head from a hairpin. SF105, Area 2, ditch. FWP 39b, Cat No 1
4. Annular jet bead. SF271, Area 4B/C, topsoil. FWP 39b, Cat No 2
5. Short cut cylinder bead, opaque green. SF246, Area 4A, layer 3, inside Building 3. FWP 39b, Cat No 2
6. Long cylinder bead, translucent sea-green. SF163, Area 4A, layer 2. FWP 39b, Cat No 5
7. Long polygonal bead, translucent sea-green. SF248, Area 4A, layer 3, inside Building 3. FWP 39b, Cat No 6

Glass

by Sally Cottam, Jennifer Price and Sally Worrell

The excavations at OD XII produced 226 fragments of Roman glass, 221 from vessels and 5 from window panes (Figure FWP64.38). A summary of the glass is presented in Table FWP.8. The distribution of glass is shown in Figure FWP64.27.

Poor quality pale green and yellow green glass is ubiquitous in late Roman assemblages and as such is an effective chronological indicator. Yellow–green glass is suggested to be more common in the later part of the fourth century (Cool 1995, 12). Only one fragment from the body of a blue–green prismatic bottle may be attributed to the first–early third centuries; the rest of the assemblage belongs entirely to the fourth century. It is clear that the assemblage from OD XII is almost exclusively late and therefore constitutes a notable addition to current knowledge concerning the range of vessels in use during the last decades of Roman Britain. Other interesting features of this assemblage include the homogeneity in colour of the majority of the fragments, the abundance of drinking vessels, especially conical beakers, the virtual absence of closed vessel forms and the presence of more unusual forms such as the late mould-blown vessels.

As is typical on late Roman sites, the assemblage is dominated by drinking vessels, with cups and beakers representing over 73% of the fragments with identifiable forms. In addition to the more everyday vessel types, there are sixteen fragments of late mould-blown cups and beakers (FWP 39b, Cat Nos 1–9). Also of interest are the very thick rim fragments from beakers or small bowls (FWP 39b, Cat Nos 19–21) which can be attributed to the second half of the fourth century. The presence of the cup or beaker fragments with the thick, applied vertical trail (FWP 39b, Cat No 29) and the trailed base-ring (FWP 39b, Cat No 58) suggests that the site may have continued in use into the fifth century. There are no vessels of great luxury. There is very little window glass which suggests that the windows of the buildings were not glazed (though there is one fragment of lead window came; see *Lead objects*; FWP 39b, Cat No 1).

Sixteen pale green bubbly fragments with mould-blown decoration were found representing a minimum of four vessels; two convex cups and two straight-sided beakers. Hemispherical cups and conical beakers are extremely common on sites throughout the fourth century, but mould-blown examples are far less prolific. Mould-blown hemispherical cups have been recognised more commonly than mould-blown conical beakers, but at OD XII they are equal in numbers.

Mould-blown hemispherical cups decorated with a ring of arcading below the rim and a graduated wide-meshed net pattern or with festoons or hexagonal honeycomb have been found throughout the Roman world. A number of examples are known from the north-west provinces, in particular the Rhineland area. The principal pattern on British finds is hexagonal honeycomb with or without a ring of arcading below the rim. Examples are known from, for instance York Minster (Cool 1995, 355, no14, fig 142), Fishbourne Bay, Isle of Wight (Price and Cottam 1995, fig 6) and Vindolanda (Price 1985, 210, no 31, fig 77).

Mould-blown conical beakers have also been noted throughout the Roman world, but they do not seem to occur commonly within the north-western provinces, except in Britain. Here there are fragments from Wroxeter (unpublished) and Brook Street, Winchester (Price and Cottam 1995, fig 7). The form of decoration on conical beakers is similar to that found on hemispherical beakers in the north-west provinces, although the beaker from Brook Street, Winchester has two rows of elongated hexagons below the rim and vertical ridges running down the body. Although examples of late Roman mould-blown cups and beakers are found throughout the province and as far north as Hadrian's Wall, there are more examples from southern Britain.

FWP 39b, Cat No 1 is a fragment of a pale green cup with a curved, cracked-off rim and a slightly convex upper body. Below the rim it has a mould-blown design of short vertical arcading, and there

are signs of further decoration below, possibly of interlocking hexagons. A similar example is known from grave 217, Köln (Friedhoff 1991, 140, 278, pl 93), Kreuznach (Fremersdorf 1961, 57–8, pl 113), and others came from Andernach and Farschweiler (Goethert-Polaschek 1977, form 50, 62, no 237, Pls 25 and 40) and Boulogne (Morin-Jean 1913, 193, fig 254). The decoration on the remainder of the mould-blown body fragments from OD XII is of irregular interlocking hexagons in a range of shapes and sizes and at variable levels of relief. Although the decoration is in very shallow relief on many of these fragments, the mould-blown decoration on the outside surface is followed on the inside wall. There are nine straight-sided mould-blown body fragments which are too small for the form to be positively identified, although the fact that they are straight-sided indicates that they are probably from conical beakers. There are four similar straight-sided mould-blown body fragments from excavations in Winchester.

Winchester has been noted for the concentration of at least sixteen late mould-blown vessels found there (Price and Cottam 1995, 10), which include hemispherical cups, conical beakers and shallow bowls. Mould-blown vessel fragments are not found in such numbers at other settlements in the south of Britain and, therefore, the fragments from a minimum of four vessels at OD XII constitute a important addition to knowledge concerning the occurrence and distribution of these unusual forms, especially as OD XII appears to be a small rural site. Also of interest is the absence from this group of some more common forms of late Roman mould-blown vessels, such as barrel jugs.

As stated above, the most commonly occurring vessels excavated on late Romano-British and Continental sites are those used for drinking, which are almost always either hemispherical cups (Isings 1957, Form 96) or conical beakers (Isings 1957, Form 106), both usually decorated with horizontal abraded lines. Many examples of conical beakers and hemispherical cups from Colchester are noted and discussed with reference to finds from throughout Roman Britain (Cool and Price 1995, 88–92, fig 5.l6). At OD XII these vessels are very well represented, although there are significantly more conical beakers than hemispherical cups in this assemblage. This phenomenon is also noted at Caister-on-Sea (Price and Cool 1993, 149), Frocester Court Villa, Gloucestershire (Price 1979, 41) and Beadiam Villa, North Yorkshire (unpublished), although the chronological or regional significance for this imbalance remains unknown.

Hemispherical cups (FWP 39b, Cat Nos 1, 5, 30) were common throughout the north-west provinces and were in use from the late third century to at least the mid-fourth century, occurring in both funerary and domestic contexts. This form appears in the same pale green, yellowish–green and colourless glass and with the same curving cracked-off rim and bands of horizontal abrasion as the conical beaker, although some examples have a vertical rim, such as that from grave 81 at Lankhills cemetery, Winchester which dates from AD 350–70 (Harden 1979 fig. 27, I). Hemispherical cups have been noted at sites throughout Britain, including in the southern and western counties, including examples from Barnsley Park villa (Price 1983, 176–7 nos 11–17, fig 59), Silchester (Price 1984, 118 no 3, fig 39), Bath (Shepherd 1985, 162 nos 7–16, fig 92) and Frocester Court villa (Price 1979, 42 no 12, fig16). The decoration on this form can be similar to that on the conical beakers, with coloured blobs as at Portchester (Harden 1975, fig 198, no 10c) or applied self-coloured trails in a festoon pattern, as at Caister-on-Sea (Price and Cool 1993, 144 nos 73–6, fig l31) and Towcester (Price and Cool 1983, nos 19–22, fig 46).

Like hemispherical cups, conical beakers are extremely common on many fourth-century urban and rural sites in the north-west provinces. Examples have been noted in burials at Lankhills cemetery, Winchester (Harden 1979, fig 27/IIA), Frocester Court villa (Price 1979, 41 nos 9–11, fig 16), Silchester (Boon 1974, 230, fig 36), Shakenoak Villa (Harden 1973, 103, fig 52) and Portchester (Harden 1975, figs 197–9) and at many other urban and rural sites. At OD XII, all of the conical beaker fragments (FWP 39b, Cat Nos 17–8, 32–9) have a curved, cracked-off rim which although left unworked, is relatively smooth. These vessels are almost invariably decorated with horizontal abraded lines, which generally occur below the rim and on the upper body. The conical beaker rim and upper body fragments from this assemblage all have horizontal abraded bands, either singly or

in groups of two or three. FWP 39b, Cat Nos 32–9 are lower body and base fragments of conical beakers and are typical in having a straight side tapering in to a small concave base.

FWP 39b, Cat Nos 19–21 are fragments of green, very bubbly beakers or small bowls which are quite distinctive. They have a very thick, slightly curved, smoothly cracked-off rim, a straight side tapering in slightly and a horizontal abraded band on or below the rim. The fragments are very similar in colour and in the quality of glass, although on the basis of their rim diameters and the differing positions of the abraded lines, they do not appear to come from the same vessel. Thick-walled yellow–green cups and beakers with cracked-off rims have been found on other late Roman sites, such as the probable hemispherical cup from the Uley Shrines (Price 1993, 214 no15, fig 158), the two greenish bowls from Burgh Castle (Harden 1983, 81 nos 83–4, fig 37) and the conical beaker from Caister-on-Sea (Price and Cool 1993, 144 no 89, fig l31). The vessel fragments from OD XII differ slightly from the above in that they have a very thick rim which becomes thin in the upper body, as opposed to being more uniform in thickness throughout the vessel.

FWP 39b, Cat No 29 is an example of a convex cup or beaker in pale yellowish–green glass with a more unusual decoration of a thick, applied vertical trail with horizontal scored ridges. Similar examples of this decorative technique have been noted at other 4th century sites such as Towcester (Price and Cool 1983, 120 no 28, fig 46), Frocester Court (Price 1979, 43 nos 22–3, fig l7), Uley (Price 1993, 215 no32, Fig 158) and on a fragment from Bancroft Villa, Milton Keynes (Price 1987, 152 no 231, fig 49), although it has been difficult to suggest the form of these vessels as the body fragments were too small. This type of decorative trail occurs on a variety of vessels in the north-west provinces in the later fourth century, especially in the Rhineland; for example the conical beaker with foot-ring from Bad Kreumach (Fremersdorf 1961, 43, Taf 74). Fremersdorf (l961) discusses various forms of trailing on late vessel forms. The light green claw beaker, dating from the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century from grave 843; a sixth-century burial in Saxon Cemetery 2, at Mucking (Evison 1974) has similar vertical scored nails.

There are eight rim fragments from beakers with out-turned fire rounded rims (FWP 39b, Cat Nos 22–8) and a base fragment with pontil mark (FWP 39b, Cat No 31) which probably comes from a similar vessel. When complete, these vessels have tall, straight bodies tapering in gently either to a small concave base, or to a high diagonal tubular base ring. Another feature of this form is a pontil mark on the base, which is a result of the vessel being held on the pontil iron whilst the rim is heat finished. Vessels with fire-rounded rims occur regularly in assemblages dating to the second half of the fourth century, although they never occur in the same numbers as vessels with cracked-off rims. Examples from Towcester in contexts dating from AD 330–70+ (Price and Cool 1983, 122 nos 40–4, fig 47), and from late Roman sites including Caister-on-Sea (Price and Cool 1993, 147 nos 108–9, fig l32), Barton Court Farm, Abingdon (Price 1986, 4, no 8), Bancroft Roman villa (Price 1987, 152 nos 235–8, fig 49) and Bath (Shepherd 1985, 163 nos 18–21, fig 92) indicate that the form was in use by the middle of the fourth century.

Examples of larger bowls have also been identified at OD XII. These are the indented truncated conical bowl of Isings Form 117 (FWP 39b, Cat Nos 42–3) and the tubular rimmed bowl of Isings Forms 44–45 (FWP 39b, Cat Nos 44–7). There are also examples which may be either indented truncated conical bowls which were in use during the second half of the fourth century or segmental bowls of Isings Form 116 (FWP 39b, Cat Nos 40–l) which were in use throughout the fourth century.

Indented truncated conical bowls have curved cracked-off rims and straight sides tapering into a small concave base. They are frequently decorated with horizontal abrasion above the shallow indents on the sides. This form is a common late Roman vessel type and is found throughout the north-west provinces, although they are more common in the south of Britain than in the north. Other examples come from, for instance, Bancroft villa (Price 1987, 152 no 230, fig 48), Barnsley Park villa (Price 1982, 178, no 19) and Frocester Court villa (Price 1979, 42 no 15, fig 16). Segmental bowls with curved out-splayed rims and horizontal abrasion are also quite a common

fourth-century form and have been noted at, for instance, Bradwell villa (Price 1975, 13 no 9, fig 33), Shakenoak villa (Harden 1973, 103, no 216, fig 52) and Portchester (Harden 1975, fig 197).

Tubular-rimmed bowls (FWP 39b, Cat Nos 44–7) occur throughout the Roman period. Although they are not particularly common in later Roman Britain, there are at least two such vessels from OD XII. The rims on these bowls are folded outwards, downwards and inwards and may be outsplayed or vertical with a cylindrical or ovoid body which may be decorated with faint diagonal close-set ribbing (FWP 39b, Cat No 46). Examples of tubular-rimmed bowls in late Roman contexts have been noted at Burgh Castle (Harden 1983, 81 no 81–2, 68.37), Barton Court Farm, Abingdon (Price 1986, 2–3, no 4), and one has also been found in a fifth-century burial at Highdown, Sussex (Harden 1951, 263, fig l).

FWP 39b, Cat No 47 is part of a tubular pushed-in base ring. These are quite commonly found on late Roman vessels throughout the north-west provinces, such as the bowl from Frocester Court (Price 1979, 43 nos 30–1, fig 17), the jugs from Colchester (Cool and Price 1994, 147 no1160, fig 8.11), Lankhills cemetery, Winchester (Harden 1979, 217 no 310, fig 27) and York (Harden 1962, 140, pl 66), the flask from Lankhills, Winchester (Harden 1979, 219 no 450, fig 27) and the footed beakers from Burgh Castle (Harden 1983, 83, 88–9, fig 37).

The small concave base with the trailed base-ring wound three times around the base edge (FWP 39b, Cat No 58) is very unusual and may be dated tentatively to the early fifth century. No exact parallels have been found in Roman Britain, although there are two one-handled cups with trailed base-rings wound once around the base edge from the Lankhills cemetery (Harden 1979, 216 nos 117, 508, fig 27). Broadly similar bases however are known in the Mediterranean region although few of these retain much of the body of the vessel. They have been noted on a cup with a tubular rim found at Monte Gelato, south Etruria (unpublished) in an early- to mid-fifth century context and on many examples in Rome, from a site south-west of the Palatine Hill, found in the abandonment phase dating to the first half of the fifth century (Sternini 1991, 127 fig 56–65). Sternini suggests that this base form with a base-ring wound one to six times around the base edge is found on jugs as well as on drinking vessels. This base fragment provides further evidence for continued glass use at OD XII into the fifth century.

As previously stated, amongst the identifiable forms, closed vessels such as jugs, flasks and bottles are extremely poorly represented in this assemblage. This is not a unique feature, being also recognised at Caister-on-Sea (Price and Cool 1993), although the scarcity is particularly marked in this assemblage. FWP 39b, Cat No 62 may be part of the funnel mouth of a jug or a flask which tapers in and has parts of two horizontal close-set narrow trails, although it is difficult to be sure since the fragments are very small. Several fourth–century jug forms have funnel mouths with out-turned rims which can be either fire-rounded or rolled in and flattened. There is generally a thick horizontal trail below the rim edge, as at Beadlam (Price and Cottam, unpublished), Ilchester (Price 1982, 230 no 19, fig 112) and Barnsley Park (Price 1982, 181, no 31, fig 60). Occasionally, there may also be a narrow, unmarvered spiral trail which continues down the neck (FWP 39b, Cat No 62). Parallels are found at York (Harden 1962, pl 67, H.12) and in the Rhineland as in grave 59, Jacobstrasse, Köln (Friedhoff 1991, Taf 67)

It has not been possible to identify the vessel forms of the other decorated fragments, although the colour and quality of the glass indicate a late fourth-century date. Diagonal and vertical optic blown corrugations (FWP 39b, Cat No 50) are found on conical beakers, cylindrical bowls and biconical jugs and are achieved by blowing a partially inflated gob of glass into a ribbed mould and then into a plain mould. Applied, unmarvered, narrow horizontal (or vertical) trails (FWP 39b, Cat Nos 51–6) are quite a common decorative technique in the later Roman period and are found on cups, bowls, jugs and flasks.

Only one type of bottle is represented at OD XII. FWP 39b, Cat No 63 is a fragment of blue–green prismatic bottle (Isings Form 50), which does not belong to the main period of occupation. These vessels came into use in the mid-first century AD and are very commonly found on sites occupied

during the first–second centuries, although some probably continued in use into the third century. These bottles were mould-blown and were used as storage vessels for liquids and semi-liquids in the first instance, although it is probable that they were used for a variety of secondary purposes subsequently. It is likely that the bottle fragment has survived as rubbish, rather than as an heirloom.

Window glass

Five fragments of window glass were found. One is a cast blue/green fragment. Cast window glass is usually dated to the first to the third centuries although many cast panes must have continued in use into the fourth century. It is generally blue/green but can be greenish or colourless. The panes have a flat, rough underside, a glossy, slightly undulating upper surface and rounded edge and were probably produced by pouring molten glass into trays (Boon 1966).

Blown window glass, produced by blowing as a long cylinder which was opened out to form a double glossy pane (Harden 1961, 41–2), is often common on fourth-century sites, although at OD XII there are only four pale green blown fragments. This is a surprisingly small amount. Although there is clearly evidence for a least limited window-glazing at some time in the site's history, it is possible that some buildings were not glazed of that the window glass was collected for reuse when the site was abandoned.

Environmental Evidence

Edited by Michael J Allen

Animal bones

by the late Barbara Noddle

Introductory note

by Michael J Allen

The following report is extracted from three archive reports prepared by the late Barbara Noddle in the early 1970s. These were summaries of the faunal remains from the Overton Down sites and Wroughton Copse. The data for OD XII has been extracted largely from her reports and although some further bone that may not have been reported upon was found, this was assessed (FWP 29) and does not significantly add to the overall interpretation provided by Noddle. Barbara Noddle's original work was written as a combined report of the animal bone from both the sites on Overton Down and that at Wroughton Copse. The aim of her reports was to assess animal husbandry over time, rather than provide detailed information about the disposal patterns and spatial variation on each site. The detailed information of material by context does not survive in the current archive – although it is possible to correlate GF numbers representing groups of bones and contexts it is no longer possible to determine precisely which bones comprised which groups. The faunal report below is accompanied by the short report on the non-domestic and amphibian bones extracted from an original report by N E King and P J Fowler (FWP 87). The full discussion of all the animal bone material from Overton Down and Wroughton Copse is presented in *LPP*, Chapter 14.

Introduction

A total of 3133 bones was examined from OD XII and are dealt with here as a single assemblage (Table FWP64.9) This total excludes the small mammal and amphibian bones discussed below.

Following identification, the proportion of fragments per species, minimum number of individuals (MNI), percentage of species, proportions of certain anatomical fragments and the age of those individuals (were possible) were calculated. The bones were also measured where appropriate. Numbers of recognisable fragments are generally not used as one bone may be broken into a number of recognisable fragments and fragmentation on this site is high.

Preservation and recovery

Bone fragmentation was considerable and this the preservation of material is reflected, in part, by the proportion of loose teeth. Although the high percentage of sheep teeth (70–90%) indicates good recovery on site, it also suggests poor preservation of the remaining faunal material. Indeed, loose teeth made up about one third of the bovine and pig fragments. These proportions are higher than OD XI (FWP 63; *LPP*, Chapter 14).

Results

Proportions of species (common domestic animals)

Sheep and cattle together comprise nearly 75% of the assemblage (Table FWP64.9). Sheep is the dominant species representing over 50% of the bones by either fragments of numbers of individuals, whereas cattle are only *c* 13% when assessed as MNI. By fragment count pig and horse are almost equal (*c* 10%) but when assessed as numbers of individuals pig are more common (13%) than horse.

Sheep: The remains of over 140 individuals were found; waste parts, particularly teeth, predominate. One pair of horn-cores appears to be that of a ram, which could conceivably be a bought in ram for stock improvement. The bones were in a very fragmentary state and this may, as a consequence, include some goat and roe deer bones. The age range of the animals, mainly assessed from the teeth shows that most of the animals are mature, with a few youthful casualties and a few killed in their second or third autumns. Thus the flock appears to have been kept for wool or for sale of young stock.

Cattle: The remains of 35 individuals were found, represented mainly by waste parts. One pair of horn-cores is rather larger and could have come from a bull. The range of ages seems to indicate that the majority of animals were killed in their second autumn, however, the sample is too small to be certain. It is possible that these animals would be rather immature to give the best beef and might indicate a shortage of winter feed or hard winters. There is a slight predominance of mandibles and teeth over edible joints on the site.

The cattle appear to have been of the Celtic Shorthorn type, to judge from the horn-cores. The animals were very small compared with modern ones, but this is may be due in part to poor nutrition; it is unlikely that animals from this period reached their full genetic potential owing to scarcity of winter fodder. The measurements are within the range given by Jewell (1963) for Romano-British cattle.

Pig: The remains of 36 individuals were found.

Horse: The remains of 21 individuals were found, mainly represented by the teeth.

Less common domestic and wild animals:. The remains of six red deer (51 bone frags) and five roe deer (19 frags) were found, indicating some hunting, though the greater part of the meat used was

supplied by domestic animals. Hare (14 frags, MNI = 2) was also found and is presumed to have been hunted, the rabbit bones (9 frags, MNI = 3) are considered intrusive. The red deer included the base of an antler and brow time, the measurements of which suggest an extremely large animal, certainly exceeding that of the present day British race of this deer (circumference of antler coronet was 310mm and between the brow any bay tine was 220mm).

The pig bones include two metatarsals over 100mm long and a lower third molar tooth over 40mm long, which are most likely to have come from a wild animal. The remains of seven dogs (35 frags) were found, they included at least one of alsatian size, a considerably smaller dog and a puppy. There seem to be more individuals under one year old than one would expect, although the numbers are too small to be really significant; it is possible that the animals suffered from a puppy disease such as distemper.

Birds: There were very few bird bones but some domestic fowl (identified by Mr D Bramwell) were present and included mainly leg bones from two individuals. One right tibia was noted of an unusually small form.

Age of animals at death

Ageing followed the methods provided by Silver (1963) based on dental evidence and that of epiphysial closure. It is recognised by the however that there are limitations of using this data.

The age at which an animal is killed is used to give some indication of their economic function. The proportions of mature individuals are used to provide some information about the agricultural systems in use. In the case of cattle, the proportion of mature individuals is about 26% and this indicates few of the cattle were being used for traction or dairy production, the majority being bred for consumption. For sheep *c* 50% were mature animals which may be interpreted their use for wool production in the Romano-British period, perhaps following the introduction of an improved wool sheep by the Romans (Ryder 1964). Most of pigs are of breeding age at least with *c* 25% mature animals. Two of the horses are below working age and were presumably killed as casualties or for meat; 48% were mature animals.

Small mammal and amphibian bones

The bones of small mammal and amphibians have not been fully quantified. The species recorded included short-tailed vole (*Microtus agrestis*), water vole (*Arvicola amphibius*) and frog (*Rana tempoaria*). Most animals were presented by their skulls or lower jaws only (but these are the largest and most easily recognisable elements). The frog, however, were presented by limb bones and vertebrae but no skulls. Nearly all the animals were recovered from pits with and are almost certainly pit-fall victims.

The range of animals present is typical of open downland pasture and fields; frogs migrate and are often pit-fall victims. Only the water vole is more unusual in this context, being 1.5km from the present river. It may, however, have lived in wetter niches in the Down Barn/Pickledean dry valley, which may have supported a winterbourne. It could also have lived in ungrazed vegetation (Jewell, pers comm) and so would not be out of place in this landscape.

Conclusions

The bones were very fragmentary and consisted largely of loose teeth, apart from in the pits, where bones may have been buried in an articulated state. It is probable that only a small proportion of the bones deposited survived because of the high largely mechanical fragmentation. Sheep farming was

prevalent and flocks were kept for their wool, while the cattle were largely meat rather than diary herds. Horses were also fairly common (8%).

Marine Shell

by Sarah F. Wyles

A total of 54 oyster shells (MNI 51) was recovered from the site from 40 contexts. They are generally rather fragmentary and in a worn condition. No other marine shell was retrieved and the oysters do not appear to have formed a significant part of the diet. The largest number of shells derived from Area 3 (24 frags; MNI = 23), where they were spread throughout topsoil and occupation layers. Smaller quantities came from Areas 1 (16 frags, MNI = 14) and 2 (14 frags/MNI), again spread throughout the stratigraphic sequence for each area. No oyster shell was recovered from Area 4.

Charcoal

by Rowena Gale

The identification of charcoal fragments was undertaken on three samples from Area 3. The charcoal was prepared and identified using standard techniques. Where possible the presence of stem, sapwood or heartwood was noted. The following taxa were identified:

Corylus sp., hazel, *Fraxinux* sp., ash, *Prunus* sp., which includes *P. avium*, wild cherry, *P. padus*, bird cherry, *P. spinosa*, blackthorn. It is not usually possible to separate the members of this genus using anatomical methods, *Quercus* sp., oak, *Ulmus* sp., elm.

A fragment of oak stem came from a pit (GF284) and a fragment of Elm sapwood from a second pit (GF 304). Soil under the floor of Building 3 (GF 312) consisted of three fragments oak and one each of ash and *Prunus*. The samples from the base of the lynchet (GF 287) contained a fragment of hazel charcoal.