Excavations at an Iron Age and Romano-British settlement site at Cleveland Farm, Ashton Keynes, Wiltshire

Prepared on behalf of:
English Heritage
23 Savile Row
London
W1X 1AB

by:
Wessex Archaeology
Portway House
Old Sarum Park
Salisbury
Wiltshire
SP4 6EB

Reference: 59260.01

March 2007

CONTENTS

List of Tables

List of Figures

List of Plates

SUMMARY

Between 1984 and 1990, a series of archaeological investigations was undertaken in the area around Cleveland Farm, Ashton Keynes, Wiltshire (centred on NGR 40675 19450), in advance of gravel extraction. Fieldwork revealed evidence for occupation of the site from the Middle/Late Iron Age through to at least the 4th century AD, with some indications of early/middle Saxon activity.

Iron Age settlement comprised at least six small enclosures in the northern part of the site, interspersed with areas of open settlement. Environmental remains indicate a hedged landscape around the site, with little evidence for agriculture. Small scale iron smithing took place on the site, and two fragments of bronze-working moulds were also found. Local sources of supply predominate amongst the pottery and quernstone assemblages, but in the Late Iron Age more long-distance contacts are attested by the presence of Italian amphorae, Droitwich briquetage and Malvernian wares from Herefordshire.

There is little indication that the imposition of Roman rule was socially disruptive in the area, and settlement continued, after a shift in location to the south, through the Roman period, with a major restructuring in the 3rd or 4th century AD. A range of structural remains, artefacts and environmental evidence illustrates the nature of the settlement at this period, with significant assemblages of pottery, coins, metalwork and animal bones, and with some preservation of waterlogged material. In contrast to the Iron Age, environmental evidence indicates the cultivation of spelt wheat and barley, both in the immediate vicinity of the site and in the wider landscape; the relatively high number of quernstones from this period could mean that the inhabitants were processing and redistributing cereals. Cattle still dominate the faunal assemblage, although there is some evidence for improvement of breeds, and perhaps for the export of hides from the site for processing elsewhere. Textile-working and other craft or industrial activities are only sparsely attested, although the quernstone assemblage includes intriguing evidence for ironworking. Coin copying may also have been taking place during the late Roman period, and at the same period the coins also provide tantalising hints of a possible temple on the site. Both ceramic and stone assemblages reflect a change from a local production system to more regional production and distribution. Personal items such as jewellery were common finds, and 'luxury' goods such as imported pottery and glass suggest that the inhabitants of the site attained a relative level of affluence. A small number of inhumation burials, however, provided the only direct evidence of the population.

Excavations at an Iron Age and Romano-British settlement site at Cleveland Farm, Ashton Keynes, Wiltshire

by Andrew B. Powell, Grace Perpetua Jones and Lorraine Mepham, with
contributions by Stephanie Knight, Jacqueline I. McKinley, Chris Stevens and
Nicholas A. Wells, and illustrations by Rob Goller

INTRODUCTION

Project background

The area around Ashton Keynes was identified as one of national archaeological
importance during a survey of the Upper Thames gravels (primarily from air
photographs), undertaken in 1983-4 by Richard Hingley on behalf of Gloucestershire
and Wiltshire County Councils. The survey, which expanded on the results of an
earlier survey (Leech 1977), revealed cropmarks and earthworks covering *c.* 25
hectares adjacent to Bradleys Pit, including a nucleated complex of enclosures and
ditches south of Cleveland Farm, covering *c.* 5 hectares (centred on NGR 40675
19450) (**Figure 1**).

As planning permission had already been granted for gravel extraction in the area
around the farm, a programme of targeted archaeological investigations was
undertaken between 1984 and 1990 in order to recover as much information as
possible before the site was destroyed (**Plate 1**). The fieldwork, funded primarily by
English Heritage, with contributions also from the developers EH Bradley Limited
and ECC Quarries Limited, was undertaken by (the Trust for) Wessex Archaeology
with assistance from Reading University students and weekend volunteers. Funding
for post-excavation analysis and publication was provided by the Aggregates Levy
Sustainability Fund distributed by English Heritage.

The site occupies a flat low-lying area, *c.* 1km north of the River Thames, the river at
this point being little more than a stream. The geology consists of drift deposits,
including the first terrace gravels of the river and alluvium. Until gravel extraction
commenced, the site was under permanent pasture (Fields A, B and C), resulting in a
shallow (*c.* 0.1m thick) topsoil.

Archaeological background

Ashton Keynes is located within the boundary of the Cotswold Water Park, an area of
40 squares miles of gravel quarries, now restored as country parks, nature reserves
and lakes. A number of other archaeological sites are present in the immediate
vicinity including Horcott Totterdown Lane, near Fairford (Pine and Preston 2004);
Latton Lands (Stansbie and Laws forthcoming); Thornhill Farm, Fairford (Jennings *et
al.* 2004) and those to be published as part of the Cotswold Water Park project:
Claydon Pike, Somerford Keynes, Whelford Bowmoor and Stubbs Farm (Miles *et al.*
forthcoming). The Iron Age settlement pattern in the Upper Thames Valley consists of
open settlements with paddocks, enclosed farmsteads and short-lived, seasonal
farmsteads such as Farmoor, located further down the Thames Valley (Lambrick
1992). A large banjo enclosure exists 3km to the west-north-west (Darvill and Locke
1988), and a bivallate hillfort at Ranbury Ring, *c.* 7 km to the north. The Cotswold

Water Park sites lie in the hinterland of Roman Cirencester, and Cleveland Farm is less than 2.5km south-west of Ermin Street, the Roman road that connects Cirencester, located to the north-west, and Wanborough, to the south-east (**Figure 4**).

The Iron Age and Romano-British settlement patterns in the Upper Thames Valley include evidence for periods of continuity but also disruption and landscape re-organisation. Middle Iron Age settlements include those at Claydon Pike and Thornhill Farm, although both sites produced little evidence of activity during the 1st century BC. During the first half of the 1st century AD a nucleated settlement was established to the south of the previous middle Iron Age focus at Claydon Pike. The same period at Thornhill Farm saw a dramatic change with large rectilinear enclosures, a long, linear boundary and a loosely gridded enclosure system laid out. A major droveway put in place during the second half of the century suggests the movement of livestock on a relatively large scale (Jennings *et al.* 2004, 15). A radical reorganisation of the landscape can be seen at both sites in the 2nd century AD . At Claydon Pike the enclosures were replaced by an aisled barn, aisled house and rectangular enclosures (Miles *et al.* forthcoming). The Thornhill Farm enclosures were superseded by a system of trackways, although there is no evidence of actual occupation during this period. During the 3rd to 4th centuries AD the major trackway at Thornhill Farm went out of use and was replaced by a number of linear boundaries (Jennings *et al.* 2004, 19). At Claydon Pike in the the 4th century AD the site was cleared and a modest villa constructed (Miles *et al.* forthcoming).

The fieldwork

The 1984 fieldwork consisted of an earthwork survey and two evaluation trenches in the area south of the farm where features were most evident in the air photographs. Remarkably, many of the features identified survived as standing earthworks. Most archaeological sites in rural Wiltshire have suffered as a result of ploughing, with earthworks levelled and occupation levels eroded (Gingell 1976, 3). The preservation of earthworks at Ashton Keynes may be explained by the fact that the site was last ploughed in the 1940s and probably only occasionally before that (Wessex Archaeology 1984). The survey, covering *c.* 1.5 hectares, added detail to the cropmark data, identifying, for example, a number of slightly raised platforms and a series of low banks and ditches. The evaluation trenches were opened in order to confirm the date range and level of preservation of the surveyed features, Trench A examining the edge of one of the apparent platforms and its surrounding ditch, Trench B being opened across the bank and ditch of an enclosure (**Figure 3**) (Wessex Archaeology 1984).

Fieldwork resumed in July 1988 with a small-scale investigation of surviving trackways and boundary ditches to the east of Cleveland Farm (Field B). This was followed, in August, by further earthwork survey undertaken by the Royal Commission for Historical Monuments of England (RCHME), which indicated the full extent and complexity of the site (Coe *et al.* 1991, fig. 2). Between September 1988 and January 1989, work focused on the most northerly of the enclosures revealed in the air photographs (at NGR 4068 1945), most of whose interior was machine-stripped of topsoil. A roundhouse and other internal features, and nine ditch sections on the enclosure's southern and eastern sides were hand-excavated indicating a Middle to Late Iron Age date, while a further eight sections were machine excavated

in an attempt to determine the line of the ditch on its northern and western sides (Wessex Archaeology 1989).

Work continued through 1989 in the area to the south of the enclosure. The Ancient Monuments Laboratory (AML) conducted magnetometry and resistivity surveys in Field C, while Geophysical Surveys of Bradford Limited (GSB) undertook a limited resistivity survey in the southern part of Field D. Following this, a watching brief, covering *c.* 5ha in Field C and the northern part of Field D (Coe *et al.* 1991, fig. 3), was carried out during topsoil stripping, with features being plotted using tacheometry. All visible archaeological features were planned at 1:200, and the physical relationships between some of extensive features determined. A sample of larger features, such as pits, sumps and ditches, was excavated to provide dating evidence and environmental data, and metal detecting was undertaken across the site, producing a large assemblage.

At the same time, the main area of earthworks in the southern part of Field D was evaluated by a 25m grid of 1.4m wide machine trenches (totalling *c.* 1.2km) (Coe *et al.* 1991, fig. 4). This indicated two locations with high densities of artefacts in association with limestone rubble, the more northerly of which, slightly raised, was examined in further detail over some 780m^2. In the final season of fieldwork, in 1990, the southern part of the site, including much of the evaluated area, was subject to a watching brief covering some 2ha (**Plate 1**). This again revealed a high density of features that corresponded in many respects to the previously surveyed earthwork features. Metal detecting again produced a large metalwork assemblage.

Cleveland Farm is clearly an important Iron Age and Roman site. However, only limited time and resources were available for the investigations. Given the scale of the archaeology a range of techniques were employed to maximise the level of data recovered. These included air photographic survey, earthwork survey, geophysical survey, evaluation, excavation, metal detection and watching brief. Accordingly, much of the site was recorded in plan only. A large finds assemblage, however, was recovered. A number of specific problems have reduced the level of information that could be recorded, including the machining methods. During the 1990 watching brief the topsoil was stripped using a 360° excavator with a wide toothless bucket, in the previous year a caterpillar box scraper had been used, with the result that most features were recognised only after both the topsoil and the subsoil had been removed, resulting in the loss of some of the shallower features. Only limited and localised phasing of the features is possible, and the development of the site can therefore only be described in broad, general terms.

The finds

The archaeological investigations produced a large artefactual assemblage dominated by pottery but also including a wide range of other material types; there are significant collections of coins and other metalwork (consisting largely of metal-detecting finds), worked stone (primarily quernstones) and vessel glass. Object numbers were allocated to 4824 finds, including complete or nearly complete pottery vessels. Of these, 1449 are metal-detected finds, some 50% of which have been geo-referenced. Overall, 37% of the small finds can be located in plan. Waterlogged deposits in a small number of features have preserved organic remains comprising a small number of leather shoes (represented by bottom units), a bundle of coppiced twigs from Iron Age Enclosure 1,

and a group of planks and stakes from Roman pit 3255. The date range of the assemblage extends from the Middle Iron Age to the post-medieval/modern period (with some earlier lithic material and a Bronze Age copper alloy pin), but the assemblage is predominantly Romano-British. Quantified records of all finds by material type within each context are held in the project archive, and summary totals by material type are presented in **Table 1**.

Selected finds categories (ceramic building material, Iron Age pottery, quernstones, animal bone) have been used as the basis for MA or MSc reports and theses (Universities of Sheffield and Southampton), and the results of these have been incorporated where appropriate in this report. Copies of the reports on pottery, quernstones and animal bone are held in the project archive, by permission of the authors. Further specialist finds reports were compiled as part of this latest stage of post-excavation work, and the results incorporated in this report; in the case of Iron Age pottery and animal bone these were updated versions of the existing MA report and MSc thesis respectively. These reports, together with selected existing catalogues, form part of the project archive, and are available on request (see end of report for details).

The environmental material

The calcareous gravel geology and the waterlogged nature of the clay-filled ditches at Cleveland Farm enabled the preservation of a suite of environmental data. The waterlogged and anaerobic clay deposits preserved limited amounts of pollen, waterlogged plant macrofossils and Coleoptera, as well as charred plant remains.

A number of samples were taken during the various phases of archaeological investigation (1988-90), for charred plant macrofossils, charred plant remains, waterlogged plant remains and pollen. The assessment of samples from the 1988-89 excavations represented a rapid examination of a small number of samples from an Iron Age ditch of Enclosure 1, while more detailed analysis has been undertaken for the Romano-British features excavated in 1989-90. Analysis of the charred plant remains formed the subject of an MSc thesis (University of Sheffield); a copy of this is held in the project archive, by permission of the author. A review of the results of this analysis, together with those of all other environmental assessments, is incorporated in this report, and is available on request (see end of report for details).

LANDSCAPE, SETTLEMENTS AND CHRONOLOGY

Possible long barrow

While many of the features remain undated, most can be provisionally assigned to either the Iron Age or the Romano-British period on the basis of their form or location within the site. However, the arrangement of one group of undated features is closely suggestive of a small Neolithic earthen long barrow, comprising two *c.* 22m long slightly divergent ditches (811 and 812), 4m apart at the north-west and 5.5m apart at the south-east (**Figure 2**). Between them, towards the south-east (front) end, were two adjacent oval pits (629 and 630). However, sections through the ditches and the larger pit produced no dating evidence, nor any evidence such as human bone that might support this interpretation. Although there are no recorded long barrows in the area,

Neolithic activity is indicated by a possible small causewayed enclosure at Down Ampney *c*. 1.3km to the east-north-east, as well as by Neolithic pits and finds of flint and pottery (Oxford Archaeology 2005).

While the position of this structure within the site might suggest that it was contemporary with the adjacent Iron Age enclosures, there are no obvious parallels for such an arrangement of features within the context of an Iron Age settlement.

The landscape setting

Evidence for Iron Age settlement, comprising six small enclosures and interspersed areas of open settlement, was found predominantly in the northern half of the site, i.e. north of the main concentration of earthworks that reflects the area of the later, Romano-British settlement. While it is possible that the intensity of Romano-British activity, as indicated by the substantial nature of the earthworks, may have erased or concealed traces of earlier activity, the northerly distribution of Iron Age pottery across the site suggests that this was not substantially the case.

The Iron Age enclosures are located within a series of boundary ditches. To the north of the enclosures, a long, winding ditch (not numbered), recorded for *c*. 400m, appears to form the northern boundary of the Iron Age settlement. This ditch also appeared to be linked to an extensive complex of enclosures and boundary ditches to its north, visible as cropmarks. To the south of the settlement a long straight ditch (748) ran east-west for over 300m. At the west it ended at, and appeared to form either the southern side of, or an internal division within, the most westerly of the Iron Age enclosures (Enclosure 4). An un-numbered ditch than ran from the north-west of this enclosure created a wide funnel-shaped arrangement with the western end of the northern boundary. The eastern end of ditch 748 joined the northern side of the Romano-British trackway that continued eastward beyond the excavation area. While most of the Iron Age features lie north of this ditch, a number, including a Late Iron Age roundhouse gully, lie to its south. However, the air photographic survey revealed a clear distinction between the area north of the ditch, where the individual Iron Age enclosures were largely discrete elements within the landscape, and that to the south where the various features were clearly interconnected within a tightly knit, nucleated settlement. This raises the possibility that ditch 748 was laid as a formal boundary between the area of previous, now abandoned settlement, containing for instance all the enclosures (if not quite all of the roundhouses), and a new, post-conquest settlement site constructed on both sides of the ditched trackway (from which another track ran south towards the river). Ditch 748 was not dated, but it clearly relates to a large-scale re-organisation of the landscape at the start of the Roman period involving the laying out of a predominantly rectilinear array of field boundaries within which the new settlement was contained.

A number of other long gullies or ditches may represent the changing layout of the settlement during the Middle and Late Iron Age. One ditch (639) ran north-east to south-west for over 200m along the eastern edge of the site, while another (813), of similar length, ran on a slightly wavy curving line towards the north, where it petered out, the two ditches almost converging at the south. At its northern end, ditch 813 may have formed the eastern side of Enclosure 2, while towards the south it appeared to cut a 2m wide pit (658). The ditch produced only three sherds of Middle/Late Iron Age pottery. Ditches 639 and 813 were both cut by ditch 748. A Romano-British

trackway, possibly following an earlier line, dog-legged around the settlement to the south. These features help place the Iron Age settlement within a wider landscape that contained trackways for the movement of livestock and long boundary/drainage ditches, possibly defining enclosed fields or areas of open pasture. The area of Iron Age settlement, including the small enclosures within it, was clearly closely associated with these wider landscape features, which the air photographs suggest were part of a more extensively occupied landscape.

The settlements

*The Iron Age enclosures (**Figure 2**)*

There were four clearly identifiable Iron Age enclosures (Enclosures 1-4), with a probable fifth being represented by an L-shaped ditch (823) and a possible sixth formed by ditch 816, although the latter lay only partially within the area of investigation. The enclosures vary in form and content, and while there are minor distinctions that can be made in their dating, within the span of the Middle and Late Iron Age, it is not possible to ascertain to what extent they were contemporary or successive features. For this reason they are described below in the order that they were numbered. A number of features, such as the ring gullies of roundhouses, were recognised, some located within the enclosures, others outside and some positioned on the line of the enclosures ditches, indicating settlement pre-dating and/or post-dating enclosure construction. Although it has not been possible positively to identify associations, therefore, between some enclosures and the structures they contain, inferences can be made on the basis of their layout.

Enclosure 1
The most northerly enclosure was subrectangular in form, measuring 38m east to west. The first interim report (Wessex Archaeology 1989) states that only its eastern, southern and western sides (ditch 113) were recorded, and that ditches exposed in the machine sections to the north were probably of later date, although possibly masking an earlier ditch. The north to south dimensions of the enclosure can therefore only be estimated, at 35m. It is clear from the air photographic and earthwork surveys, however, that at its north-west corner the enclosure abutted the long, northern boundary ditch (not numbered) which may have formed its northern side.

 The enclosure had at least one entrance, *c.* 3.6m wide, at the south-east corner, with another being suggested by a possible ditch terminal at the north-west corner, and a third, possibly blocked entrance being suggested by a sharp narrowing of the ditch at the south-west corner. The ditch was extremely irregular in plan and profile, varying between 1.25m and 4m wide, and 0.6m to 1m deep, with moderately steep sides.

Close to the western terminal of the south-eastern entrance, there was a distinctive black organic fill at the bottom of the ditch, but elsewhere along the south side, it contained a very gravelly lower fill, then a layer of clay containing varying amounts of gravel, and an upper fill of clay loam, often sealed by a very clean layer of clay. There was clear evidence along its eastern side, however, that ditch had been cleaned out by a steep-sided, flat-bottomed re-cut, presumably to aid drainage, which also contained the black organic fill at its base.

Waterlogged conditions at the base of the ditch led to good preservation of a range of environmental data, including plant macro-fossils, Coleoptera and charred plant remains, as well as animal bone and molluscs. Among the finds was a bundle of straight hazel twigs (or possibly willow), on average 4.8mm in diameter and *c.* 500mm long, found on the base of the ditch near the enclosure's north-east corner. It is evident that the twigs were coppiced, probably from one to three year-old stools, indicating a level of woodland management. They may have been used as roofing materials, or for basket-making.

The enclosure contained a roundhouse in its drier, north-west corner, the western half of which had been truncated during topsoil stripping. The roundhouse was defined on the eastern side by a *c.* 10m diameter gully, up to 0.45m wide and 0.2m deep, with a short length of concentric gully suggesting two phases of construction or repair. A *c.* 3.5m gap in its eastern side may represent the roundhouse entrance. Despite the fact that a number of postholes were located within the interior of the structure, they do not form any clearly recognisable post-built structure. It is uncertain whether a length of straight gully cutting across this gap at a tangent to the circle was part of the roundhouse structure. A gully (163) that ran approximately east-west across the roundhouse and the eastern half of the enclosure appears to be a later feature, as it cut the ditch fills.

Several other features were located within the enclosure, mostly clustered in the south-eastern area. They include gullies 126 and 361, both *c.* 3.6 long and ran inwards from the enclosure ditch, apparently cut by its inner edge. A third similar feature (124), 2.7m long, contained a nearly complete Middle Iron Age barrel-shaped jar (**Figure 5, 1**) as well as smithing slag and a little hearth lining. A small number of other features excavated in this area contained single fills of clean clay and were therefore thought to be of natural origin.

The re-cutting of the enclosure ditch and the two phases of roundhouse construction may be reflected in the date range of the pottery and other finds recovered. The majority of the pottery from the ditch (*c.* 80% by weight) was of Middle Iron Age date, although the re-cut produced Middle-Late and Late Iron Age pottery. Features within the interior had a similar date range – a number of the postholes (as well as feature 124) produced Middle Iron Age pottery, while features associated with the roundhouse were weighted more towards the Middle-Late Iron Age. This may indicate that the construction of the roundhouse was related, not to the initial phase of the enclosure, but to the subsequent re-cutting of its ditch (and possibly the blocking of one of its entrances).

Other finds from the first phase of the enclosure ditch included a small fragment of a bronze mould recovered from the lower ditch fill, and a Nauheim brooch (1st century BC, Object 3, **Plate 2**) and shale armlet fragment (obj. 7) from the upper fill. The upper fill also yielded a fragment of shale bracelet. Two quern fragments in a very hard fossiliferous limestone were recovered from the upper fills of the ditch recut.

Enclosure 2

Enclosure 2 lay 30m to the south of Enclosure 1. The arrangement of ditches suggests two distinct phases, whose chronological relationships, including those with a large penannular gully at the north of the enclosure (789), were not ascertained. Enclosure 2a comprised three straight sides at the south-east (840), south-west (788) and north-

west (795), creating an area of 28m by 45m. The ditches were quite regular in plan and profile, 1.1m-1.5m wide and 0.4-0.5m deep. It is not certain whether the east side was left open, or if a fourth side was formed by the longer north-south ditch 813. Ditches 840 and 652 each produced three sherds of handmade middle Iron Age pottery, although of the three sherds from ditch 813, one is a late Iron Age wheelthrown sherd and suggests a slightly later date for this feature.

If ditch 813 was utilised as a fourth side, gaps of 8.3m at the south, and 5.6m to the north, would have formed entrance points, the southern entrance being partly blocked by a 4m length of ditch (652). A 2m wide pit (841), located on the line of the ditch at the south, appeared to cut it and produced three sherds of Middle Iron Age pottery.

The other, undated phase (Enclosure 2b) appeared to be a larger, four-sided enclosure, with a straight ditch along the north side (792) located across the line of ditch 795 and ditches, partly concealed by a hedge line, along the north-west and south-west sides (not numbered). This enclosure presumably incorporated ditch 840 at the south-east, thereby creating maximum dimensions of 67m east-west by 43m north-south, with a 3.5m wide entrance at the south. It is unclear if ditch 813 formed a fourth side to this phase of the enclosure.

Within both enclosure phases, abutting both ditch 813 and the northern side of Enclosure 2b, was a penannular ditch (789), although its stratigraphical relationship to neither ditch is recorded. The ditch, which was 1.80m wide and 0.85m deep, described a circle *c.* 18m in diameter with a 6m wide gap on the south-east side facing towards the south-eastern entrance of Enclosure 2a. Given its form and orientation it is likely that the ditch surrounded a roundhouse, although no recognisable structure could be discerned in the 11 postholes recorded within it. Both the ditch and the postholes produced considerable amounts of burnt limestone. Twenty-five sherds of Middle Iron Age pottery were recorded from the gully. The same fabric types were seen in the penannular gully, ditch 840 and ditch segment 652.

Close to the penannular gully, and within Enclosure 2a, were a subsquare pit (796) *c.* 1.6m across, and two four-post structures, *c.* 1.5m and 2.5m square, of a type frequently interpreted as granaries. There were also a number of other postholes of varying size, whose distribution extended into the western part of Enclosure 2b, some forming possible pairs, perhaps supporting looms or drying racks, but others forming no recognisable structures. Also in Enclosure 2a, there were also a number of short lengths of gully, one measuring 4m long with a small pit or posthole at its eastern end; possibly similar combinations of features, of unknown function, were recorded in Enclosures 3 and 4, and one at the eastern end of the site.

Enclosure 3
Enclosure 3 was 15m northwest of Enclosure 2a, but just 4.5m from Enclosure 2b. It was 'shield-shaped', almost square at the north-east but rounded at the south-west, measuring *c.* 38m by 28m, and with a 1.6m wide entrance midway along its south-east side. Its regular ditch (701) was 2m wide and 0.6m deep.

There was a semicircular gully (742), forming the south-western arc of a circle *c.* 13m in diameter, in the south-western half of the enclosure, probably the remains of a truncated roundhouse. A clear terminal to the gully at the south-east, facing towards the enclosure entrance, reflects the often typical orientation of roundhouse entrances,

but while there was a cluster of postholes and stakeholes within the arc, it formed no recognisable structure. Both the roundhouse gully and the enclosure ditch contained Middle Iron Age pottery (the latter also producing a presumably intrusive sherd of 1st/2nd century AD coarseware).

Lying across the projected line of the roundhouse gully, and therefore unlikely to be contemporary with it, was a gully (743) with a posthole (757) at its end, comparable in arrangement to those recorded in Enclosure 2. However, while the gully, which was 6m long, 0.5m wide and 0.7m deep, with large quantities of limestone from its upper fills, produced Late Iron Age pottery, the posthole contained two sherds of Middle Iron Age pottery, and may instead have formed part of the roundhouse structure. There was a short length of gully (755), producing seven sherds of Late Iron Age pottery, towards the north-east of the enclosure.

Enclosure 4

The most westerly enclosure, Enclosure 4, was rectangular in shape, measuring 54m by 27m, its long axis aligned north-south. The enclosure ditch (746) was generally uniform around its circuit, 1.5m wide and up to 1.15m deep, but unbroken by any entrance. There were no structures discernible in the various postholes, pits and lengths of gully (although one slightly curved length of gully had a projected diameter of *c*. 16m) that were recorded in the interior of the enclosure. These were concentrated in the centre of the enclosure, and appeared to be bounded to the north by a length of straight gully which seemed to form an internal division. Pottery from the enclosure ditch and a short length of straight gully (756) indicated a Middle Iron Age date.

The enclosure was connected to a number of ditches or gullies, although its stratigraphical relationships to them were not established. As noted above, a ditch running from the north-west corner of the enclosure formed a funnel with the northern boundary ditch. As this enclosure was sited right at the mouth of that funnel, it may have had some function related to the movement of livestock. In addition the air photographs indicated that the southern end of the enclosure was continued eastward by the long straight ditch 748 (above). However, during the watching brief it became evident that the enclosure either extended some 15m further south to abut the trackway (and had been bisected by ditch 748), or that, at some point in time, a small annexe had been added at that end.

Enclosures 5 and 6

Towards the east of the site were two roundhouse gullies (764 and 770), 20m apart, possibly associated with an L-shaped ditch (823). The ditch, which had a rounded terminal at the south-east, but petered out at the north, had the appearance of forming two sides of an 'open' enclosure. Roundhouse gully 764, at the northern end of the ditch and producing Middle Iron Age pottery, was 13.5m in diameter, with a wide gap on the south-east side, while gully 770 was 12m in diameter, probably with an east-facing entrance. Close to the roundhouses and within the area defined by the two arms of ditch 823, there were a number of other small features. Among these were two postholes and an angled length of gully that may have formed some small structure outside the entrance to roundhouse 764, and there was a pair of postholes to the south. Three pits (631, 831 and 832) produced Middle Iron Age pottery, and one (831) also produced a piece of briquetage. Pit 631 cut roundhouse gully 764, while a large pit (817) at the north end of ditch 823, also cutting roundhouse gully 764, produced sherds of Middle/Late Iron Age pottery, a fragment of bronze mould and another

piece of briquetage. To the east of this group, there were a number of isolated postholes and lengths of gully, one of which (774) produced a single, almost complete, smithing hearth bottom, while to the north there was a 35m long ditch (816) turning at either end to the north and north-east, extending beyond the 1989 excavation area; it had the appearance of the southern end of a sixth enclosure, although no such feature was visible in the air photographs.

Unenclosed Iron Age roundhouses and other features

In addition to the five suggested roundhouses recorded in the enclosures already described, a further possible ten were located during the watching brief across Fields C and D, one of which dates to the Middle Iron Age period (797) and two to the Late Iron Age (705 and 825). The earlier, Middle Iron Age structure is located in the northern part of the site, whilst the later structures are to be found further south, close to the line of boundary ditch 748. The structures were indicated by the presence of penannular gullies, thought to represent the drip gullies around roundhouses, of between 7m and 14m diameter. In most cases these were 0.2-0.25m wide and 0.1-0.15m deep, and where discernible the entrances face between south and east, with the exception of south-facing late Iron Age gully 825.

Middle Iron Age roundhouse 797 lay immediately north of Enclosure 2 on the line of the northern end of ditch 813. The gully was 11m in diameter, and almost complete apart from on the eastern side where the circuit was made up of two short length of gully with intervening postholes. A line of four postholes across the interior may have formed part of the structure. An arrangement of five posts in a small east-facing arc, just 2m across, immediately south of the roundhouse, clearly formed some structure, although of unknown function.

In the same general area, a very small oval penannular gully (not numbered), 4m by 5.5m, also lay on the line of ditch 813 as well as on the north-east side of penannular ditch 789 in Enclosure 2. It was clearly too small to have been a domestic structure, and it is likely to have had some ancillary function. Immediately to the north of roundhouse 797 there were two arcs of ditch (801 and 802), describing circles *c.* 15m in diameter. These lay at the northern edge of the 1989 excavation area, and although their function is unclear, it is possible that they indicate the locations of further roundhouses.

South of Enclosure 2 was a cluster of at least five, quite variable circular or oval structures defined by gullies, only one of which could be dated (to the Late Iron Age). One was a north-south aligned oval gully (825), measuring 13.5m by 9.3m with a posthole (826) at the centre and a south-facing entrance, which produced a Dressel 1B amphora spike. The other, to its south, was a circular gully (657), *c.* 10m in diameter, with a wide south-east facing entrance. Also in this group was a small double ring gully (829), with a 7.5m diameter outer gully and a 5m diameter inner gully; it was cut through the centre by ditch 748 so that although the terminals of an east-facing entrance were recorded for the outer gully, none was visible for the inner gully. Other features were an oval gully, 6m by 7m with a gap at the eastern end, and two opposed arcs describing an oval *c.* 5m by 6.5m, as well as other lengths of curved gully, pits and postholes.

Between Enclosures 3 and 4 was a pair of roundhouse gullies, 9m apart. Although only the larger (705), at *c.* 11m in diameter, could be dated (to the Late Iron Age), gully 735, measuring 9m in diameter, was very similar in form and is likely to have been broadly contemporary. Both had entrances facing approximately east, and both had central, stone-lined hearths. Each contained a few postholes, insufficient to indicate their construction, although 705 had a pair of postholes in the entrance, set just back from the line of the gully. Immediately outside the pair, on the line of the gully and therefore unlikely to be directly contemporary with the structure, was a 1.3m diameter pit (721) containing an interesting ceramic assemblage. This included three Dressel 1B amphora rims (**Figure 5, 2**), as well as 16 sherds of grog-tempered pottery of which two were identified as belonging to a necked bowl/jar, and nine sherds of sandy ware. The pit also produced a smithing hearth bottom, several amorphous lumps of smithing slag, and fuel-ash slag. Dressel 1B amphora are relatively uncommon in the region and the presence of three vessel rims in a single pit represents an unusual deposit.

West of Enclosure 4, a cluster of postholes and short gully segments, three forming an arc describing a circle *c.* 7-8m in diameter, and others lying parallel to each other on its eastern side (possibly a porch), may represent one or more possible structures, although their form is unclear. One irregular gully (754) produced 121 Middle Iron Age sherds from two neckless ovoid jars, one lid-seated jar and one barrel-shaped jar. It may also be noted that a Bronze Age 'Picardy' pin (Hawkes 1942) was found unstratified by metal-detecting in this area.

*The Romano-British enclosures/compounds (**Figure 3**)*

During the early Roman period the settlement shifted to the south, to an area demarcated by linear 748. Unfortunately it has not been possible to interpret the layout of the Romano-British settlement, despite the presence of an extensive network of features visible as cropmarks and earthworks. The archaeological features were plotted only by tacheometry during the watching brief and very limited excavation actually took place. Furthermore, a significant part of the area north of the trackway was recorded only in the trenches of the 1989 evaluation. With few stratigraphic relationships being recorded, phasing relied mainly on pottery dating, as outlined below. Interpretation is also complicated by the three methodologies by which the settlement was recorded. While the air photographic survey, the earthwork survey and the watching brief revealed comparable and complementary overall layouts for the settlement, there were also significant differences. This is to be expected as, for instance, alluvial deposits sealed some features preventing their showing as cropmarks. Similarly, the apparent intensity and longevity of Romano-British settlement activity, as revealed by the watching brief, will have resulted in some earlier earthwork features being modified or levelled, so that the earthworks that survived are more likely to reflect the later phases of the site's occupation.

What the watching brief revealed, however, was evidence for repeated modifications to the layout of the Romano-British settlement as indicated by the many intercutting features, including ditches, gullies, pits and ponds, as well as continuity of use evident in multiple re-cuts recorded in the ditch sections. Many of the ditches appeared to form part of a system of fields and paddocks linked to the trackway located in the north-west of Field D. Some of the larger ditches formed subrectangular enclosures with rounded corners similar in size and shape to the Iron Age enclosures to the north,

although here they appear integrated within the tightly-knit nucleated settlement. Two of these, flanking the north and south sides of the trackway, were examined by single evaluation trenches in 1984 (**Figure 3**, Trenches A and B).

Trench B
The larger, subrectangular enclosure, flanking the north side of the trackway, was only partially exposed during the watching brief, but is visible in the air photographic and earthwork surveys. It had a bank surviving to a height of 0.2m built up of material excavated from a 1m deep internal ditch, from which large quantities of animal bone were recovered. The ditch had been recut to aid drainage and the spoil dumped in the interior, and a substantial post, of uncertain function, was set in its base. The earthwork survey suggested an entrance off the trackway at the south-east corner, while the air photographs indicated a series of possible internal divisions within the enclosure.

Trench A
A smaller enclosure on the opposite side of the trackway was defined by a 1.1m deep ditch that was subject to periodic flooding and had been recut three times. There were postholes, stakeholes and a possible ditch or gully in the interior of the enclosure. Two of the enclosure ditch recuts produced small quantities of Romano-British pottery, dating no earlier than the early 2nd century AD. Two 3rd century AD coins were also recovered from one of the ditch recuts, and other finds comprised limestone fragments, pieces of dressed stone and a few tile fragments.

*The Romano-British structures (**Figure 3**)*

Five possible structures were recorded in 1990 in the area of the main earthworks, three of them south of the trackway. Their location south of linear boundary 748 clearly reflects a southwards shift in settlement from the Middle Iron Age to the Romano-British period.

The watching brief revealed a roundhouse, located to the north of the trackway and within the subrectangular enclosure exposed in Trench B, represented by two gullies, the inner one (5139) cut at the north by an otherwise concentric outer gully (5153), suggesting two phases of construction or repair. Together they described a semicircle, and while it is reasonable to infer that the structure was a roundhouse *c.* 7m in diameter, a line of four postholes running from the southern terminal of gully 5139 across the open face of the semicircle could indicate a D-shaped structure, or else an internal division within a roundhouse. The roundhouse was undated, but is spatially related to the network of Roman features in Field D, indicating the continuation of roundhouse construction into the Roman period. Immediately to the north-west was a small rectangular structure, 12m by 10m.

Possible roundhouse 6118 also lay north of the trackway, and was recorded during the 1989 evaluation and 1990 excavation. This structure, which was undated, was *c.* 7m in diameter, represented by three short lengths of gully, with a 4m wide entrance at the south-east, set back within which was a large posthole. Despite this structure's relatively small size, there was a 1.5m wide stone-built hearth (6110) off-centre within it, raising questions about its viability as a domestic structure.

There was considerable variation in the possible roundhouse structures recorded south of the trackway, two of which two were dated as Romano-British. One (not numbered, adjacent to pond) consisted of a penannular ditch *c.* 9m in diameter ditch, with a 4.5m wide gap on the east side; no internal features were recorded. A late Roman penannular brooch was recovered by metal dectecting from the pond at the eastern side of this ditch.

Another (6303) consisted of a 5m curved gully, the upper fill of which contained a substantial amount of large stones among which were 25 sherds of mid $3^{rd}/4^{th}$ century AD coarseware pottery. The stones appeared to have fallen into the gully and were not considered to be a wall, although a further small spread of stones *c.* 8.5m to the south-west was interpreted as representing the other side of the structure. Between them was a group of at least seven flat stones which, although three were burnt, showed no evidence of *in situ* burning as would be expected with a hearth, and they may instead have been have been a post pad for a central timber. Nonetheless, the interpretation of these features as a roundhouse remains highly tentative.

The most complete evidence for a Romano-British roundhouse lay in a small oval ditched enclosure, south of the trackway towards the west of the settlement. Here, the 1989 evaluation had revealed a slightly raised area with a high density of artefacts in association with limestone rubble. During machine stripping to further investigate the area large quantities of artefacts were recovered from the turf and upper part of the topsoil. In parts, the topsoil overlay natural gravel, but elsewhere it overlay a 0.1m thick layer of 'dirty gravel' that sealed archaeological features, and contained further quantities of artefacts and rubble. Removal of this layer revealed a number of incomplete but overlapping circular gullies representing at least three phases of roundhouse construction. One (3134), represented by two lengths of gully on its south and north-west sides, was *c.* 7.5m in diameter, and produced Romano-British pottery of $1^{st}/2^{nd}$ century AD date. This was succeeded by a larger structure (3132), whose more complete gully was *c.* 9.5m in diameter, and which produced pottery of late 3rd/early 4th century AD date. A 4th century coin was also recovered from this ditch (364-375 AD). The third structure (3225), whose chronological relationship to the other two could not be ascertained, would also have been *c.* 7.5m in diameter. Within these arcs there were a number of small pits and postholes, none of which could be clearly associated with any phase, although a number appeared to either cut or be cut by lengths of gully.

The possibility that the same location saw the construction of a sequence of three roundhouses may account for the relatively long time span suggested by the pottery from gullies 3134 ($1^{st}/2^{nd}$ century AD) and 3132 (late 3rd/early 4th century AD). However, given the substantial changes in the layout of the settlement indicated by the overlapping and intercutting of other features within it, it may be wise to treat the dating with some caution, and to not rule out the possibility that the later finds may have derived from the layer of 'dirty gravel', containing building rubble and later finds, that sealed them.

Two smaller subcircular structures (3385 and 6357), *c.* 3m and 5m across, were probably too small to have been roundhouses. Both were cut by small rectangular enclosures/compounds (see below).

*Five-post structures (**Figure 2**)*

In addition to the two four-post 'granaries', between 1.5m and 2.5m square, in Iron Age Enclosure 2, there were three other square structures within the open areas of the site. However, these were slightly larger in size and had a fifth, central posthole. One (not numbered), *c.* 3.2m square, lay just north-east of Enclosure 2, while the other two (621 and 749), both *c.* 4m square, were located to its south and south-west respectively. It is possible that they fulfilled the same function as the four-post structures, their larger size requiring the support of the extra post. However, the two to the south both cut the fills of the silted up ditch 748, suggesting an early Romano-British date at the earliest, and given their open locations they may have had some other function. If, as suggested above, ditch 748 was constructed as a formal boundary between the areas of old and new settlement, their positioning over its line, whatever their function, may have had some symbolic significance.

Small rectangular enclosures

During the 1990 watching brief a number of square or rectangular enclosures, suggested by small ditches or gullies, were recorded. Some were similar in appearance and dimensions, measuring 10-13m across, some apparently open on one (often the northern) side, and others having small internal compartments. The most southerly example (3384; **Figure 3**), for instance, which produced Romano-British pottery of 2nd/3rd century AD date, was *c.* 11m long and 8.6m wide, and open along its long north side. In the south-east corner was a small compartment measuring 4.2m by 2.2m internally.

The ditch of the most easterly example (6334; **Figure 3**) produced 1st/2nd century AD pottery. There is insufficient information to determine the function of these enclosures, but their rectilinear form, comparable in overall dimensions to the larger of the roundhouses, suggests that they may represent the locations of Romanised domestic structures, replacing the earlier circular structures. It is perhaps significant that at least four of these structures were constructed either adjacent to, or on the same locations as, roundhouses within the area of Romano-British settlement.

A number of similar, although slightly larger, features are suggested by the arrangements of rectilinear gullies/ditches to the north, in one case abutting, and in another overlapping with, ditch 748 (**Figure 2**).

Other features

Possible footings for part of a stone wall were recorded, *c* 30m east of feature 3384. These were adjacent to an area of laid stone, 1.2m in length and 0.6m wide, possibly indicating a hearth. No clear evidence for a structure was located. A late 4th/early 5th century *Liebenau* type brooch (**Plate 4**) was located in an area of stone rubble to the immediate north of these features.

Immediately south of the overlapping Romano-British roundhouses there was a spread of limestone rubble aligned north-east/south-west and edged at the north-west by lines of pitched and vertical slabs, possibly representing a paved area on the edge of a pond to south. There was a possible pit or well (3255; **Figure 3**), of 3rd/4th century AD date, on the southern edge of the trackway. A group of small wooden

planks and stakes were located within this pit, and may have been used as a lining for the feature.

The chronology of the settlements

The broad chronological framework of the site depends largely on the Middle Iron Age to late Romano-British pottery assemblage, although the predominance of less closely datable coarsewares limits its potential to refine that framework. That refinement is in part supplied by the coins and other metalwork, although in general the lack of closely datable material recovered from well stratified deposits (less than 5% of the brooches, for example, and only 19% of the coins were stratified) has frustrated attempts to impose chronological order on the complexity of features recorded. Overall, the evidence suggests a focus of Middle Iron Age settlement in the northern part of the site, disparate and fairly low level activity in the early Roman period (1st to mid 2nd century AD), with a marked increase in the spatial extent and level of activity in the later Roman period (3rd/4th century AD).

Chronological evidence for the Middle Iron Age settlement comes almost entirely from the ceramic assemblage, although a La Tène I brooch of 4th century BC date was recovered during metal detecting (**Plate 2**). Comparisons with other ceramic collections from the region, such as Groundwell Farm, Wiltshire and Ashville and Watkins Farm, Oxfordshire (Gingell 1982; De Roche 1978; Allen 1990), enable the Cleveland Farm assemblage to be dated to the period *c*. 400-100 BC, at a time when calcareous fabrics were being superseded by sandy wares in the Upper Thames and Cotswold region.

Late Iron Age and conquest period pottery is also present, although in relatively small quantities – four wide-mouthed, cordoned bowls which appear to be the regionally preferred form from the 'Belgic' repertoire; one bead-rimmed vessel; and at least three Dressel 1B amphorae (Edgeley-Long 2002). Alongside the pottery are 12 pre-Conquest brooches (1st century BC to mid 1st century AD), including La Tène III, Nauheim and Nauheim-derivative, Colchester, Langton Down and Nertomarus types (**Plate 2**); of these only one (a true Nauheim type) was stratified, in the upper fill of the Enclosure 1 ditch.

Coins and pottery both appear to show a low level of activity during the period from the mid 1st century AD at least until the mid 2nd century. Only 45 coins were found dating from the end of the Iron Age to the early 3rd century, while amongst the ceramic assemblage Savernake wares, so common in early Roman contexts at Wanborough, Wiltshire, for example (Seager Smith 2001), are scarce. Square or prismatic glass bottles, utilitarian forms common on later 1st and early 2nd century AD sites, are likewise notable by their absence here. In contrast, brooch use at the site had its *floruit* from the mid 1st century to the 2nd century AD (54 brooches, including Colchester derivatives, T-shaped, trumpet-headed and headstud types: **Plate 3**). Moreover, the typology of the quernstones indicates an emphasis on the early Roman period (55 examples, compared to 17 from the late Roman period), although, confusingly, of the 52 quernstones from dated contexts, 46 came from contexts dated to the 3rd/4th century AD (on pottery grounds), a fact possibly explained by the high level of reuse of the quernstones.

More extensive use of the site from the middle of the 2nd century AD is evidenced by the presence of Black Burnished ware from the Wareham/Poole Harbour region of Dorset. The samian assemblage has an emphasis on the 2nd to early 3rd century, with Eastern Gaulish products well represented. Other imports dating from the later 2nd to 3rd century were identified in small quantities – Central Gaulish and Trier black-slipped wares.

Ceramic evidence from the later Roman period is more forthcoming, in the form of Oxfordshire and, to a lesser extent New Forest finewares and mortaria, and Dorset Black Burnished ware in characteristic late Roman forms such as dropped flange bowls and flared rim jars. Coin evidence also shows an emphasis on the period from AD 238 onwards, reflecting a more widespread use of coinage across the Empire at this time. Four hundred coins from Cleveland Farm date from between AD 238 and the end of the 3rd century, the vast majority struck between AD 260 and 296 (**Figure 6**). From AD 318 the volume of coinage increased again, and by the middle of the 4th century large numbers of small bronze coins were produced, a pattern again echoed at Cleveland Farm. Spatial analysis of the coins indicates a higher proportion of late 3rd century radiates in Field C, the eastern part of the Romano-British settlement, while Field D, to the west, shows a higher proportion of early/mid 4th century *nummi*. Whilst the detritus in which coins were lost would have been periodically swept away and dumped elsewhere – a phenomenon recognised at Cirencester (Guest 1998, 265-8), it is possible that the distribution of coins represents the shifting of particular activities around the site in the 3rd and 4th centuries AD, or perhaps a shift in the focus of the settlement.

The end of the occupation of Cleveland Farm is tantalisingly difficult to pinpoint. Late Roman pottery types extend the date range up to the end of the 4th century AD if not into the early 5th century. The late 4th/early 5th century *Liebenau* type brooch was recovered from the southern part of the site, but was not well stratified. Was the site continuously occupied into the early Saxon period? Certainly Early/Middle Saxon pottery is present, just under 100 sherds of organic-tempered, sandy and calcareous fabrics dated broadly to the 5th to 8th centuries, and in three contexts sherds were associated with 'latest Roman' wares. An Anglo-Saxon cast saucer brooch was found unstratified at the eastern edge of Field C (**Plate 4**).

ENVIRONMENT, ECONOMY AND SOCIETY

Farming and environment

Some sixty environmental samples were taken from pits, gullies, ditches and other features in order to retrieve waterlogged and charred plant remains that might shed light on the Iron Age and Romano-British economy and environment.

Eighteen samples were taken from Iron Age contexts. Many of these focused on Enclosure 1, with seven samples from the enclosure ditch, one from the roundhouse gully and one from pit 127. Samples were also extracted from the pits located on the enclosure ditches, roundhouse gullies and linear boundaries (pits 631 and 817, cutting gully 764; pit 841, cutting ditch 840, Enclosure 2; pit 658, cut by ditch 813) and pit 721, located in the entrance to roundhouse 721. These samples produced relatively little evidence for agriculture – a few charred remains of hulled wheat, emmer or spelt

(*Triticum dicoccum/spelta*) and probable six-row barley (*Hordeum vulgare sl*), as well as a number of weed seeds that probably grew among the crops, such as black medick (*Medicago lupulina*), buttercup (*Ranunculus acris/repens/bulbosus*), cat's tails (*Phleum* sp.) and some fragments of brome grass (*Bromus* sp.).

Moreover, despite the finding of waterlogged material in clear association with Iron Age houses, ditches, pits and enclosures, plants clearly indicative of human activity were not recovered. The exception was a bundle of straight woody stems or rods, either of hazelnut (*Corylus avellana*) or willow (*Salix* sp.), recovered from the ditch of Enclosure 1. It is possible they were used for thatching or basket-weaving – rods may be placed in shallow water to make them more pliable. Certainly fragments of willow basket were recovered from the Glastonbury Lake Village (Coles and Coles 1986) and it might be assumed that such crafts were a common domestic activity within Iron Age Britain.

However, the plant remains did provide rich evidence for the localised landscape, indicating a hedged environment, similar to that at Mingies Ditch, Oxfordshire (Allen and Robinson 1993), but in contrast to Thornhill Farm and Claydon Pike where, despite waterlogged evidence being available, there was little to no evidence for scrubland species and hence hedges (Robinson 2004, 141). The ditches clearly contained standing water, although it is probable that the site was subjected to occasional flooding which allowed the colonisation of the ditches by various molluscan species as well as plant species.

The remaining samples were taken from the area south of linear 748. They include three samples from timber-lined pit 3255; four samples from a possible occupation deposit located to the north of the trackway, in the area of structure 5153/5139; one from a pit located to the north-east of the same structure; one from a pit found to the north of structure 6303; two samples from an occupation deposit to the east of structure 6118 and three samples from the hearth associated with this structure. The remaining samples came from pit features, two of which were located to the south of the pond and three near the eastern edge of Field D. In contrast to the Iron Age samples, the Romano-British contexts were comparatively rich in charred plant remains (**Table 2**), the predominance of spelt wheat and probably hulled, six-row barley being a common feature of Upper Thames Valley sites (Robinson and Wilson 1987), and the dominance of spelt wheat being a common feature of many Roman sites across Southern England. In addition, coriander, plum and apple were all also found. While the remains of hazelnut and sloe are likely to represent natural elements of the local vegetation it is also probable that they contributed to the diet in both periods. The poor representation of weed seeds may be explained by the crops having been stored as semi-clean spikelets (Stevens 2003). The weed species indicate a relatively broad range of soil types under cultivation during the Roman period, with wetland species indicating cultivation in the immediate vicinity of the site, but with heavier clay and drier, sandy soils also being exploited.

The animal bone assemblage exhibits no sudden or dramatic changes during the period of the site's occupation, with cattle remaining dominant throughout, although almost equalled by sheep/goat (**Table 3**). There was, however, some increase in size of animals in the Roman period, probably as a result of introducing or improving breeds. In addition, a number of new species appear, such as domestic fowl and donkey, some of which were probably Roman introductions.

Animal husbandry practices also display continuity from Iron Age to Romano-British, although a higher proportion of older cattle in the Roman period may indicate the retention of these animals for traction (**Figure 7**). With increasing population in the post-conquest period more land would need to be productive and draught cattle thus became more important (Sykes forthcoming). In addition, Romano-British cattle slaughtered for meat were killed at a slightly younger age than their Iron Age counterparts, perhaps because Romano-British husbandry techniques resulted in faster maturing individuals, or because consumers favoured younger meat. A more convincing difference between phases is the smaller proportion of demonstrably butchered horse bones in the later phases of occupation, which indicate a move away from consumption of horse flesh (**Table 4**).

An interesting feature of the Romano-British assemblage was the low proportion of head and foot bones, elements that may be removed, sometimes with the skin, during primary butchery, and deposited elsewhere due to their low meat content. It is possible that primary and secondary butchery activities were undertaken in different parts of the site, although there were no indications of such specialisation; alternatively, the hides may have exported from the site for processing elsewhere.

Craft and industry

On a site the size of Cleveland Farm one might expect to find structural and artefactual evidence for a range of different craft/industrial activities, but this was in fact limited. Apart from a few pairs of postholes possibly holding looms or drying racks etc, there were few features, such as hearths, kilns or ovens that would indicate craft or industry. Textile-working is attested only by five spindlewhorls (three of shale and two of bone) - loomweights and other weaving implements were apparently completely absent. There is no sign of shale-working, and only very slight evidence for bone-working (nine antler offcuts). The Iron Age pottery fabrics are dominated by those containing fossiliferous shell and limestone inclusions, indicating the use of local clay sources and therefore local production. Many of the Roman coarsewares may also have been locally produced - a small quantity of possible pottery waster sherds may indicate greyware production. The resources necessary for pottery manufacture were locally available, as demonstrated by the subsequent existence of a post-medieval pottery kiln at Ashton Keynes. There were two fragments of bronze-working moulds, both from Iron Age features.

The presence of over 100 fragments of quernstones hints that Cleveland Farm may have been a manufacturing site, even though the raw materials were not available in the immediate locality. However, as no incomplete examples were found and there was little variation in the type of Old Red Sandstone used, it must be concluded that the querns were imported in a complete state (Saunders 1997). There is no conclusive evidence that Cleveland Farm was a cereal crop production site (Grinter 1997), although the presence of such a large number of quern stones may indicate that dried and threshed material was brought to the site for processing (McLean 2001).

The only craft/industrial activity for which there was anything other than slight evidence was ironworking. A total of approximately 5.71kg of metalworking debris was recorded from the site, of which 4.29kg derived from contexts assigned to the Middle and/or Late Iron Age, located to the north of linear boundary 748. The rest was recovered from topsoil or clearance layers across the area of earthworks to the

south, with only minute quantities from stratified Roman contexts. Some, if not all, of this may be residual Iron Age material. Most of the debris is likely to derive from iron smithing, and no smelting debris was identified.

Amongst the contexts assigned to the Iron Age only five produced more than 100g of debris. A Middle Iron Age gully in Enclosure 1 (124) produced smithing slag and a little hearth lining, with a mixture of fuel-ash slag and hearth lining, coming from the enclosure ditch. Other Middle Iron Age features produced little smithing slag. Perhaps the most interesting feature was the Late Iron Age pit (721) in the entrance to roundhouse 705, which produced a range of debris, including a single smithing hearth bottom and several amorphous lumps of smithing slag, with the remainder of the material being classified as fuel-ash slag. Other Late Iron Age contexts produced smaller quantities of smithing slag, hearth lining or fuel-ash slag. An undated length of gully at the eastern end of the site (774) produced a single, almost complete smithing hearth bottom, while all the material from the trackway ditch, in the western part of the site, comprised smithing slag including one fragment of smithing hearth bottom. Two small, superimposed smithing hearth bottoms, near complete if rather abraded, came from a 1st to mid 3rd century AD surface. The presence of small amounts of smithing slag as well as several smithing hearth bottoms, the plano-convex buns of slag which formed in the base of smithing hearths, is sufficient to indicate that small-scale iron smithing was carried out in the Middle and Late Iron Age, with the majority occurring in the later period.

Given the general absence of ironworking slag from Romano-British contexts it is interesting to note the evidence from the quernstone assemblage, which includes at least 30 quern fragments carrying surface deposits indicative of ironworking. A further 24 quern fragments were burnt, possibly resulting from similar or related activity. These fragments were concentrated in late Roman contexts. In the immediate area comparable evidence, also from late Roman levels, was recorded from Claydon Pike (McLean 2001).

One more possible industrial activity warrants a mention, for which evidence comes from the coin assemblage. A large proportion of the bronze coins of AD 330-64 are locally-made copies, and an unusual feature of the Cleveland Farm assemblage is the sheer volume of coins issued from AD 364 to 378; it may be that coin copying was occurring somewhere in the settlement.

Trade and exchange

Materials and objects were reaching the site from a range of local, regional and international sources. The potential economic benefits of the site's position within the hinterland of Cirencester, particularly in the later Roman period, are suggested by the regional pattern of coin loss (Moorehead 1997; 2001), and it is apparent that the inhabitants had access to a range of goods, including 'luxury' items, either through the market of Cirencester or via the post-conquest road network.

In the Middle and Late Iron Age local sources predominate, but there is evidence towards the end of this period within the ceramic assemblage of more long-distance contacts (Edgeley-Long 2002). The presence of Droitwich briquetage (albeit only two small sherds) is explicable in terms of the contents of these vessels (salt), and briquetage has been found at several Middle Iron Age sites around Cleveland Farm,

including Claydon Pike. The identification of a significant quantity of sherds containing Palaeozoic limestone inclusions, regional imports from the Woolhope/Malvern area of Herefordshire first identified by Peacock (1968), is more puzzling. This was the second most commonly occurring fabric type within the Iron Age assemblage. Morris has suggested that the import of such vessels may represent 'the maintenance of exchange networks' that would uphold social relations and obligations which could be called upon in times of crisis (Morris 1997, 38). The Dressel 1B amphorae, manufactured principally in Italy, at Etruria, Latium, are much more unusual in the region; the British distribution tends to be limited to Dorset, Hampshire and the south-east (Tyers 1996, 89-90). The presence of these three types of non-local pottery may be in some way connected, perhaps indicating a system of reciprocity, 'where social customs dictate the transfer of goods between individuals or between groups' (Peacock and Williams 1986, 55). Evidence for the long-distance trade and/or exchange of other goods at this period is unforthcoming from the site; stone querns, for example, were manufactured from locally available Jurassic limestone or sarsen sandstone, probably representing the use of glacial erratics from the Wiltshire area.

In the Roman period both ceramic and stone assemblages contain a greater range of non-local imports, reflecting a change from a local production system to a more selective system of regional production and distribution (Morris 1996, 49). While there is some evidence that in the Iron Age, and into the early Roman period, both quernstones and pottery found on sites in the area may have formed a 'trading package', obtained from similar source areas, from the 1st century AD sources for the two artefact types diverge and diversify (McLean 2001, 84-5). In both instances local sources (in north Wiltshire and south Gloucestershire) were being supplemented by regional products (quernstones from Surrey, the Pennines, the Forest of Dean, Herefordshire and the Bristol area; pottery from south Dorset, Oxfordshire, the New Forest and the Surrey/Hampshire border) and also (for pottery) by continental imports (samian ware, black-slipped wares from the Rhineland, Spanish and French amphorae). Similar patterns are seen on other sites in the area, such as Claydon Pike.

Amongst the large collection of brooches from the site are several West Country types – Polden Hill, T-shaped and trumpet-headed types (all early Roman) (Mackreth 2004). All are common at other sites in the Cotswold Water Park area, such as Somerford Keynes and Claydon Pike, and a large concentration of trumpet-headed brooches in the Cirencester area (16 from Cleveland Farm, ten from Somerford Keynes and a large number from Kingscote) has led to the suggestion that a workshop in the area may have been producing this form (Cool forthcoming). Wroxeter types, of which there are four from Cleveland Farm, are thought to originate from the Midlands or North Wales (Bayley and Butcher 2004, 169).

The domestic and personal sphere

Although the environmental and subsistence evidence indicates that the site was a predominantly agricultural settlement, the domestic lifestyle of its inhabitants can be glimpsed in the presence of domestic and personal items. Evidence for the inhabitants' living quarters comes mainly from the roundhouses, the majority lying within the area of the Iron Age settlement, although they were still being built and occupied into the Roman period.

Beyond this the structural evidence is ambiguous. The series of small rectangular gullies/ditches, comparable in size to the roundhouses, and in many case occupying approximately the same locations, may reflect new, 'Romanised' house forms. The artefactual assemblage can add little beyond noting the presence on the site of a significant quantity of redeposited ceramic building material (including identifiable *tegula* and *imbrex* fragments), indicating the former existence of substantial buildings on or very close to the site. Spatial analysis of the various categories of metalwork present on the site has also proved inconclusive. Most classes, such as objects of personal adornment, toilet items, weights, nails and so forth, were recovered from a wide area and no concentrations were noted. In addition, the co-ordinates of objects were not always recorded. For instance, of 140 glass vessel fragments listed on the database, only 14 were recorded in plan.

Within the domestic context, the most commonly occurring ceramic vessel types were suited to cooking, their jar forms helping to keep contents inside the vessel, and the relatively wide opening allowing easy access for stirring and serving. Some displayed evidence of internal burnt residues resulting from charring of a vessel's contents, or external sooting indicating their having been placed in or over an open fire, stone lined hearths being recorded in a number of the roundhouses. Other pottery forms suggest uses as serving vessels, storage vessels or possibly other, non-mundane activities.

Other household items are present amongst the metalwork assemblage in the form of spoons (**Figure 8, 6-8**), a possible ladle, a flagon lid, lock-pins and lift keys/latchlifters. A small, decorative drop-handle (**Figure 8, 9**) probably came from a bowl. There is also a range of tools – knives, awls, chisels – but very few of these were well stratified and some could be of post-Roman date. One of the knife handles is definitely of Romano-British date – an example with cast zoomorphic decoration (**Figure 8, 2**). One unusual find was a steelyard found in association with two lead weights (**Figure 8, 3-5**). A single seal-box lid provided the only evidence of writing.

One artefact type, which might have been expected to provide a straightforward indication of domestic activity in the form of food processing, turned out to demonstrate a range of more complex processes, at least during the Roman period (during the Iron Age there seems to have been a direct correlation between quernstones and their original place of use). There were over 100 quernstone fragments, but very few were complete. No concentrations could be positively identified near to ovens or features related to food. Instead, many were found in secondary contexts – in the packing of postholes and pits, and laid into floor surfaces and walls – and at least 30 had surface deposits indicating a use in iron-working (McLean 2001). Many of the fragments were recovered from clearance layers, although 56 could be located in plan. Three concentrations in the distribution of these fragments were visible, but these appear to relate to contexts of re-use. They include 18 fragments which formed part of an area of laid stone immediately east of roundhouse 6118; a collection to the south of the pond and west of feature 3384, which relates only to clearance layers and a stone spread; and a group of six fragments from the topsoil at the eastern side of structure 6303.

An interesting object amongst the worked stone assemblage was an oculist's stamp (an object type more properly known as a *collyrium* stamp) (**Figure 8, 1**). These items were used by doctors (not necessarily specialist oculists) to work sticks of semi-solid

medicaments before they hardened (**Appendix 1**). The stamp has retrograde inscriptions on all four edges and a symbol cut into one face. The side inscriptions usually give three pieces of information: the name of the doctor, the name of the medicament to be used as treatment and the description of the ailment. The vast majority of *collyrium* stamps have been found in the Roman provinces of Gallia, Germania and Britannia, probably not, as previously thought, because eye diseases were more prevalent in these areas, but perhaps because medicaments were differently administered here, possibly by peripatetic doctors, reflecting the requirements of an essentially rural population (Boon 1983).

A range of 'luxury' goods, such as imported pottery and glass vessels, reflects the relative level of affluence of the site's occupants (as well as their access to markets). Objects of personal adornment and dress, for example, account for a large proportion of the copper alloy assemblage (**Plate 5**). This may well have been influenced by the manner of collection; nonetheless, there is an interesting collection of brooches, bracelets and rings which mostly date to the Roman period. The brooches (87 identifiable, with a further 27 represented by fragments only) were almost all unstratified, with only four objects coming from stratified deposits. The date range is broad, from a 4th century BC form to an Anglo-Saxon saucer brooch, both unstratified. There is a clear pre-conquest presence at the site, but brooch use at the site had its *floruit* from the mid 1st century to the 2nd century AD. Although brooches typical of the late 2nd century were found, they were scarcer than earlier types. Later forms include penannular brooches, with the latest activity represented by a later 4th/early 5th century brooch and the saucer brooch.

At least 40 copper alloy bracelets were also present, some of which are indicative of late Roman activity, at a time when brooches became less common. Many had been flattened out after use, and one displays wear that occurred after being flattened. Twelve armlet fragments of Kimmeridge shale, two decorated, were also present. Finger-rings are equally well represented, with at least 41 recorded. Many displayed bezels of varying shapes. Some of the settings are now empty, others hold intaglios. Other jewellery is represented by 17 glass beads, all late Roman types apart from two melon beads. Only three copper alloy pins were identified; all are thought to be Romano-British. The head of one had been fashioned from blue glass. Pins of bone were more common (12 examples, all incomplete). Evidence of footwear is provided by fragments from five leather shoes, recovered from pit and ditch features located across the Roman settlement area in Field D. All are from bottom units, and where identifiable are of roundel shape. Hobnails survived in three of the examples.

Relatively few toilet/cosmetic items were recovered (**Plate 5**). Tweezers are the mostly commonly occurring item in the assemblage and include three complete sets, and half of a pair. A large, complete pair of tweezers was also found in association with another toilet item, a narrow strip with a wire coiled six times around one end, of uncertain function. A nail cleaner was also recovered, as well as a possible second, a complete toilet spoon and part of a second. Also of interest in this category is a complete glass stirring rod, used to stir perfumes and cosmetics. A possible mirror is indicated by a fragment of sheet copper alloy with ring-dot decoration, similar to an example from Wanborough (Hooley 2001, no. 129).

Most of the vessel glass was undiagnostic and few forms could be identified. The assemblage derives largely from thin-walled drinking vessels, in simple shapes with

flame-rounded or cracked-off rims. Base fragments from three square bottles and two footring bases were present, as well as a curved, colourless handle with two ribs, probably from a jug. A scarcity of the more utilitarian square and prismatic bottles is likely to be due to chronological rather than functional factors, since the bottles were particularly common in the early Roman period and their scarcity here is paralleled at this period in other material types such as pottery and coins. Evidence is slight for other leisure activities such as gaming – a single bone gaming piece.

Burial and religion

The remains of just seven burials were recovered, three of them grouped together north of the trackway where it turns west away from the site (Coe *et al.* 1991), and four others in the southern part of the Romano-British settlement (one of them, a neonate, unstratified). Four of those buried were adults (one male, one possibly male and two possibly female), one was an infant/juvenile (*c.* 4.5-5.5 years) and two were neonates. The stature of only one individual could be calculated, an adult male of over 50 years who, although short at an estimated 1.6m, appears to have been relatively stocky. Both males (the second was over 40 years) had very strong attachments for arm muscles and were clearly involved in activities requiring upper body strength, for example smithying as opposed to just heavy lifting.

The child showed signs of *cribra orbitalia*, believed to be connected with childhood iron deficiency anaemia (Molleson 1993; Robledo *et al.* 1995), and possibly related to poor diet, and also hypoplasia, the predominant causes of which are believed to include periods of illness or nutritional stress (Hillson 1979). The periosteal new bone observed over parts of the child's lower limb shafts may be indicative of a condition linked to death; in other words, it is likely that the child was either ill and/or malnourished on and off through the latter part of its life. There was no dating evidence for the burials although small groups and singletons such as these are not unusual for the Roman period in rural areas. They provide little evidence for mortuary practices, and there is likewise little to indicate religious beliefs.

The four and five post structures of the type recorded within the area of the Iron Age settlement have been interpreted in various ways – as granaries, shrines, excarnation structures or watchtowers, although there is no reason why such a simple form should not have provided the basic framework for a range of different building structures. Nonetheless, the siting of two five-post structures over ditch 748 may have had some symbolic, rather than practical, significance relating to that ditch's possible role as an important boundary.

Within the artefact assemblage, two pre-conquest coins may offer evidence for deliberate deposition – the Iron Age gold quarter unit, and the *denarius* of Juba II of Mauretania. Most gold coin finds seem to be the result of deliberate deposition, in the Roman period as well as the Iron Age, and these two coins should probably be so regarded.

One other aspect of the coin assemblage may be relevant in this respect. The peak in coin loss during the period 364-78 has already been discussed in terms of a possible association with the hinterland of Cirencester. However, it has also been recognised that sites with Romano-British temples also have large numbers of Valentinianic coins in their assemblages (Davies and Gregory 1991, 75-7), and that where these coins

have been located on those sites they concentrate around the temple (Guest forthcoming; R. Reece pers. comm.). Spatial analysis showed a general spread of coins of this date across Cleveland Farm, but with a particular concentration in the north-east – a possible site for a temple?

The presence of at least 29 rolled lead sheets could be suggestive here, but the evidence remains ambiguous. Only one sheet has been unrolled, and showed no inscription. Most are of a similar size (a rolled length of about 30mm), but their function remains uncertain. All but one are unstratified metal detector finds and cannot be related to features. Spatial analysis indicates that they cluster in an area that was not excavated, approximately 10m to the south-east of feature 6334, and therefore some distance from the area of concentration of Valentinianic coins. Finally, three copper alloy objects may have come from figurines with ritual significance: two cones, which may represent hones, and a fragment showing two eyes or nostrils.

CONTINUITY, CHANGE AND THE EFFECTS OF ROMANISATION

The location of the Ashton Keynes Iron Age and Romano-British settlements on the extensively settled and farmed gravel terraces of Upper Thames Valley gives the site the potential to highlight changes in the nature and structure of settlement patterns in the run up to, and following, the Roman conquest, the site lying within the rural hinterland of the Roman town of Cirencester, 8km to the north-west, and close to the Roman road of Ermin Street (**Figure 4**).

The Middle to Late Iron Age occupation at Ashton Keynes appears to have comprised a series of small enclosures, open areas and structures, bounded by a large ditch to the north that appeared to be linked to a wider complex of ditches and enclosures to the north of the settlement. Each enclosure contained at most only a single roundhouse, in some cases with other structures including possible granaries, perhaps indicating the locations of a sequence of primary dwellings replaced over time. Further roundhouses as well as other structures of varying size and shape lay outside the enclosures. The settlement is clearly native in form but the presence, although in small quantities, of imported items traded from the continent, such as Dressel 1B amphorae, provide the first indications of the influence of Roman styles and tastes on the Late Iron Age population.

Native settlements in the area frequently endured into the Roman period (Miles 1988; McWhirr 1981), and the Roman conquest may initially have had only a limited impact on the rural settlement pattern into the early 2nd century AD, although the nuclei of such settlements often shifted following the conquest, perhaps as a result of Roman influence (Clarke 1993; Miles and Palmer 1983). The late Iron Age settlement at Claydon Pike, for example, continued largely unchanged until *c.* AD 120, following which the spatial layout of the site was radically altered (Miles *et al.* forthcoming). While there appears to have been a gradual shift in settlement even during the Iron Age at Ashton Keynes, there was a marked change during the early Roman period when a new focus of settlement was established to the south on either side of the ditched trackway, associated with a new, more regular layout of surrounding fields.

Nonetheless, within the new settlement area at Ashton Keynes the native form of structure, the roundhouse, continued to be used, at least in the early Roman period;

there are reasons, as described above, to be wary of a 3rd/4th century AD date for two of the roundhouses, for although they are not unknown in southern Britain, as at Whitehill Farm, west of Swindon (Anderson 1979) and Churchill Hospital, Oxford (Young 1977), these were both associated with kiln structures. Despite the survival of earthworks within the area of Romano-British settlement, there are no features that can be convincingly interpreted as Roman-style rectangular buildings, although some of the small rectangular ditched features have been tentatively interpreted as Romanised replacements of the earlier roundhouses. There was little evidence of stone wall footings, although it is possible that this reflects the difficult conditions under which the excavation was carried out. Certainly, the presence of a range of luxury goods indicate that this was not a low status settlement, and it is possible that the distribution of coins towards the north-east of the site might indicate the location of a shrine or temple.

The evidence for Romanisation among the finds assemblage is, however, ambiguous and partly contradictory. In terms of material culture the range of goods available to the inhabitants increased but, due to the lack of close dating evidence for the site, it is uncertain exactly when new types (vessel glass, samian ware) appeared. Some sources of raw materials (for example, for pottery and quernstones) certainly continued to supply the site at least into the immediate post-conquest period.

However, a major change in the quernstone assemblage can be discerned in the Roman period, at least from the 2nd century AD, involving the introduction and use of disproportionately large numbers of querns, many of them in Old Red Devonian Quartz Conglomerate and Sandstone from the Forest of Dean (McLean 2001). One possible explanation for this is that the inhabitants were processing cereals for more than just their own needs, possibly receiving cereal that had already been dried and threshed from other sites (Morris 1979, 19), and redistributing the processed flour. Another hint of inter-site specialisation is the possibility that following primary butchery, animal hides were exported from the site for tanning elsewhere. It has been suggested that the 1st century AD settlement at Somerford Keynes, whose layout was also reorganised in the early 2nd century, was then used as an official Roman tile depot (Miles *et al*. forthcoming). Both Cirencester and the possible town at Cricklade, sited on Ermin Street 3km to the south-east of the site, may have acted as consumer markets for processed animal products from rural producers (Fulford 1982; Grant 1989).

Acknowledgments

Key to finds figures and plates

Fig. 5:   Iron Age pottery: (1) barrel-shaped jar, shelly fabric, Object Number (ON) 2, context 157, gully 124, Enclosure 1; (2) Dressel 1B amphora rim, context 723, pit 721.

Fig. 8:   Objects relating to domestic life: (1) oculist's stamp, stone, ON 4961, context 5050, ditch 5027, Field D, Field D; (2) zoomorphic handle from folding knife, copper alloy, ON 2643, context 2996; (3) steelyard, copper alloy, ON 9542; (4) and (5) steelyard weights, lead, No. 4 weight 63g, No. 5 in lead 'case', ON 9542, context 5003, occupation deposit, Field D; (6) small spoon, copper alloy, ON 3113, context 1461; (7) spoon handle, copper alloy, ON 248, unstratified, Field C; (8) spoon, copper alloy, ON 708, unstratified, Field D; (9) drop handle with anthropomorphic terminals, possibly from vessel, ON 4191, context 5003, occupation deposit, Field D.

Plate 2:   Pre-Conquest brooches: (top, left to right) Nertomarus, ON 2410, context 1166, ditch 1165, Field D; hinged (Feugère type 20d), ON 771, metal detector (MD) find, Field D; Nauheim derivative, ON 4006, MD find; La Tène III (Nauheim), ON 3, context 199, ditch 113, Enclosure 1; (bottom, left to right) Colchester, ON 4360, context 5001, cleaning layer, Field D; Langton Down, ON 1700, unstratified; La Tène III (Feugère type 2b), ON 4757, MD find; Late Tène I, ON 1400, unstratified.

Plate 3:   Later 1ˢᵗ and 2ⁿᵈ century AD brooches: (top, left to right) trumpet-headed, ON 1478, MD find; trumpet-headed, ON 713, MD find; hinged plate, ON 3202, context 2100; Colchester derivative (intermediate T-shaped/Polden Hill), ON 9893, MD find, Field D; Colchester derivative (Polden Hill), ON 1243, MD find, Field D; (centre, left to right) hinged T-shaped, ON 4051, unstratified; headstud, ON 9046, context 6811; (bottom, left to right) Wroxeter type, ON 1145, MD find, Field D; Colchester derivative (hinged dolphin), ON 4004, MD find; Colchester derivative (two-piece), ON 721, MD find.

Plate 4:   Late Roman and post-Roman brooches: (top, left to right) penannular, ON 725, MD find, Field D; cast saucer brooch, Saxon, ON 712, MD find; (centre) *Liebenau* type, ON 9676, context 7020, stone spread, Field D; (bottom, left to right) penannular, ON 9181, context 1255, ditch 1254, Field D; penannular, ON 4551, MD find.

Plate 5:   Jewellery and other personal items: (top, left to right, all items copper alloy) armlet, incised decoration, ON 4196, unstratified; armlet, incised decoration, ON 376, MD find, Field C; possible nail cleaner with twisted wire suspension ring, ON 670, unstratified, Field C; (centre, top) seal box lid, ON 1096, MD find; (lower centre, left to right) ring, red setting with intaglio, ON 1469, MD find; ring, blue setting with intaglio, ON 1292, MD find; ring, ON 4552, MD find; (bottom, left to right) toilet set comprising tweezers and toilet implement, ON 4002, MD find; nail cleaner, ON 9601, context 8026, occupation deposit, Field D; pin with blue glass head, ON 9264, context 5028, cleaning layer, Field D; tweezers, ON 739, MD find, Field D.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Specialist archive reports are associated with this paper. All are available on demand from Wessex Archaeology: postmaster@wessexarch.co.uk

Andrews, P., *Metalworking debris from Cleveland Farm*
Atkins, L., *Worked bone objects from Cleveland Farm*
Atkins, L., *Shale objects from Cleveland Farm*
Jones, G.P., *Romano-British Glass from Cleveland Farm*
Jones, G.P., *Iron Age pottery*
Jones, G.P., *Metalwork from Cleveland Farm*
Knight, S., with Bates, A., Hammon, A. and Davies, J., *Animal Bone*
McKinley, J.I., *Human Bone from Cleveland Farm*
Stevens, C., *Charred and waterlogged plant remains from Cleveland Farm*
Wells, N.A., *Coins from Cleveland Farm*

ALLEN, T.G., 1990, *An Iron Age and Romano-British Enclosed Settlement at Watkins Farm Northmoor, Oxon*. Oxford University Committee for Archaeology

ALLEN, T.G. and ROBINSON, M.A. (eds.), 1993, *The Prehistoric and Iron Age Enclosed Settlement at Mingies Ditch; Hardwick-with-Yelford, Oxon*. Thames Valley Landscapes: the Windrush Valley Volume 2, Oxford, Oxford Archaeology Unit/ Oxford University Committee for Archaeology

ANDERSON, A.S., 1979, *The Roman Pottery Industry in North Wiltshire*, Swindon: Swindon Archaeol. Soc. Rep. 2

BAYLEY, J. and BUTCHER, S., 2004, *Roman Brooches in Britain*. London: Society of Antiquaries

BOON, G.C., 1983, Potters, oculists and eye troubles, *Britannia* 14, 1-14

CLARKE, S., 1993, *Settlement and Social Development: Settlement Archaeology in the Severn Cotswolds Region from 750 BC to AD 750*. PhD thesis, University of Bradford

COE, D., JENKINS, V. and RICHARDS, J., 1991, Cleveland Farm, Ashton Keynes: second interim report: investigations May-August 1989, *Wiltshire Archaeol. Natur. Hist. Mag.* 84, 40-50

COLES, B. and COLES, J., 1986, *From Sweet Track to Glastonbury*. London: Thames & Hudson

COOL, H.E.M., forthcoming a, The small finds from Claydon Pike, in D. Miles *et al.* forthcoming

DARVILL, T. and LOCKE, R., 1988, Aerial photography in the Upper Thames Valley and eastern Cotswolds in 1986, *Bristol and Gloucestershire Arch. Soc. Trans.* 106, 192-8

DAVIES, J.A. and GREGORY, T., 1991, Coinage from a civitas: a survey of the Roman coins found in Norfolk and their contribution to the archaeology of the Civitas Icenorum, *Britannia* 22, 65-101

DE ROCHE, C. D., 1978, The Iron Age pottery, in M. Parrington, *The Excavation of an Iron Age Settlement, Bronze Age Ring-Ditches and Roman Features at Ashville Trading Estate, Abingdon (Oxfordshire) 1974-76*. London: CBA Res. Rep. 28

EDGELEY-LONG, G.P., 2002, *Cleveland Farm, Ashton Keynes, Gloucestershire: the Iron Age Pottery*. MA report, University of Southampton

FULFORD, M., 1982, Town and country in Roman Britain - a parasitical relationship?, in D. Miles (ed.), *The Romano-British Countryside: Studies in Rural Settlement Economy*. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports (British Series) 103(ii): 403-419

GINGELL, C., 1982, Excavations of an Iron Age enclosure at Groundwell Farm, Blunsdon St. Andrew, 1976-7'. *Wiltshire Archaeol. Natur. Hist. Mag.* 76, 33-75

GRANT, A., 1989, Animals in Roman Britain, in M. Todd (ed.), *Research on Roman Britain 1960 – 89*, 135-46. London: Britannia Monog. 11

GRINTER, P., 1997 *Evidence of crops and crop processing from the Romano-British period at Cleveland Farm, Ashton Keynes, Wiltshire*. MSc thesis, University of Sheffield.

GUEST, P. forthcoming, The coins from Elms Farm, Heybridge

HAWKES, C.F.C., 1942, The Deverel-Rimbury urn and the Picardy pin: a phase of Bronze Age settlement in Kent, *Proc. Prehist. Soc.* 8, 26-47

HILLSON, S.W., 1979, Diet and dental disease, *World Archaeol.* II (2), 147-62

JENNINGS, D., MUIR, J., PALMER, S., and SMITH, A., 2004, *Thornhill Farm, Fairford, Gloucestershire: An Iron Age and Roman pastoral site in the Upper Thames Valley*. Oxford: Oxford Archaeology, Thames Valley Landscape Monograph 23

LEECH, R., 1977. *The Upper Thames Valley in Gloucestershire and Wiltshire: An Archaeological Survey of the River Gravels*. Bristol, CRAAGS Survey 4

MACKRETH, D., 2004, The Brooches, in D. Jennings, J. Muir, S. Palmer and A. Smith, *Thornhill Farm, Fairford, Gloucestershire. An Iron Age and Roman pastoral site in the Upper Thames Valley*, 70-8, Oxford, Thames Valley Landscapes Monograph 23

MCLEAN, M.I., 2001, *A comparative analysis of the quernstone assemblages from four Late Iron Age-early Romano-British sites within the Upper Thames Valley: Thornhill Farm, Roughground Farm, Claydon Pike and Ashton Keynes*. MA dissertation, University of Southampton

MCWHIRR, A., 1981, *Roman Gloucestershire*. Gloucester: Alan Sutton

MILES, D., 1988, Villas and variety: aspects of economy and society in the Upper Thames landscape, in K. Branigan and D. Miles (eds.), *The Economies of Romano-British Villas*, 60-72. Sheffield: J. R. Collis Publications

MILES, D. and PALMER, S., 1983, Claydon Pike, *Current Archaeology 86*, 88 - 92

MILES, D., PALMER, S., SMITH, A. and JONES, G., forthcoming, *Iron Age and Roman settlement in the Upper Thames Valley: Excavations at Claydon Pike and other sites within the Cotswold Water Park*, Thames Valley Landscapes Monog., Oxford Archaeol.

MOLLESON, T.I., 1993, The human remains, in D.E. Farwell and T.I. Molleson, *Poundbury Volume 2: The* Cemeteries, 142-214. Dorset Natur. Hist. Archaeol. Monog. 11

MOOREHEAD, T.S.N., 1997, All Cannings, Wiltshire, in R. Bland and J. Orna-Ornstein (eds.), *Coin Hoards From Roman Britain Volume X*, 406-9. London: British Museum Press

MOOREHEAD, T.S.N., 2001, Roman coin finds from Wiltshire, in P. Ellis (ed.), *Roman Wiltshire and After: Papers in Honour of Ken Annable*, 85-105. Devizes: Wiltshire Archaeol. Natur. Hist. Soc.

MORRIS, P., 1979, *Agricultural Buildings in Roman Britain*, Oxford: Brit. Archaeol. Rep. 70

MORRIS, E.L., 1996, Iron Age artefact production and exchange, in T.C. Champion and J.R. Collis (eds), *The Iron Age in Britain and Ireland: Recent Trends*, 41-66. University of Sheffield: J.R. Collis Publications

MORRIS, E.L., 1997, Where is the Danebury Ware? in A. Gwilt and C. Haselgrove (eds), *Reconstructing Iron Age Societies*, 36-9. Oxford: Oxbow Monog. 71

OXFORD ARCHAEOLOGY, 2005, *The Cotswold Water Park: Interpreting the Historic Environment, Heritage Feasibility Study*, draft Oxford Archaeology report (February 2005)

PEACOCK, D.P.S., 1968, A petrological study of certain Iron Age Pottery from Western England, *Proc. Prehist. Soc.* 34, 414-26

PEACOCK, D.P.S. and WILLIAMS, D.F., 1986, Amphorae and the Roman Economy: An Introductory Guide. London: Longman

PINE, J. and PRESTON, S., 2004, *Iron Age and Roman settlement and landscape at Totterdown Lane, Horcott, near Fairford, Gloucestershire,* Thames Valley Archaeological Services Monog. 6.

ROBINSON, M., 2004, The plant and invertebrate remains, in D. Jennings *et al.* 2004, 133-145

ROBINSON, M.A. and WILSON, R., 1987, A survey of environmental archaeology in the South Midlands, In H.C.M. Keeley (ed.) *Environmental Archaeology: a Regional Review2*, 16-100. London: HBMCO Occasional Paper 1

ROBLEDO, B., TRANCHO, G.J., and BROTHWELL, D., 1995, *Cribra Orbitalia*: health indicator in the late Roman population of Cannington (Sommerset [sic.], Great Britain)' *J. Palaeopathology* 7 (3), 185-93

SAUNDERS, R., 1997, Quernstones from Ashton Keynes, Wiltshire, *Quern Study Group Newsletter 4*

SEAGER SMITH, R.H., 2001, The coarse pottery, in A.S. Anderson, J.S. Wacher and A.P. Fitzpatrick, *The Romano-British 'Small Town' at Wanborough, Wiltshire*, 232-300. London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, Britannia Monograph Series 19

SMITH, A., forthcoming, The Cotswold Water Park Project, in Miles *et al.* forthcoming

STEVENS, C.J., 2003, An investigation of agricultural consumption and production models for prehistoric and Roman Britain, *Environmental Archaeology* 8, 61-76

SYKES, N., forthcoming, The animal remains from the Late Iron Age and Roman settlement at Longdoles Field, in D. Miles *et al.* forthcoming

TYERS, P., 1996, *Roman Pottery in Britain*. London: Routledge

VOINOT, J., 1984, Inventaire des cachets d'oculistes gallo-romains, *Conférences Lyonnaises d'opthalmologie* 150, 1-578

WESSEX ARCHAEOLOGY, 1984. *The Bradleys Pit, Ashton Keynes, Wiltshire: Archaeological Evaluation of an Earthwork Site*, unpublished Trust for Wessex Archaeology report (September 1984)

WESSEX ARCHAEOLOGY, 1989. *Cleveland Farm, Ashton Keynes: First interim report, June 1989*, unpublished Wessex Archaeology report (June 1989)

YOUNG, C. 1977, *Oxfordshire Roman Pottery*, Oxford: Brit. Archaeol. Rep. 43

Appendix 1: The oculist's stamp (Figure 8, 1)

by Nicholas A. Wells

Oculists' stamps are more properly known as *collyrium* stamps as they were used by doctors (not necessarily specialist oculists) to work sticks of semi-solid medicaments (*collyria*) before they hardened. The stamps are usually small square or rectangular slips of fine-grained stone with retrograde inscriptions on all four sides, and sometimes on one or both faces. The side inscriptions usually give three pieces of information:

- the name of the doctor
- the name of the *collyrium* to be used as treatment
- the description of the ailment

This stamp, measuring 38mm square, has retrograde inscriptions on all four edges and a symbol cut into one face.

Edge 1: N I L I O G E N I S T Λ C T V S

NILIO is from *nilios* meaning 'a precious stone of the colour of dark topaz'.

GENI probably comes from *genitor* meaning 'begetter, parent or source'.

STACTUS is the word for 'unguent'.

This unguent originates from the <u>nilios</u> stone

Edge 2: . . B I V L D I Λ D P E L Λ
O P O B Λ L S Λ M Λ T (2 lines)

The first three words form the name of the oculist/doctor: TIB[ERIUS] IUL[IUS] DIAD[UMENUS]

PELA probably comes from *pelagus* meaning 'sea', the Greek word, θαλασσα (*thalassa*) having been attested on other stamps. If so, this may be translated as 'sea-salt'.

OPOBALSAMAT means 'juice of the balsam tree'

Tiberius Iulius Diadumenus [has prescribed] *sea salt* (or water) [mixed with?] *the juice of the balsam tree*

Edge 3: . . B I V L D I Λ D V D I Λ G L
Λ D E P I P O R Λ S O C V L (2 lines)

The first three words are again the name of the oculist/doctor: TIB[ERIUS] IUL[IUS] DIADU[MENUS]

DIAGL is from *diaglaucium*, meaning 'a salve made from the herb *glaucium*'

AD = 'to'

EPIP is from *epiphora*, meaning 'disease'

ORAS is from *ora*, meaning 'corner, edge'

OCUL is from *oculus*, meaning 'eye' (ORAS + OCUL together = 'eyelid')

Tiberius Iulius Diadumenus [has prescribed] *a salve made from the herb glaucium* [for application] *to the disease* [on] *the eyelids*

Edge 4:   (2 lines)

This edge is too worn to decipher, but almost certainly starts in the same way as lines 2 and 3, i.e. with the name TIB / IUL / DIAD

Face: ♈

This could have been Tiberius Iulius Diadumenus' personal symbol. What is apparent, though, is that the sides with two lines (2, 3 and 4) have their top line next to the inscribed face, so it seems likely that this symbol (whatever else it did) helped the doctor know which way up to hold the stamp when using it.

The inscription on line 1 is clearly in a different hand, nor does it follow the oculist name/*collyria* type formula on other lines. Furthermore it is upside down compared to lines 2, 3 and probably 4. This is clearly a reuse of a faded inscription, an outcome shown in Line 4, and perhaps indicates that the stamp was passed on to another oculist – possibly an heir.

A *Cae Diadumenus* is attested on an oculist's stamp at Tarragon (Voinot 1984, no.166), while a *Sextus Julius Diadumenus* is found at Mandeuse (*ibid.*, no.243). This latter bears the same nomen, and may be related to our *Tiberis Julius*.

Table 1: Finds totals by material type

Material Type	BRADLEYS PIT		CLEVELAND FARM		TOTAL	
	Number	Weight (g)	Number	Weight (g)	Number	Weight (g)
Pottery	1438	3941	52,679	522,093	54,117	526,034
Ceramic Building Material	61	1560	1218	86,002	1279	87,562
Plaster/*Opus signinum*	-	-	8	1237	8	1237
Fired Clay	-	-	949	10,920	949	10,920
Stone	246	7312	841	195,052	1087	202,364
Burnt Stone	-	-	1088	101,387	1088	101,387
Worked Flint	-	-	68	1047	68	1047
Burnt Flint	11	193	35	727	46	920
Glass	6	10	171	237	177	247
Slag	9	35	182	10,772	191	10,807
Coins	110	-	1267	-	1377	-
Metal	5	-	3623	-	3628	-
Copper alloy	*1*	-	525	-	*526*	-
Lead	-	-	795	-	*795*	-
Iron	*4*	-	2303	-	*2307*	-
Shale	-	-	15	-	15	-
Wood	-	-	15	-	15	-
Leather	-	-	12	-	12	-
Worked Bone	-	-	31	-	31	-
Human Bone	-	-	3 individuals -	- + 355 g redeposited	3 individuals -	- + 355 g redeposited
Animal Bone	383	3772	30,129	222,957	30,512	226,729
Marine Shell	-	-	135	1038	135	1038

Table 2: Charred plant remains

Feature	ditch 113	ditch 113	ditch 113	205	337	1182	1182	1182
Feature Type	Enc. 1	Enc. 1	Enc. 1	r-h gully (Enc. 1)	r-h gully (Enc. 1)	ditch	ditch	ditch
Phase	IA	IA	IA	IA	IA	RB	RB	RB
Sample Vol. (Ltrs)		4	10	10	10	1mm	>1mm	>1mm
Flot ml	500	125	1000	60	50			
Cereals								
Hordeum sp. (grain)								
Hordeum sp. (rachis frag)	1							
Cereal (grain)				4				
Triticum spelta/dicoccum (grain)	1				1	+	+	+
Triticum spelta/dicoccum (sprouted grain)						++	++	+
Triticum spelta (glumes)	2					++++	++++	++++
Triticum spelta/dicoccum (glumes)			1					
Cereal culm node			1					
Species								
Ranunculus sp.			cf.1					
Rumex sp.						+	+	
Medicago lupilina	1/2 charred					1		
Toralis arvensis/japonica								+
Anthemis cotula						++	++	
Eleocharis palustris							1	+
Carex sp.							+	
Avena sp. (awns)								+++
Bromus sp.			2					1
Phleum sp.			1					1
Avena/Bromus sp.		1						

Table 3: Iron Age species and bone elements by unadjusted RFCs (Restricted Fragment Counts)

(*over-represented: proximal and distal parts counted separately)

	Horse	Cattle	Sheep/Goat	Pig	Deer	Dog	Total
Horn core		5	13				18
Mandible		18	6	4		1	29
Tooth		6	7				13
Atlas		1					1
Axis		3		1			4
Scapula		17	4	5			26
Humerus*	9	38	10	11	2		70
Radius*	10	36	36	3	2	2	89
Ulna		5			1	1	7
Metacarpal*	5	43	27		1		76
Pelvis	5	13	8	1		2	29
Femur*	9	32	14	7			62
Tibia*	6	58	53	9		2	128
Metatarsal*	7	46	35	2			90
Metapodial		3					3
Calcaneum	3	6	2		1		12
Astragalus	2	10					12
First phalange	2	5	1	2	1		11
Second Phalange	4	2					6
Third phalange	1			1			2
Total	63	347	216	46	8	8	688
%	**9**	**50**	**31**	**7**	**1**	**1**	

Table 4: Animal bone - taphonomic factors by phase

	Species	Gnawed %	Burnt %	Butchered %	Total (n)
Iron Age	Horse	30		13	63
	Cattle	29	3	16	347
	Sheep/goat	13	<1	6	216
	Pig	26		7	46
	Deer	25		50	8
	Dog	13		13	8
Romano-British	Horse	31	3	6	180
	Cattle	25	<1	14	952
	Sheep/goat	24	<1	5	774
	Pig	33	1	7	156
	Deer	25		50	8
	Dog	25		6	16