

**Channel Tunnel Rail Link
London and Continental Railways
Oxford Wessex Archaeology Joint Venture**

**The charred plant remains from Bower Road,
Smeeth, Kent (ARC 440/99)
by Chris Stevens**

**CTRL Specialist Report Series
2006**

©London and Continental Railways

All rights including translation, reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior written permission of London and Continental Railways.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	3
2	METHODS	3
3	RESULTS	3
4	DISCUSSION	4
4.1	The charred plant remains	4
4.2	Note on mineralised and waterlogged material from Pit 242	5
5	BIBLIOGRAPHY	6

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	The charred plant remains from Bower Road	8
----------	---	---

1 INTRODUCTION

Fifty-five environmental samples were taken during the excavations at Bower Road (ARC 440/ 95+900 - 97+100 /99) of which twenty-four were processed and assessed. Preservation within some of these samples was very good and cereal remains were highly abundant within five samples. A further sample from pit 242 was noted to contain mineralised remains. These six samples were analysed in full. All were Roman in date, the earliest coming from pit 886, dated to the 1st century - mid 2nd century AD, the latest from pit 242 dated to the later part of the fourth century AD. The remaining three samples were all dated to the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD.

2 METHODS

The samples were processed by flotation in a modified Siraf-type machine, with the flots collected onto a 250µm mesh. The residues were fractionated into 10, 4, 2 and 0.5 mm mesh sizes. The flot was dried and the residue sorted by eye, while a low-powered binocular microscope was used for sorting the flot. Plant macrofossils were then extracted, identified and quantified. The plant taxa identified from each sample are shown in Table 1 following the nomenclature of Stace 1997 (Table 00). Table 1 can be found at the end of the report.

In several cases samples were extremely rich in hulled wheat glumes, fragments of cereals and large grass seeds, mainly of oats and brome grass. In these cases, some of the smaller sieved fractions (< 2ml) were sub-sampled to produce estimated counts. The size of the sub-sample was in most case one-tenth the original size of the sieved fraction. The estimates were then calculated by multiplying the count by 10. The sample from pit 891 was exceptionally rich and in this case the counts from the 2mm was estimated from one quarter of the original fraction size while the counts from the 1mm and 500µm fractions were estimated from a twentieth of the original fraction.

3 RESULTS

All the analysed carbonised samples contained more than 1000 charred items and in the case of pit 886 more than 30,000 items. By far the most common remains came from spelt wheat (*Triticum spelta*), in particular glume bases and spikelet forks, which made up the vast number of identified remains. While emmer glumes (*Triticum dicoccum*) were identified they formed a very minor component especially when compared to the sheer numbers of spelt glumes recorded. A small number of grains of possible short-grained spelt or free-threshing wheat were also noted. Other remains of free-threshing wheats (*Triticum aestivum* s.l) were

more positively identified including rachis fragments and remains of lemmas. Barley grains (*Hordeum vulgare* s.l), mainly of the hulled variety, were also present in the samples although they formed only 3% or less of the total number of grains. Barley rachis fragments were only recorded from one sample (pit 123, context 125). Many seeds of oats (*Avena* sp.) present. Several floret bases were recovered, but none could be identified as of the cultivated variety.

Seeds of wild species were common in the samples and while in similar numbers to grains they were less numerous than glumes. The most common species seeds represented were dock (*Rumex* sp.), oats (*Avena* sp.) and brome grass (*Bromus* sp.). Large numbers of grass floret bases were recovered from four of the samples, but they were absent from the earliest sample, pit 886. These resembled oats *Avena* sp., but it could not be established whether they were of the cultivated (*Avena sativa*) or wild variety (*Avena fatua*). However, when studied alongside reference material the floret bases were identified as belonging to brome grass (*Bromus* sp.). This identification is supported by the absence of positive identifications of brome grass (*Bromus* sp.), from pit 886 from which such floret bases were absent.

Other species whose seeds were relatively common within the samples were vetch/tare/wild pea (*Vicia/Lathyrus* sp.), stinking-mayweed (*Anthemis cotula*), scentless mayweed (*Tripleurospermum inodorum*), annual meadow grass /cat's tails' (*Poa* sp. /*Phleum* sp.), and perennial rye grass (*Lolium* cf. *perenne*).

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 The charred plant remains

Several points of interest arise from the examination of the samples. The first is that the high amounts of glume waste in the samples. For hulled wheats, such as emmer and spelt, pairs of grains remain tightly enclosed in what are termed spikelets. To release the grains they must first be pounded, then the glumes removed through further sieving and winnowing. In wet climates these operations are likely to have been carried out after the crops are taken from storage (Hillman 1981, 1984). Such waste is often referred to as the waste from fine-sieving (van der Veen 1992). Fine-sieving has also been characterised by high numbers of small weeds (Jones, G. 1987). However, relatively few small weeds were present in the samples compared to those of larger weeds especially grasses. This predominance of larger weed seeds might suggest that rather the samples result from the waste charred from the pounding and processing of semi-clean spikelets that had already been fine-sieved of many weed seeds perhaps prior to storage.

Several species present in the samples are characteristic of specific soil conditions. Associated with lighter, often acid and/or dry soils were corn marigold (*Chrysanthemum segetum*), sheep's sorrel (*Rumex acetosella*), scentless mayweed (*Tripleurospermum inodorum*) and runch (*Raphanus raphanistrum*). Accompanying the seed of (*Chrysanthemum segetum*), in pit 886, were several seeds of various species that were only present in this one sample. Many of these varied from each other in their ecological preferences, for example, narrow-fruited corn-salad (*Valerianella dentata*) is common on drier calcareous soils, while spikerush (*Eleocharis palustris*), whose seeds were present within the same sample, is associated with wetter, possibly even flooded soils.

The range of ecological conditions represented within the samples in general might suggest that the crops reaching Bower Road came from a number of widely situated fields, located within varying hydrological and geological regions. It is however possible that even within a single field such changes in ecology can be found, especially where the field crosses both geological and topographical boundaries.

Of the species recovered, one of the more significant in terms of soil conditions is stinking mayweed *Anthemis cotula*. The species received some considerable attention from Martin Jones with respect to its increased presence through time (Jones 1981, 1989). The species is characteristic of heavier clay soils and through the difficulty of working such soils Jones associated it with improved ards and ploughs. However, while Jones has seen it as increasing through time from the Iron Age, others have seen it as a Roman introduction (Godwin 1984).

Whether the species is native or not, it only becomes frequent in charred and waterlogged samples from the Roman period, and only abundant from the medieval period (Greig 1991). With respect to charred assemblages it has been recovered on relatively few Roman sites; e.g. Oxford (Jones 1975, 1979, Pelling 2002), Gloucester (Clarke 1971), Milton Keynes (Jones 1987), York (Hall and Kenward (1990), and Lancaster (Huntley in Buxton *et al.* 2000). In many of these cases finds are from later Roman features, especially corn-driers, although a few are from earlier dated features. In terms of southeast England it is absent from many of the Roman sites in London and Sussex, but present at Little Waltham, Essex (Wilson 1978). It has also been found at a number of waterlogged sites around Oxford (Robinson 1980, 1979) and York (Kenward *et al* 1986, Hall *et al* 1980) where it is notably absent from earlier deposits.

4.2 Note on mineralised and waterlogged material from Pit 242

A sample from a single feature of later Roman date was examined predominantly for waterlogged and mineralised material. The feature contained little to no charred material and while spelt chaff and probable grains were identified it is possible such material is residual,

especially given the amount of charred material from earlier periods. More unusually the feature contained seeds and other material in a mineralised state, although some may have been preserved through mineralisation combined with waterlogged and anaerobic conditions. Calcium-phosphate mineralisation is usually indicative of the presence of cess or cess like material. Found with these cereal grains were numerous fragments of straw (Cereal culm nodes and internodes), a few mineralised weed seeds and numerous seeds of bramble (*Rubus* sp.). While the material may be derived from human cess the presence of three whole goat or sheep droppings indicates that the material including the straw is representative of compost, stabling or manure type material.

5 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Buxton, K, Howard-Davis, C, Huntley, J, 2000 Phase 1; the establishment of the Roman fort and settlement; Phase 2: renewal of the fort and rearrangement of the extramural area; Phase 3: demolition and rebuilding; Phase 4: the military fabricia and extramural annex, in *Bremetenacum: excavations at Roman Ribchester 1980, 1989-1990* (eds K Buxton and C Howard-Davis), Lancaster, 25-49, 51-75, 77-101, 103-126

Clarke, H H, 1971 The plant remains. Analysis of vegetable matter from the corn drier, in Fowler, P J, and Walthew, C V, Archaeology and the M5. 1st report, 1969, *Trans. Bristol Gloucestershire Archaeol Soc* **90**, 22-63

Godwin, H, 1984 *History of the British Flora (2nd edition)*, Cambridge

Greig, J, 1991 The British Isles in *Progress in Old World Palaeoethnobotany* (eds W van Zeist, K Wasylikowa and K Behre), Rotterdam, 299-334

Hall, A R, Kenward, H K, and Williams, D, 1980 Environmental evidence from Roman deposits in Skeldergate, *The Archaeology of York AY 14(3)*, CBA, 101-56

Hall, A R, and Kenward, H K, 1990 Environmental evidence from the Colonia: General accident and Rougier Street, *The Archaeology of York AY 14(6)*, CBA, and *fiche 1-9*, 289-434

Hillman, G C, 1981 Reconstructing crop husbandry practices from charred remains of crops, in *Farming Practice in British Prehistory* (ed R J Mercer), Edinburgh, 123-162

Hillman, G, 1984 Interpretation of archaeological plant remains, The application of ethnographic from Turkey, in *Plants and Ancient man: Studies in the palaeoethnobotany* (eds W van Zeist and W A Casparie), Proceedings of the 6 th symposium of the international work group for Palaeobotanists, Rotterdam, 1-42

Jones M, 1975 Seed report, 50-2, in Parrington, M, and Balkwill, C, Excavations at Broad Street, Abingdon, *Oxoniensia* **40**, 5-58

Jones, M, 1979 Plant remains from dry bulk samples, in Iron Age and Roman riverside settlements in Farmoor, Oxfordshire (eds G Lambrick and M Robinson), *CBA Research Report 32*, 103-4

- Jones, M K, 1981 The development of crop husbandry, in, *The Environment of Man, the Iron Age to the Anglo-Saxon Period, Oxford* (eds M K Jones and G Dimbleby), British Series **87**, 95-127
- Jones, M, 1987 Carbonised grain, in Roman Milton Keynes: Excavations and fieldwork 1971-82 (ed D Mynard), *Buckinghamshire Archaeol Soc Monograph 1*, 192-3
- Jones, M K, 1989 Agriculture in Roman Britain: The dynamics of change, in *Research on Roman Britain, 1960-89* (ed M Todd), Britannian Monograph Series No. **11**, London, The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 127-134
- Jones, G E M, 1987 A statistical approach to the archaeological identification of crop processing, *Journal of Archaeological Science 14*, 311-323
- Pelling, R, 2002 Charred Plant remains, in Booth, P M, Evans, J, and Hiller, J, *Excavations in the Extramural Settlement of Roman Alchester, Oxfordshire, 1991 Oxford Archaeology, Monograph Series 1*, 418-22
- Robinson, M, 1979 Part III: Biological Evidence, in *Iron and Roman Riverside Settlement at Farmoor, Oxfordshire* (eds G Lambrick and M Robinson), CBA Res Rep **32**
- Robinson, M, 1980 Waterlogged plant and invertebrate evidence, 199-205, in Hinchcliffe, J, and Thomas, R, Archaeological investigations at Appleford, *Oxoniensia 45*, 9-111
- Stace, C, 1997 *New Flora of the British Isles* 2nd edition, Cambridge
- van der Veen, M, 1992 *Crop husbandry regimes; An archaeobotanical study of farming in northern England 1000 B.C. - A.D. 500*, Sheffield Archaeological Monographs **3**, University of Sheffield, Department of Archaeology and Prehistory
- Wilson D G, 1978 Appendix I Iron Age and Roman plant remains, in Drury, P J, Excavations at Little Waltham 1970-1971, *CBA Research Report 26, Chelmsford Excavation Committee report No. 1*, 142-5

Table 1: The charred plant remains from Bower Road

Period			180-270	180-220	150-200 (350)	150-200	80-150	370-400AD
Feature			Ditch	Ditch	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit
Cut			507	566	123	123	886	242
Context			508	559	124	125	891	250
Sample			1	4	46	47	67	50
Vol. size (l)			41	40	40	35	40	1
Flot size (ml)			70	45	28	35	800	n/a
Items per Litre			49.2439	84.475	48.425	155.2571	959.325	16
Latin name	common name	plant part						
Cereals								
<i>Hordeum vulgare</i> L. <i>sl</i>	barley	-	2	6	-	10	est. 22	-
<i>Hordeum vulgare</i> L. <i>sl</i>	barley	G	-	-	-	4	-	-
<i>Hordeum vulgare</i> L. <i>sl</i>	barley	R	-	-	-	2	-	-
<i>Triticum</i> sp. L.	wheat	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
<i>Triticum</i> cf. <i>dicoccum</i> (Schübl)	emmer wheat	-	cf. 1	-	cf.4	1	est. 48	-
<i>Triticum dicoccum</i> (Schübl)	emmer wheat	GB	cf. 1	cf.20	1	2	est. 24	-
<i>Triticum dicoccum</i> (Schübl)	emmer wheat	SF	-	-	1	-	est. 60	-
<i>Triticum spelta</i> L.	spelt wheat	GB	447	612	296	2140	est. 23428	2
<i>Triticum spelta</i> L.	spelt wheat	SF	1	-	3	6	est. 88	-
<i>Triticum dicoccum/spelta</i>	emmer/spelt wheat	-	123	189	351	244	est. 3447	3 min
<i>Triticum dicoccum/spelta</i>	emmer/spelt wheat	G	1	-	5	10	-	-
<i>Triticum dicoccum/spelta</i>	emmer/spelt wheat	TG	10	-	3	-	est. 24	-
<i>Triticum dicoccum/spelta</i>	emmer/spelt wheat	SF	2	33	2	5	est. 88	-
<i>Triticum dicoccum/spelta</i>	emmer/spelt wheat	GB	est. 640	est. 1950	52	est. 1990	est. 8000	1
<i>Triticum dicoccum/spelta</i>	emmer/spelt wheat	R	-	-	-	-	est. 16	-
<i>T. cf. short grained spelt/ aestivum sl</i>	spelt/bread wheat	-	2	16	8	5	est. 38	-
<i>Triticum cf. aestivum</i> L. <i>sl</i>	bread wheat	R	-	1	1	1	est. 4	-

Period			180-270	180-220	150-200 (350)	150-200	80-150	370-400AD
Feature			Ditch	Ditch	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit
Cut			507	566	123	123	886	242
Context			508	559	124	125	891	250
Sample			1	4	46	47	67	50
Cereal fragments Indet. (est whole grains)	cereal	-	15	est.150+	est. 60	-	est. 80	-
Cereal	cereal	R	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cereal	cereal	RB	-	-	-	-	est. 4	-
Cereal	cereal	CN	1	-	-	1	-	1 min
Cereal	cereal	IN	-	-	-	-	-	+++ min
Cereal	cereal	LBCN	-	2	-	-	-	-
Species								
<i>Ranunculus</i> L. sp. subg <i>Ranunculus</i> arb	buttercup	-	1	-	-	-	-	1 min
<i>Corylus avellana</i> L.	hazel	NS	-	-	1	-	est. 12	-
<i>Papaver somniferum</i> L.	opium poppy	-	-	-	cf.3	-	-	-
Chenopodiaceae L./Caryophyllaceae L.	goosefoot/campion	-	-	-	-	3	-	-
<i>Chenopodium album</i> L.	fathen	-	-	1	1	1	-	-
<i>Atriplex</i> sp. L.	oraches	-	-	1	1	3	-	-
<i>Stellaria palustris</i> Retz/ <i>graminea</i> L.	marsh stitchwort/lesser stitchwort	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
<i>Silene</i> sp. L.	campions	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
<i>Polygonum/Persicaria</i> sp.	knot grasses	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Polygonum aviculare</i> L.	knot grass	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
<i>Fallopia convolvulus</i> (L.) Á. Löve	black bindweed	-	-	-	-	-	est. 8	-
<i>Rumex</i> sp. L.	docks	-	26	15	7	40	est. 36	1 min
<i>Rumex acetosella</i> L.	sheeps sorrel	-	1	1	1	2	-	-
<i>Rumex</i> cf. <i>crispus</i> L.	curled dock	-	105	33	184	240	est. 450	-
<i>Malva</i> sp. L.	mallow	-	-	-	6	6	cf.1	-
<i>Malva</i> sp. seedhead L.	mallow	seed head	-	-	3 frgs	1 frg	-	-
<i>Brassica</i> sp. L.	cabbage	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
<i>Raphanus raphanistrum</i> L.	runch	capsule	-	-	-	1	-	-

Period			180-270	180-220	150-200 (350)	150-200	80-150	370-400AD
Feature			Ditch	Ditch	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit
Cut			507	566	123	123	886	242
Context			508	559	124	125	891	250
Sample			1	4	46	47	67	50
<i>Rubus</i> sp. L.	brambles	-	-	-	-	-	1	160 w/min
<i>Crataegus monogyna</i> Jacq.	hawthorn	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<i>Vicia</i> L./ <i>Lathyrus</i> sp. L.	vetch/pea	-	8	18	3	8	est. 66	-
<i>Trifolium</i> sp. L.	clover	-	1	4	7	2	est. 20	-
<i>Aethusa cynapium</i> L.	fool's parsley	-	-	-	-	cf.1	-	-
<i>Torilis</i> sp. Adans.	hedge parsley	-	-	-	8	3	-	-
<i>Stachys</i> sp. L.	woundwort	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
<i>Mentha</i> sp. L.	mint	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
<i>Plantago lanceolata</i> L.	ribwort plantain	-	-	1	-	2	est. 16	-
<i>Veronica</i> sp. L. (flat)	speedwell	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
<i>Odontites vernus</i> (Bellardi) Dumort	red bartsia	-	-	1	-	1	-	-
<i>Galium aparine</i> L.	cleavers	-	-	-	-	-	est. 20	-
<i>Sambucus nigra</i> L.	elder	-	-	-	-	-	-	1 w/min
<i>Valerianella dentata</i> (L.) Pollich	narrow fruited corn salad	-	-	-	-	-	est. 4	-
<i>Carduus</i> L./ <i>Cirsium</i> sp. Mill.	thistle	-	4	-	6	2	2	-
<i>Centaurea</i> sp. L.	knapweed	-	-	-	1	1	est. 68	-
<i>Lapsana communis</i> L.	nipplewort	-	-	-	2	-	-	-
<i>Tragopogon pratensis</i> L.	goat's beard	-	-	-	-	cf.1	-	-
<i>Anthemis cotula</i> L.	stinking chamomile	-	-	-	72	11	est. 20	-
<i>Anthemis cotula</i> L.	stinking chamomile	seed head	-	-	-	1 frg	-	-
<i>Chrysanthemum segetum</i> L.	corn marigold	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<i>Tripleurospermum inodorum</i> (L.) Sch. Bip.	scentless mayweed	-	4	1	161	37	est. 140	-
Cyperaceae indet.	sedges	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
<i>Eleocharis cf. palustris</i> (L.) Roem. & Schult.	common spike-rush	-	-	-	-	-	est. 20	-
<i>Carex</i> sp. L. lenticular	sedge	-	-	-	-	-	1	-

Period			180-270	180-220	150-200 (350)	150-200	80-150	370-400AD
Feature			Ditch	Ditch	Pit	Pit	Pit	Pit
Cut			507	566	123	123	886	242
Context			508	559	124	125	891	250
Sample			1	4	46	47	67	50
<i>Lolium</i> L. sp.	rye grass	-	1	-	cf.3	4	est. 56	-
<i>Poa/Phleum</i> sp. L.	meadow grass/cats'-tails	-	4	19	40	16	est. 20	cf.1 min
<i>Avena</i> sp. L.	oat	-	244	68	167	300	est. 680	-
<i>Avena</i> sp. L.	oat	AW	est. 100	est. 300	-	est. 50	est. 1440	-
<i>Avena</i> sp. L.	oat	FBW	-	1	-	-	-	-
<i>Avena</i> sp. L.	oat	SW	1	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Avena</i> L./ <i>Bromus</i> L. sp.	oat/brome	-	186	32	est. 440	est. 140	est. 368	-
<i>Avena</i> L./ <i>Bromus</i> L. sp.	oat/brome	FBI	18	9	17	108	-	-
<i>Bromus</i> sp. L.	brome	-	68	41	76	27	-	-
Small indet.		-	1	-	-	-	-	3 min
<i>Spherococum</i> fungal spore			-	3	-	-	-	-
Goat droppings			-	-	-	-	-	3 min

Key

AW: awn; CN: culm node; FBI: floret base indet.; FBW: floret base wild; G: germinated grain; GB: glume base; IN: culm internode; L/BCN: lower/basal culm internode; NS: nutshell fragment; R: rachis fragment; RB: rachis basal fragment; S: stem; SB: spikelet base; SF: spikelet fork; SW: spikelet wild; TG: tail grain