AN excavation was carried out at Amberfield, Burgh by Sands by Headland Archaeology in February 2002, approximately 200 metres to the south of Hadrian’s Wall and the Wall fort known as Burgh II. Immediately to the east, previous phases of archaeological investigation had identified a considerable settlement of later 2nd-3rd century date, believed to be part of the vicus, or civilian settlement, associated with the fort.

The features excavated included a well, four deep pits interpreted as post-pits for a substantial building lying mainly to the north of the excavation area, postholes and beamslots relating to timber buildings, and shallow ditches and gullies which appear to be boundary features. Finds from the site are consistent with the interpretation of the site as part of the vicus, and dated its occupation to the second half of the 2nd century. The implications for the dating of the Burgh II fort are discussed.

Introduction

Following the identification of features of Roman date during a preliminary evaluation at Amberfield, Burgh by Sands in November 2001, a week-long excavation was carried out by Headland Archaeology in February 2002. The work was undertaken on behalf of Croft Homes Ltd, in advance of development of the site (Masser, 2002). An area approximately 30 x 25 m wide was investigated, centred on NGR NY 3274 5888, approximately 200 metres to the south of Hadrian’s Wall and the site of the fort known as Burgh II (Figure 1, Site 1).

Burgh II was identified as the fort referred to as Aballava by Collingwood (1922) whose excavations opposite the church to the north of the main road revealed the east wall of the fort and its main gateway, and footings of buildings interpreted as barrack-blocks in the interior. Commenting on the finds, Collingwood noted that “nothing was found which required a date before the middle of the second century, and the amount of pottery seeming to require a date at all late in the fourth century was not large”.

Two other Roman forts have since been identified in the vicinity of Burgh by Sands. Burgh I lies 700 metres to the south of the site (Fig. 1, Site 2) and was identified from aerial photographs in 1975 and excavations in 1978 (Jones, 1979). The 1.9 ha fort was found to have replaced a four-post structure surrounded by a ditch, interpreted as a watchtower. The pottery from both phases was entirely of early 2nd century date, identifying the fort as part of the Stanegate system of forts which preceded the construction of the Wall to the north. The identification of a watchtower raised the possibility that a short-lived system of watchtowers similar to those constructed on the Taunus limes in Germany may have preceded the forts on the Stanegate frontier. The dating of the pottery from the two sites suggests that Burgh II directly replaced Burgh I. Cropmarks interpreted as another fort, Burgh...
Fig. 1. Roman Burgh by Sands.
III, were located on aerial photographs in 1977 one kilometre to the west of the site
(Fig. 1, Site 3), to the south of the Vallum. Fieldwalking confirmed a Roman date,
but no closer dating evidence was forthcoming, and its relationship to the other two
forts remains obscure.

Subsequent to Collingwood’s excavations, a number of further investigations
have contributed to our understanding of the history of the Burgh II fort and its
relationship to the Wall and the Vallum. Austen (1994), on the basis of excavations
at the West End (Fig. 1, Site 4), at Milecastle 72 (Site 5), and across the Vallum
(Site 6), has shown that the Wall met the fort defences across the middle of the fort,
rather than one-third of the way from the north side as was the case for the original
forts built with the Wall, and that the Vallum does not deviate around the fort, again
unlike the analogies such as Chesters suggested by Collingwood. On this basis he
concluded that Burgh II may have been added to the Wall at a later date, in the
third century, replacing an original fort detached from the Wall. Geophysical survey
to the north and east of Collingwood’s excavations has confirmed the location of the
fort defences as he described them, as well as finding evidence for alterations to the
alignment of the Wall, consisting of a linear structure meeting the north-east corner
of the fort so as to put the fort entirely behind the Wall (Linford, 1992; Austen and
McCarthy, 1999). Thus the sequence of fortifications in the vicinity of Burgh
appears far more complex than originally envisaged and remains poorly understood.

The current excavation site at Amberfield appears to lie within the area of civilian
settlement, or vicus, associated with one or other of the forts at Burgh. Evaluations
and partial excavation directly to the east of the current excavation site
(Hodgkinson, 1993; Reeves and McCarthy, 1999; Reeves, 2002) produced evidence
of an extensive and stratigraphically complex settlement, apparently laid out in
relation to a road which was thought to lie just beyond the east edge of the
excavation area, running south from the Burgh II fort. Although the work carried
out in 2000 was limited to machine-stripping of the site, with full excavation limited
to the building foundations and services of the housing development that prompted
the investigation, the foundation trenches and beamslots of as many as nineteen
timber buildings were identified, with associated cobbled surfaces, pits, linear
features and ovens or hearths (Reeves, 2002).

Evidence has also emerged for another area of vicus settlement to the east of the
Burgh II fort. Excavations in the Vicarage Garden (Fig. 1, Site 10), on the east side
of the fort between the Wall and the Vallum (Evans and Jones, 1980; Mattingly,
Jones and Evans, 1982) encountered a phase of late third century buildings; much
residual second century material was also present, deriving from an earlier phase of
settlement. Linford’s (1992) geophysical survey identified “an area of intense
magnetic activity interpreted as the response to extra-mural domestic and/or
industrial activity” to the south of the linear feature running off the north-east corner
of the fort. Whether the eastern and southern vici developed at the same time, and
how they might have differed in their function and population is an important but,
on present evidence, largely unanswerable question.

**The 2002 Excavation** (Fig. 2)

Initial evaluation of the site in November 2001 identified a soil layer up to 0.3 m
Fig. 2. Amberfield, Burgh by Sands: site plan.
thick, somewhat paler than the overlying topsoil, overlying the gravel subsoil into which features were cut. This deposit was interpreted as a product of colluvial soil movement, probably a result of ploughing on the gentle north-east facing slope. The same process appears to have resulted in some truncation of archaeological deposits, as only subsoil features were present, some very shallow, and no surfaces survived. Little stratigraphic information could be gleaned from the excavation undertaken in February 2002, as the number of intercutting features was not great. A number of groupings of features do, however, appear to be functionally related, and some indications as to the dating of the site can be drawn from the pottery.

Possible timber building and construction trenches

A number of linear features on the east side of the site – Features 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 – are clearly associated and form a coherent arrangement. All are narrow and steep-sided, varying in depth up to 0.4 m, which suggests that they may be structural, representing slots dug for sleeper beams, although an alternative explanation as drainage gullies is also possible. If these are indeed structural features, they could represent a timber building approximately 9 m wide. Features 9 and 10 were very shallow and truncated, but may define the north end of the building, since F7 terminates on them: if so, the building would have been approximately 17 m long. This interpretation must remain fairly speculative, however, since no convincing parallels for such a structure can be suggested. Two contexts from F5 produced pottery dated A.D. 150-200 and A.D. 140-200 respectively, whilst F8 produced a date range of A.D. 140-55 and F4 gave a range of A.D. 140-70. Taken as a whole, the pottery assemblage from these features would fit into a date range c.A.D. 140-55/60.

To the south of this putative building, a rectangular feature F51, and beyond it a linear feature F52, continue the alignment of F7 and may therefore be associated in some way with the building, although their date is uncertain as no diagnostic finds were recovered. F51 and F52 are definitely foundation trenches of some sort: both had square profiles, 0.3 and 0.15 m deep respectively, and were backfilled with large stones, including a fragment of dressed building stone, that probably represent post-packing.

The well

A well, F33, was excavated to a depth of 1.2 m, the lower levels remaining unexcavated and preserved in situ within the new development. The feature was circular and the lining, which was presumably organic, did not survive in the excavated part. An attempt was made to determine its full depth by probing with an auger, but the feature was not bottomed at the maximum reach of the auger, 4.6 m deep. Below 2.8 m the deposits were waterlogged, and at 4 m a hard, stony layer, presumably debris blocking the well, was encountered, below which the auger entered a void. Pottery from the excavated fill of the feature was Antonine in date. Although two postholes, F32 and F63, were excavated nearby, neither these nor any other features could be clearly identified as structures at the head of the well.
Three very deep, narrow pits were excavated in the northern part of the site: F27 was augered to a depth of 2.0 m; the full depth of F25 was not determined, but was shown to be at least 1.4 m; F24 was somewhat shallower, though at 1.16 m deep it was still substantial. The form of these pits suggests they may have functioned as post-pits. No recognisable post-pipes were observed. Large quantities of pottery which were generally of late Antonine date were recovered from these features: the material from F24 was dated to A.D. 160/80-200, F25 to A.D. 150-90 and F27 to A.D. 140-60. These features may, therefore, belong to a later phase than the possible building (F4 etc.), although the generally late date of the finds from them may rather reflect the demolition of long-lived structures, contemporary with the other features on the site. If these are indeed post-pits, their size would imply a massive structure such as a tower or granary, but this remains doubtful as the area of the site exposed is too small to place them adequately in the context of the settlement as a whole.

Among the other pits, F11 was augered to a maximum of 1.8 m, at which depth gravel, which was presumed to be the base of the feature, was reached. Shallower pits and hollows such as F28, F29 and F30 were also found in the northern part of the site. Numerous other much smaller postholes may be related to one or more structures, but their distribution is irregular and no clear pattern identifiable as a structure can be identified. Two groupings of postholes, comprising F42-50 and F37-41 respectively, undoubtedly indicate the location of structures which cannot, however, be convincingly reconstructed. Dating evidence from these postholes is mostly lacking, only F63 containing diagnostic pottery with a Hadrianic-mid Antonine date range.

A number of linear features were on a slightly different alignment to the possible timber building. Features 2, 22, 23 were generally broad and shallow, no more than 0.25 m deep and typically much shallower, with gently rounded profiles suggesting they represent ditches rather than structural features. These form a rectilinear grid-like arrangement which may relate to small yards or enclosures. This system of boundary features may have been more widespread than is apparent, as F22 and F23 survive only in part and are largely truncated. Several lines of narrow parallel gullies on an east-west orientation – Features 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20 – may be related to the aforementioned ditches; they may represent repeated replacement or modification of a fenced boundary, but are difficult to interpret as they are shallow and truncated, and survive only intermittently. The only stratigraphic relationship with the putative timber building, ditch F2 cutting F4, indicates that these ditches and gullies post-date the building, and their layout in relation to the building supports this, suggesting that they cannot be contemporary. F2 also cut the terminal of an earlier ditch, F1, which contained pottery with a date-range of A.D. 180-200. It is possible, therefore, that the system of ditched enclosures is relatively late, although finds from the ditches were scarce, the only diagnostic pottery coming from two sections excavated through F2, dated to A.D. 140-60 and A.D. 160/80-200 respectively.
THE POTTERY (J. Evans, with contributions by M. Ward and D. Williams)

Some 262 sherds of Roman pottery weighing 6.25 kg were recovered from the site, most from stratified contexts. The assemblage is a small but useful one. The bulk of the assemblage is of Hadrianic to late Antonine date, and there are a few sherds of earlier date in the collection suggesting some earlier activity in the general vicinity. All stratified diagnostic sherds are listed in the catalogue; a key to the codes used for fabric descriptions is given at the end of this section and illustrated sherds are marked with an asterisk.

Fabric supply

Amphorae

Amphorae are very strongly represented in the assemblage, some 13% by count and 46.4% by weight. Most are Dressel 20 bodysherds (A01) but there are also occasional sherds of Gallic wine amphora, rather unusually for a north-western site (cf. Evans and Rátkai forthcoming; Evans forthcoming a), and surprisingly a small Baetican vessel (cat. 65), probably of form Haltern 70, perhaps containing olives or defrutum. Evans (2001) has discussed amphora levels from different site types, and the high levels from the Amberfield site undoubtedly place it in the category of “military associated sites”, which include vici. The amphorae alone distinguish this assemblage from that to be found on a Cumbrian rural site (Evans forthcoming b).

Mortaria

Mortaria are reasonably represented at 3.5% by count. Apart from a single Gallic sherd from Noyon, which must precede occupation on the site, all the mortaria are of north-western manufacture, with no examples of Mancetter material which tends to become dominant in the late 2nd century. The fabrics include a Raetian type fabric, probably of Carlisle origin (cat. 76, 86).

Samian ware (M. Ward)

Samian ware is very strongly represented in the assemblage, at 17.3% by count (and 10.7% even by weight). This is a very high level for samian ware, and again one that is unlikely to be found except on a “military associated” site or in a major civil town, demonstrating further that this assemblage is not one associated with a rural site. The level of decorated ware is also fairly high, 26.3%, a figure appropriate for an urban or “military associated” site, but not one likely to be found in a rural assemblage.

The abbreviations SG, CG and EG indicate vessels which were produced in South Gaulish, Central Gaulish and East Gaulish workshops. “Ind” denotes a vessel of indeterminate form. For other terminology, see Bulmer, 1980 and Webster, 1996. Where date-ranges, rather than the use of epochs such as “Hadrianic-Antonine”, have been given, these should not be thought more precise than the use of epochs. They are employed to facilitate detailed analysis of the material. Table 1 gives details of the forms of vessel represented, and Fig. 3 illustrates their date-ranges. Maximum numbers of vessels are given, since the estimation of minimum numbers is difficult.
and probably misleading particularly in the case of collections containing a large proportion of fragments in poor condition.

Table 1. Summary of all forms of samian ware by fabric
(maximum numbers of vessels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>18/31</th>
<th>18/31 or 31</th>
<th>18/31R or 31</th>
<th>18/31R or 31R</th>
<th>31R</th>
<th>31R dish</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>36 ind</th>
<th>37 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total of 45 sherds represents a maximum of 38 vessels, of which only two appear to have been produced in South Gaul in the period c.A.D. 70/80-110. The remainder consists of 35 Central Gaulish vessels and a single East Gaulish vessel of dish form 32 which was probably produced at Rheinzabern.

The great bulk of the Central Gaulish samian was produced in the Hadrianic or early Antonine period, at Lezoux. Only one vessel was certainly produced at Les Martres-de-Veyre (cat. 54). None of the Lezoux vessels needs to have been produced later than c.A.D. 170. The six sherds dated generally to the Hadrianic-Antonine period, in the wide range c.A.D. 120-200, are all mere fragments, mostly of indeterminate form; none was necessarily produced later than c.A.D. 160. There was only one firm example of the deep dish form 31R which one would expect in any assemblage formed after c.A.D. 160, and that seemed to represent an early instance of form 31R. This is upheld by the evidence of the decorated and stamped samian. Only one moulded bowl (cat. 59) was certain to have been produced after c.A.D. 150, and the single surviving stamp, by the potter Cintusmus I (cat. 29), was dated c.A.D. 140-155. On the other hand, the single East Gaulish vessel must have been produced in the late second- or earlier third-century, certainly after c.A.D. 160.

As for the condition of the material, the sherds were mostly small. Only one vessel, a dish of an early form 31R (cat. 24), had certainly been burnt. There were two vessels on which graffiti had been inscribed. Despite the very small size of the sample, fragments of ten moulded bowls survived, of which nine had decoration surviving (see the catalogue above). Apart from the fairly large number of moulded bowls which were represented, it is noteworthy that about half of the vessels in the collection were dish forms and there was only one cup.

Other fabrics

BB1 is a major element of the assemblage, at 26.0% by count. This is fairly typical for the north-west region in the 2nd century (Evans and Rátkai forthcoming). Finewares other than samian are scarce in the assemblage with occasional sherds of an oxidised roughcast ware, possibly from Wilderspool or another centre in that tradition, and of a red painted oxidised ware in the Wilderspool tradition but again probably not from that source or from Walton-le-Dale. Carlisle would seem an obvious possible origin for these. Derbyshire ware rather surprisingly appears with a late 2nd century jar rim (cat. 12). Oxidised wares are present, but not strongly represented at 11.5%. Reduced wares are a little more common at 16.8%. Forms
Fig. 3. Summary of samian vessels (maximum 38) by date of manufacture.
represented are mainly BB jar copies, with few BB bowl copies and occasional vessels which might be of later 1st-early 2nd century date.

**Functional analysis**

Table 2 shows the functional analysis of the assemblage. The percentage accounted for by jar forms is low, and is well exceeded by tablewares (dishes and bowls) on the usual measure of minimum numbers of rims. Although jar levels are increased on the rim extent measure, which generally gives higher values for closed forms (Evans, 1991), they are still relatively low. The values from this site clearly fall in with urban and military sites, rather than those from basic level rural sites (Evans, 2001, fig 4). Drinking vessels are not represented, although samian cups do occur on the site, but mortaria are quite strongly represented, and amphorae unusually so, especially in so small a collection. The high level of finewares from the site is comparable with assemblages from military and urban sites (Evans, 1993), but massively above levels which might be found on any normal rural site.

**Table 2. Functional analysis of the pottery assemblage, expressed as percentage of minimum number of rims and of rim extent.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jars</th>
<th>Bowls</th>
<th>Dishes</th>
<th>Cups and beakers</th>
<th>Mortaria</th>
<th>Amphorae</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of MNR</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>44 rims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of RE</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>466%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date**

A start date for activity on the site is pretty clear from the samian evidence: the extreme paucity of South Gaulish and Les Martres ware pieces, respectively 5% and 3% of the samian, makes a Hadrianic start for the group very clear. Most of the samian is of Hadrianic-early Antonine date, but there are a few later Antonine pieces and a late sherd of East Gaulish ware. The latest pottery from the site is a BB1 simple rimmed dish with intersecting arc decoration from F2 (cat. 14), a BB1 jar body sherd with square lattice from F1 (cat. 2), a BB1 flange rimmed dish with intersecting arc decoration from F24 (cat. 44, 48), and a samian sherd from F25 (cat. 59). None of the material need have been deposited later than c.A.D. 200/220. In contrast to the dating emphasis of the samian, most of the contexts, which are closely dated, have an Antonine date.

A reassessment of the pottery reported from the previous excavations at Amberfield suggests a similar date, and the conclusions of the authors that activity on the site continued into the third century (Hodgkinson, 1993, 19; Reeves and McCarthy, 1999, 17) can be questioned. The finds described from trench A consist of an oxidised 2nd century mortarium, a later 2nd century BB1 bowl, two Dr 33 samian cups and a Dr30R bowl. None of these need date to later than the late 2nd century. Trench B produced an acute lattice decorated sherd of BB1 of Hadrianic-Antonine date (given a later range in Hodgkinson (1993)) and a 2nd century intaglio. The finds from trench C included two Dr 37 bowls, one described as Central Gaulish and the other not attributed, several oxidised mortaria fragments which must be of later 1st or 2nd century date, and a later 2nd century BB1 dish...
and one fragment of a possibly Mancetter mortarium; again nothing that need date to later than the late 2nd century. Trench D produced a Wilderspool tradition vessel, given a later 2nd century date, and an Antonine Dr 37. Trench E produced an oxidised mortarium bodysherd which must be of later 1st or 2nd century date. Trench F contained a Raetian type mortarium, probably of Antonine date, a 2nd century greyware jar and a Central Gaulish Dr 37 of Hadrianic-Antonine date. Trench G contained a BB1 jar rim (undated) and an oxidised mortarium sherd which must be of later 1st-2nd century date. It is clear from this summary that nothing of certainly 3rd century date came from this site and that a Hadrianic-Antonine date range, like that for the current site, seems very likely.

Catalogue

Feature 1

Context 121
1) A Central Gaulish samian Dr 18/31R or 31R rim and a bodysherd. A.D. 150-200. Wt 12 g D. 21 cms, RE 7%
2) A BB1(B01) jar bodysherd, very burnt, with square lattice, A.D. 180-220. Wt 10 g
3) A BB1(B01) dish/bowl chamfered base sherd. Wt 20 g, B.D. 19 cms, BE 11%
4) *A BB1 (B01) flange rimmed bowl rim with pointed arcades, sooted, Hadrianic-mid Antonine. Wt 26 g, D. 24 cms? RE 2% (Fig. 4, 1)
5) *Two Dressel 20 joining rimsherds (A01). Wt 310 g, D. 19 cms, RE 35% D.F.

Williams writes: “Roughly half of the rim from a Dressel 20 olive-oil amphora from the region of the River Guadalquivir in Baetica, southern Spain. The form of the rim is a fairly common one and closely resembles parallels from the well-dated site at Augst, which are dated to the end of the first century A.D./very beginning of the second century A.D.” (Martin-Kilcher, 1987, Beilage 1, nos. 69-71). (Fig. 4, 2)

Date – c.A.D. 180-200/220

Feature 2

Context 103
6) A CG samian Dr 37 rimsherd. A.D. 120-60, probably A.D. 125-45. Wt 5 g D. 21 cms, RE 3%
7) A SG samian rim fragment, possibly a Dr 37. A.D. 70-110 Wt 4 g D. ? cms, RE 2%
8) A large CG base bodysherd flake, probably from an Antonine product. A.D. 120-200 Wt 4 g
9) A greyware jar base, fabric R03. Wt 27 g, D. 8 cms, BE 23%

Date – perhaps A.D. 140-160.

Context 147
10) A CG samian Dr 37 bodysherd. A battered fragment representing the figure of a triton (possibly Oswald, 1936, 18), from a bowl of Hadrianic, or more probably, Antonine origin at Lezoux. A.D. 120-200. Wt 7 g
Fig. 4. Pottery from Amberfield.
Fig. 5. Pottery from Amberfield.
Fig. 6. Pottery from Amberfield.
Fig. 7. Pottery from Amberfield.
11) *A greyware jar rimsherd, a BB copy?, fabric R02, (Hadrianic)-Antonine. Wt 10 g, D. 14 cms, RE 5% (Fig. 4, 3)
12) *A Derbyshire ware lid-seated jar rim, fabric G01, sooted, Gillam (1970) type 52, late Antonine or later. Wt 14 g, D. 12 cms?, RE 6% (Fig. 4, 4)
13) A BB1(B01) jar base. Wt 15 g, B.D. 8 cms, BE 15%
14) *A BB1 (B01) simple rimmed dish with intersecting arc decoration, heavily sooted, c.A.D. 160/180+ Wt 42 g, D. 21 cms, RE 12% (Fig. 4, 5)
Date – A.D. 160/180-200+

Feature 4
Context 149
15) A CG samian Dr 18/31R rim and joining bodysherd with dulled surfaces and pale fabric. A.D. 120-60. Wt 27 g D. 29 cms, RE 7%
16) *A white-slipped oxidised mortarium rim with flange rising above the bead, fabric M21, Hadrianic-early Antonine(?). Wt 45 g, D. 21 cms, RE 5% (Fig. 4, 6)
17) *A BB1 (B01) simple rimmed dish with pointed arcs, mid-late Antonine Wt 24 g, D. 18 cms, RE 8% (Fig. 4, 7)
18) *Three joining bodysherds, internally limescaled, and two rimsherds from a BB1 (B01) jar with acute lattice decoration, heavily sooted, cf. Gillam (1976) nos 4-5, Antonine. Wt 160 g, D. 14 cms, RE 34% (Fig. 4, 8)
Date – A.D. 140-70?

Feature 5
Context 57
19) *Five BB1(B01) jar rimsherds and eight bodysherds from the same vessel, heavily sooted on exterior and some sherds burnt, acute lattice decoration on exterior, cf. Gillam (1970) type 135, mid-later Antonine. Wt 82 g, D. 15 cms, RE 37% (Fig. 4, 9)
20) *A very sooted flange rimmed BB1 (B01) dish with acute lattice on exterior, Hadrianic-mid Antonine. Wt 40 g, D. 17 cms, RE 14%, B.D. 17 cms, BE 14% (Fig. 5, 10)
Date – mid-later Antonine.

Context 105
21) *A rim and two shoulder sherds and a bodysherd with acute lattice decoration, in greyware, fabric R02, sooted, a Hadrianic-Antonine BB copy, perhaps Antonine. Wt 68 g, D. 15 cms, RE 11% (Fig. 5, 11)
22) *A BB1(B01) small jar/beaker rim, sooted, Hadrianic-Antonine, cf. Gillam (1976) no 25, Hadrianic-Antonine. Wt 6 g, D. 10 cms, RE 11% (Fig. 5, 12)
23) *A BB1 (B01) simple rimmed dish, acute lattice on the wall, Antonine? Wt 17 g, D. 20 cms, RE 3% (Fig. 5, 13)
Date – Antonine?

Feature 6
Context 153
24) Five joining sherds (slightly burnt) from the profile of a CG samian Dr 31R. A
dish probably transitional in form from 18/31R to 31R (i.e. shortly after A.D. 160), burnt. A.D. 160-200. Wt 75 g D. ? cms, RE <3%

Feature 8

Context 2
25) *A BB1 jar rim (B01), sooted, with a burnished wavy line on the rim, cf. Gillam (1976) no 1, early-mid 2nd century. D. 13 cms, RE 16%, Wt 23 g (Fig. 5, 14)

Context 55
26) *A greyware small jar rim, beaded, possibly a BB copy, perhaps Hadrianic-Antonine, fabric R03. Wt 5 g, D. 11 cms, RE 10% (Fig. 5, 15)
27) Three joining BB1 (B01) jar base sherds, burnt and sooted. Wt 36 g, B.D. 7 cms, BE 47%
28) Five BB1 jar bodysherds, exterior burnished, two are sooted and one has an iron tack rusted onto it. Wt 25 g
Date – Hadrianic-Antonine.

Context 163
29) A CG samian Dr 18/31 footring base, with part of a graffito “X” incised below the base within it. Stamped CI[NTVS]MF: by Cintusmus i of Lezoux, Die 4b (Dannell 1971, 304, 25a). There is no site dating for this stamp, but its use on cups of form 27 suggests that it comes from one of the potter’s earlier dies. Stamps from a different die, but with the same reading, occur in the Rhineland, where the import of Central Gaulish ware was virtually confined to the first half of the second century, and in a group of burnt samian dated c.A.D. 140-150 at Castleford (Dickinson and Hartley, 2000, 59, 625-6). c.A.D. 140-155. Wt 90 g B.D. 10 cms, BE 40%

Feature 11

Context 127
30) *A Central Gaulish Dr 37 bodysherd. A fragment of the decoration above the basal line shows a hotch-potch of motifs including a leaf (Rogers, 1974, H43; cf. Stanfield and Simpson, 1958, pl 75.22), the figure of Diana with hind (Oswald, 1936, 106; cf Stanfield and Simpson, 1958, pl 76.28) and a small double medallion containing a mask (cf. Stanfield and Simpson, 1958, pl 75.18; Oswald, 1936, 1343A?). The motifs and general composition suggest the style of Potter X-6 (see also Rogers, 1999, pl 134 nos 4, 6). c.A.D. 125-150. Wt 16g (Plate 1, 1).
31) A CG samian Dr 36 bodysherd from the upper wall, probably Hadrianic. A.D. 120-60. Wt 5 g
32) A CG samian Dr 18/31 footring base sherd which may show signs of wear and also has the cut of a cleat-type rivet in the footring. Probably a Hadrianic Lezoux product. A.D. 100-140. Wt 17 g B.D. 11? cms, BE 7%
Date – A.D. 125-50.
Feature 12

Context 165
33) A white-slipped oxidised bodysherd and a footring flagon base sherd in fabric Q01. Wt 27 g, B.D. 8 cms, BE 22%

Feature 19

Context 54
34) A very overfired oxidised, white-slipped mortarium bodysherd from a vessel where the flange rises above the bead, probably later 1st-early 2nd century, fabric M21. Wt 60 g
Date – probably 2nd century.

Feature 21

Context 80
35) A BB1(B01) bodysherd, exterior sooted. Wt 3 g
36) *A globular greyware jar with short, everted rim, sooted, fabric R04?, probably later 1st-early 2nd century. Wt 12 g, D. 10 cms, RE 8% (Fig. 5, 16)
Date – Hadrianic+
Context 134
37) A BB1 (B01) jar bodysherd, with acute lattice decoration, sooted, Hadrianic-Antonine. Wt 11 g
Date – Hadrianic-Antonine.

Feature 24

Context 31
38) *A CG samian Dr 37 bodysherd. An indistinct ovolo whose tongue seems to end in a small rosette-like terminal (probably Rogers, 1974, B61 rather than B15). Below a bold wavy-line border, vine scrolls (M2) are interspersed with blurred geese (Oswald, 1936, 2252 or similar). The ovolo does not appear to be the same as that on a bowl from Wilderspool which features the same vine (Dickinson and Hartley, 1992, 38, fig 17.57. The ovolo on the Burgh by Sands bowl together with this vine may suggest the style of Drusus ii, c.A.D. 125-145. Wt 35g (Plate 1, 2)
39) *A greyware jar with beaded rim, fabric R02. Wt 21 g, D.12 cms, RE 19% (Fig. 5, 17)
40) *A fine greyware bodysherd with stamped decoration, similar to Parisian ware, 1st or 2nd century, fabric R03?. Wt 7 g (Fig. 5, 18)
41) A red-slipped oxidised flanged bowl wall with flange, cf. Dr 23/24 for form, 1st or 2nd century, fabric F02. Wt 12 g
42) A BB1 (B01) jar base sherd (broken in two). Wt 42 g, D. 7 cms, BE 27%
43) A BB1 (B01) dish/bowl base, exterior very sooted, with acute lattice beneath, Hadrianic-mid Antonine. Wt 28 g, B.D. 18 cms, BE 7%
44) *A BB1 (B01) flange rimmed dish/bowl rim, very sooted, exterior decorated with intersecting arcs, mid-late Antonine. Wt 32 g, D. 19 cms, RE 11% (Fig. 5, 19)
Date – A.D. 160/80-200

Context 32
45) A CG samian Dr 18/31 or 31 dish, most probably produced before c.A.D. 160. The footring is battered but looks very worn from use. A single letter of a graffito has survived on the external base above the footring; another single letter survives below the base within the footring. A.D. 120-160 Wt 46 g B.D. 9 cms, B.E. 16%
46) *A greyware “cheese press” base, fabric R03. Wt 45 g, B.D. 12 cms, BE 20% (Fig. 5, 20)
47) *A bead rimmed globular jar rimsherd and a bodysherd, sooted. Fabric R04. Wt 20 g D. 12 cms, RE 10% (Fig. 5, 21)
48) *A BB1 flange rimmed bowl, exterior decorated with intersecting arcs, heavily sooted, late Antonine. Wt 27 g, D. 14 cms, RE 11% (Fig. 5, 22)
Date – late Antonine.

Context 33
49) A sandy black reduced jar base, fabric R01. Wt 23 g, B.D. 10 cms, BE 11%
50) CG samian Dr 37. A small fragment of blurred decoration: a small ovolo whose
tongue terminates in a very large, but indistinct rosette (Rogers, 1974, B35?) lies above blurred panelling. This includes an unidentifiable mask or head set to the left of a row of plain rings within borders which appear to be A15, which in combination with ovolo B35 might suggest the style of Potter X-6. At any rate, produced in the Hadrianic-early Antonine period (c.A.D. 125-150). Wt 16 g

51) A CG samian Dr 18/31R or 31R base sherd. The footring is battered but looks very worn from use. A.D. 140-200 Wt 27 g B.D. 13 cms, BE 11%
52) A CG samian Dr 18/31R dish rimsherd. A.D. 120-60 Wt 14 g D. 18 cms, RE 10%

Context 34

53) *A BB1 jar with acute lattice decoration, cf. Gillam (1976), No 5, Antonine. D. c.16 cms, RE 5%, Wt 26 g (Fig. 6, 23)

Feature 25

Context 49

54) A Les Martres-de-Veyre samian Dr 18/31R rimsherd. A.D. 100-125 Wt 3 g D. 18? cms, RE 3%
55) A CG samian Dr 18/31R rimsherd. A.D. 120-60 Wt 15 g D. 19 cms, RE 11%
56) A CG samian Dr 18/31R rimsherd. A.D. 120-60 Wt 4 g D. 17 cms, RE 7%
57) A CG samian base bodysherd. A.D. 120-200 (probably before A.D. 160) Wt 6 g
58) A CG samian Dr 18/31 or 31 footring base. A.D. 120-60. Wt 24 g B.D. c.10 cms, BE c.10 %
59) *A CG samian Dr 37 bodysherd. Below the ovolo Rogers, 1974, B206 and astragaloid border (A10) a festoon with a blurred astragaloid ornament contained a dolphin. The style is that of such potters as Laxtucissa and Censorinus, who worked in the second half of the second century. A date in the range c.A.D. 150/160-190 would cover the possibilities. Wt 7 g (Plate 1, 3)
60) A whiteware jar base, beaded, fabric W01. Wt 37 g, B.D. 7 cms, BE 30%
61) *A greyware jar rimsherd, sooted, a Hadrianic-Antonine BB copy, fabric R02. Wt 10 g, D. 14 cms, RE 8% (Fig. 6, 24)

Date – A.D. 150-90, perhaps A.D. 150-70.

Feature 27

Context 44

62) A CG samian Dr 18/31R dish bodysherd. A.D. 120-60 Wt 5 g
63) A CG samian Dr 37 rimsherd from a small bowl, displaying only a fragment of an ovolo (Rogers, 1974, B231). This ovolo was used by Pugnus and probably Potter X-7 and the Large S Potter as well as by Cinnamus. However, the general appearance of this sherd may suggest an earlier origin than in an Antonine workshop of Cinnamus, probably Hadrianic but certainly c.A.D. 130-160. Wt 7 g D. 15 cms, RE 7%
64) Two CG samian flakes from two vessels, form indeterminate, both probably produced before A.D. 160. A.D. 120-200 Wt 1 g
65) *A Dressel 20 type bodysherd. D. F. Williams writes: “A large plain, thickish,
bodysherd from the rounded shoulder of an amphora. The sherd is in the same gritty buff fabric [Munsell 7.5YR 7/4] as the common Baetican amphora Dressel 20. However, the curvature of this sherd indicates that the girth of the vessel is considerably smaller than that normally encountered with the globular-shaped Dressel 20, suggesting a more cylindrical body and a different amphora form from Baetica. Recently, the bifid-handled Dressel 2-4 and fish-sauce types have also been recognized in the Dressel 20-type fabric (information from Cesar Carreras) and it is possible that this vessel could belong to one of these forms. However, as far as the writer is aware, these types have yet to be recognized in Britain, and so it is perhaps more likely that the sherd belongs instead to the Haltern 70 form, or a variation of this, which are not uncommonly found in Britain and northern Europe (Peacock and Williams, 1986, Class 15). Rather than olive-oil, this form seems to have mainly carried olives or defrutum and was in use from about the mid-first century B.C. to the Flavian period (Liou, 1982; van der Werff, 1984). Halton 70 is recorded in pre-Roman contexts at Heybridge (Wickenden, 1986) but only seems to have arrived in Roman Britain in any numbers during the late 60s or early 70s (Carreras, forthcoming). Wt 135 g (Fig. 6, 25)

66) *A BB1 simple rimmed dish, exterior heavily sooted, Antonine. Wt 22 g, D. 24 cms, RE 5% (Fig. 6, 26)

67) *A greyware flange rimmed bowl rim, very sooted, Hadrianic-Antonine, fabric R01? Wt 57 g, D. 18 cms, RE 17% (Fig. 6, 27)
Date – A.D. 130-60

Context 45

68) A CG samian Dr 18/31 or 18/31R dish bodysherd. A.D. 120-60 Wt 17 g
69) CG samian Dr 37. Above the basal border a fragment only of the decoration includes possibly the tail of a marine creature and a trifid space-filler (Rogers, 1974, G32, blurred). The motif G32 was used by several potters working at Lezoux in the Hadriane-early Antonine period. Wt 15 g
70) *An oxidised wide-mouthed jar rim with everted, rising rim, fabric O04, 2nd century. Wt 77 g, D. 33 cms, RE 7%, Wt 77 g (Fig. 6, 28)
71) *A BB1 (B01) jar rim and two joining shoulder sherds, sooted, cf. Gillam (1976) no 4, later 2nd century. Wt 33 g, D. 14 cms, RE 15% (Fig. 7, 29)
Date – Antonine, perhaps c.A.D. 140-60.

Context 46

72) A SG samian bodysherd, form indet. A small fragment of pale ware, probably SG rather than CG. A.D. 80-110. Wt 2 g
73) *A BB1 (B01) dish rim, slightly grooved, with pointed arcs, Hadrianic-Antonine. Wt 27 g, D. 18 cms, RE 11% (Fig. 7, 30)
Date – Hadrianic-Antonine, perhaps mid Antonine.

Context 47

74) A BB1 (B01) chamfered dish/bowl wall bodysherd, exterior acute lattice, Hadrianic-mid Antonine. Wt 7 g
Date – Hadrianic-mid Antonine(+)

tewaas_003_2005_vol5_0006
**Feature 29**
Context 11
75) A minute chip, probably Hadrianic-early Antonine but too small for certainty, CGS. Wt <1 g

**Feature 33**
Context 15
76) A bodysherd from a Raetian mortarium, fabric M11, Carlisle?, Antonine. Wt 40 g
Date – Antonine?

**Feature 50**
Context 77
77) A BB1(B01) jar bodysherd with acute lattice, Hadrianic-Antonine, sooted. Wt 11 g

**Feature 53/4**
Context 99/95
78) A buff mortarium base wall sherd, fabric M02. Wt 65 g, D. ? cms, BE <1%
79) A BB1 (B01) jar bodysherd, sooted and burnt, acute lattice decoration, Hadrianic-Antonine. Wt 6 g
Date – Hadrianic-Antonine.

**Feature 58**
Context 9
80) *A white slipped beaded and flanged oxidised mortarium rim fragment with hooked rim, the bead probably being below the flange, in an oxidised fabric with some coarse quartz temper. Fabric M21. 2nd century, perhaps early-mid 2nd century. D. 32? cms, RE 6%, Wt 37 g (Fig. 7, 31)
81) A BB1 (B01) simple jar base sherd. B.D. 7 cms, BE 24%, Wt 15 g
82) A CG samian Dr 37 bodysherd showing a small fragment of moulded decoration. This shows a blurred ovolo whose tongue has a rosette-shaped tip, possibly representing Rogers (1974) type B7 or B24. Below a horizontal border (probably Rogers, 1974, A2) lies a small double medallion which has been badly smeared. Ovolo B7 was used by such potters as X-13, X-14 and Attianus; ovolo B24 was used by Docilis. At any rate, the bowl will have been produced at Lezoux in the Hadrianic-early Antonine period within the range c.A.D. 125-150/160. Wt 4 g
83) A Dr 18/31R or 31R rim, CGS, A.D. 150-200. D. 28 cms, RE 12%, Wt 30 g
84) *A BB1 flange rimmed bowl with acute lattice decoration, Hadrianic-mid Antonine. D. 21 cms, RE 6%, Wt 28 g (Fig. 7, 32)
Feature 63

Context 86
85) A BB1 (B01) dish/bowl wall sherd with acute lattice, Hadrianic-mid Antonine. Wt 13 g

Subsoil overlying archaeological features

Context 1
86) *A Raetian type mortarium in fabric M11, not a Walton or Wilderspool fabric, perhaps Carlisle. Probably Antonine. D. 35 cms, RE 8%, Wt 140 g (Fig. 7, 33)

Context 8
87) A Dr 31/31R battered rim fragment, CGS, A.D. 150-200. D ? cms, RE 2%, Wt 6 g
88) An indet. flake, CGS, A.D. 120-200. Wt 1 g
89) *A greyware jar rim, a BB copy in fabric R08, perhaps Hadrianic-early Antonine. D. 11 cms, RE 17%, Wt 19 g (Fig. 7, 34)

Context 17
90) A samian Dr 32 rimsherd, EG, Rheinzabern, dated A.D. 160-260, most probably in the range A.D. 160/80-220/40. D. 28 cms, RE 3%, Wt 80 g
Date – Hadrianic-mid Antonine?

Unstratified
91) *Four BB1 sherds (B01) from a dish with a chamfered base and a grooved rim, exterior with acute lattice decoration, sooted, Hadrianic-mid Antonine. Wt 140 g, D. 17 cms, RE 20%, B.D. 10 cms, BE 40%5 (Fig. 7, 35)
92) Two joining CG samian Dr 27 rimsherds. A.D. 120-150  Wt 11 g D. c.12 cms, RE 9%
93) A CG samian bodysherd, form indet. A.D. 120-200, probably Antonine. Wt 10 g
94) *A CG samian Dr 37 rimsherd whose decoration is blurred: an indistinct ovolo may represent Rogers (1974) B144 (damaged or partially impressed at the tip of the tongue) above an unidentifiable border. Below, a large scroll composition included a bird in flight (Oswald, 1936, 2315) and a leaf (Rogers, 1974, H72); in an interstice, a triangular pediment or shrine (Rogers, 1974, U269) contained a small, indistinct mask and was flanked by blurred cornucopiae. The general composition is similar to that by Attianus ii on Rogers, 1999, pl. 9.9. All the motifs are badly blurred on this sherd and some cannot be identified precisely, but the leaf H72 appears on bowls of Attianus as well as Cinnamus and the pediment or shrine occurs on bowls of the Sacer i/ Attianus ii group. The motif contains a bird and is accompanied by cornucopiae on a bowl from Wilderspool which has been attributed to Sacer (Dickinson, 1992, 121 D8). The ovolo if B144 might be taken as evidence for the early work of Cinnamus with scrolls featuring this bird (cf. Dickinson and Hartley, 2000, 37-38 nos 339, 344), but it was also used by Sacer. At any rate, the bowl will have been produced in the Hadrianic or very early Antonine period. Wt 50 g D. 20 cms, RE 7 % (Plate 1, 4)
Fabric Descriptions

A01 Dressel 20 amphorae, Baetica, S. Spain, 1st-3rd century (Peacock and Williams, 1986).
A10 Pelichet 47/Gauloise 4 amphorae, S Gaul (Peacock and Williams, 1986).
B01 BB1, Poole Harbour, Dorset (Williams, 1977).
F01 An oxidised brown-slipped clay pellet roughcast fabric with an orange core and margins, with common fine sand c.0.05-0.1 mm. Possibly Wilderspool or another centre in a similar tradition.
F02 An oxidised red-slipped/(painted) fabric with an orange core and margins, “clean”, with very occasional sand c.0.1 mm. Probably not Wilderspool or Walton but in that tradition.
G01 Derbyshire ware (Gillam, 1939).
M01 Noyon mortaria (Hartley, 1977, group I/II) with a buff core, margins and surfaces with common fine sand c.0.05-0.1 mm and occasional rounded white inclusions up to 1mm. Trituration grits; common angular fine white quartz c.1-2 mm. Later 1st-early 2nd century.
M02 A buff mortarium fabric with a buff-orange core and buff margins and surfaces, “clean” with occasional red ironstone c.0.2-0.5 mm. Trituration grits; common sub-rounded brown stone (some micaceous), siltstone?, c.1-3 mm and some white and translucent angular quartz c.1-2 mm. North-Western.
M11 Raetian type mortaria with brick orange core, margins and surfaces, with common sand c.0.2-0.4 mm. Trituration grits; white quartz c.0.5-2 mm. Source probably Carlisle rather than Walton-le-Dale.
M21 A hard-fired, white-slipped, oxidised fabric with orange core and margins, with common translucent angular quartz c.0.4-1 mm in a “clean” matrix. Trituration grits; common white quartz and sandstone c.2-3 mm and some brown siltstone? Or fine-grained sandstone c.2-3 mm.
M22 A hard-fired, white-slipped, oxidised fabric with orange core and margins, with abundant translucent quartz c.0.2-0.5 mm. Trituration grits; angular white quartz c.1-2 mm.
M23 An oxidised mortarium fabric with buff-orange core, margins and surfaces, “clean” and “soapy”. Trituration grits; common angular translucent quartz c.1-2 mm and occasional rounded brown siltstone? c.1-2 mm.
O01 An oxidised fabric with an orange core, margins and surfaces, with common moderate sand c.0.2-0.3 mm.
O02 An oxidised fabric with orange-brown core, margins and surfaces, with some fine sand c.0.05 mm in a “clean” matrix.
O03 An oxidised fabric with an orange core, margins and surfaces, with abundant fine limestone? sand c.0.05-0.1 mm.
O04 A hard oxidised fabric with an orange core, margins and surfaces, “soapy” with some fine sand temper c.0.1 mm.
Q01 An oxidised white-slipped fabric with an orange core and margins, with some sand c.0.3 mm and common fine sand c.0.05 mm.
Q02 An oxidised white-slipped fabric with an orange core and margins, with common angular coarse translucent sand c.0.2-0.5 mm.
Q03 An oxidised white-slipped fabric with an orange core and margins, “clean” with occasional red ironstone c.0.3-0.5 mm.

R01 A reduced fabric with a black core, brown margins and black surfaces, with abundant translucent sand c.0.2-0.3 mm.

R02 A reduced fabric with a grey core and margins and dark grey surfaces, with some sand c.0.2-0.5 mm and common fine sand c.0.1 mm. Similar to Q01.

R03 A reduced fabric with a grey core, margins and surfaces, with occasional-some sand c.0.05-0.2 mm.

R04 A reduced fabric with a pale grey core and margins and mid-dark grey surfaces, fairly “clean” with occasional-some rounded brown ironstone c.0.1-0.5 mm.

R05 A reduced fabric with a mid grey core and margins and dark grey slipped surfaces, with abundant coarse angular sand temper c.0.3-0.5 mm.

R06 A reduced fabric with a grey-black core, margins and surfaces, with some moderate sand c.0.3 mm and abundant fine sand c.0.05-0.1 mm. Cf. R02, finer sand commoner in R06.

R07 A reduced fabric with a mid grey core, margins and surfaces, “clean”.

R08 A reduced fabric with a mid grey core and margins and dark grey slipped surfaces, with translucent angular sand temper c.0.2-0.5 mm in a “clean” matrix.

SGS South Gaulish Samian.
MdVS Les Martres-de-Veyre Samian.
CGS Central Gaulish Samian.
EGS East Gaulish Samian.

W01 A whiteware with a buff-orange core and margins, and buff surfaces, with occasional sand c.0.2-0.4 mm.

W02 A whiteware with a white core, margins and surfaces, with very occasional sand c.0.2-0.8 mm and occasional red ironstone c.0.2 mm.

W03 A whiteware with a buff core, margins and surfaces, with common moderate angular sand temper c.0.3 mm.

OTHER FINDS (Naomi Crowley)

Glass

Five small fragments of glass were retrieved from the site, from the fills of postholes or gullies. The identifiable fragments suggest a utilitarian function. Two fragments come from large bottles that would have been used as storage or in-transit containers for a whole range of liquid or semi-viscous commodities such as beverages, foodstuffs, medicines and ointments, and date to the late 1st to 2nd century.

Feature 21
Context 80
1) Small fragment of 5 mm thick vessel or window glass. Naturally coloured greenish blue glass. Context 80, small find 35, fill of ditch/gully F21.
Feature 27

Context 45
2) Small fragment from the base of a bottle. Mould blown greenish-blue glass. Base decorated with a high relief design of which just parts of two concentric circles are extant. Late 1st or 2nd century.

Context 46
3) Fragment of handle from a cylindrical or square sectioned bottle. Applied to a mould blown vessel. Thick naturally coloured bluish-green glass. Combed surface. Late 1st or 2nd century (Fig. 8, 1).

Feature 33

Context 15
4) Very tiny fragment of naturally coloured bluish-green glass.

Feature 44

Context 65
5) Small fragment of pale green vessel glass. One surface ground. 3 mm thick.

Iron
The site produced 17 iron objects, most of which are nails or spikes, which would have been used in the construction of timber framed buildings. Also present is a socketed, barbed arrowhead, consistent with the site being a military one. An unstratified knife blade could be interpreted as either domestic or military.

Feature 1

Context 121
1. Small round headed nail, surviving length 15 mm.

Feature 2

Context 103
2. Round headed nail, surviving length 20 mm.

Context 147
3. Socketed arrowhead with 4 slightly splayed cutting barbs. Length 82 mm.

Feature 4

Context 149
4. Spike with square cross-section. Surviving length 115 mm, bent halfway along length.

Feature 24

Context 32
5. Round headed nail, length 80 mm
Fig. 8. Stone and glass from Amberfield.
Context 33
6. Loop headed spike, length 58 mm, broken in two pieces.
7. Unidentifiable object, mainly corrosion product.

Context 34
8. Square headed nail with rectangular cross-section, surviving length 45 mm.

Context 36
9. Unidentified object, length 60 mm, cylindrical and hollow at one end, diameter 18 mm, solid rounded at other end, diameter 10 mm.

Feature 33
Context 15
10. Thin wire or pin, length 18 mm.
11. Chain link diameter 8 mm.
12. Small round headed bent nail, length 15 mm.

Feature 58
Context 9
13. Spike, with circular cross-section tapering to a triangular section at the pointed end, surviving length 145 mm.
14. Square headed nail with oval section, bent. Length 45 mm.
15. Round headed nail, surviving length 20 mm.

Unstratified
16. Incomplete knife blade, surviving length 100 mm.
17. Modern nail.

Evidence of metal working

Evidence from soil samples shows that a number of postholes and ditch fills contained fragments of iron slag, hammerscale, and charcoal (Table 3). These do not seem to be confined to one distinct area, but in features spread across the site. This indicates that metal was being worked but there is no direct evidence for where on the site this was taking place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Iron slag and charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Iron slag and charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Iron slag, charcoal and hammerscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Iron slag and charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Iron slag, charcoal and hammerscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Iron slag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Iron slag and hammerscale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3. Contexts producing evidence for metalworking
Stone Object

Unstratified

1. Basalt stone object, length 850 mm, roughly triangular in section, smoothed surfaces, possibly used as a whetstone.

Building Material

Ceramic material

The site produced 14 fragments of ceramic building material consisting of seven fragments of brick, six fragments of tegula roof tile and two unidentified small fragments of tile (Table 4). There are two distinct fabrics which have been assigned fabric codes 1 and 2 for the purpose of this report. The majority of the brick and tile fragments are in Fabric 1, a red sandy fabric with quartz and mica sand inclusions, occasionally up to 1 mm in size. All the examples of both brick and tegula in this fabric have a fine sand on their bases from the moulding process. There is one fragment of brick in Fabric 2, also a red sandy fabric but with more frequent quartz sand up to 2 mm, occasional rock fragments up to 5 mm and occasional lighter clay streaks. It is likely that the brick and tile was made locally. The brick and roof tile fragments were found mainly in pits where they might have functioned as post-packing, with a few others found in ditch fills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>500 g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tegula</td>
<td>500 g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Daub</td>
<td>Walling</td>
<td>25 g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Possible surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tegula</td>
<td>350 g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tegula</td>
<td>50 g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>75 g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abraded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>100 g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>500 g</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thickness 23 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>150 g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thickness 67 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Moulding</td>
<td>3000 g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Light coloured sandstone, possibly from doorway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>150 g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thickness 40 mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Rubble</td>
<td>250 g</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Red micaceous sandstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tegula</td>
<td>125 g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Square flange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Stone</td>
<td>Block</td>
<td>1250 g</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dark red sandstone, squared edge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daub

The fill of ditch F4 (context 149) produced 2 fragments of daub, one with a possible surface, suggesting its use as clay walling. A number of ditches and gullies also produced small fragments of daub.

Stone

Two fragments of sandstone were recovered from the packing of postholes. Context
36 produced a fragment of moulding, possibly from a doorway, in a light coloured sandstone (Fig. 8, 2). Context 41 produced a fragment of a stone block with one squared edge, in a dark red sandstone. Context 44 contained 2 fragments of red sandstone rubble.

Discussion

The presence of daub fragments indicates timber framed, clay walled buildings. This is supported by the presence of excavated postholes. The presence of stone, particularly the moulded fragment, and the brick and roof tile fragments, suggest the possibility of more substantial buildings in the vicinity of the excavation, from which this material has been taken and reused as packing, or dumped.

PLANT REMAINS (M. Hastie)

Carbonised remains

14 bulk soil samples were taken from a representative sample of features. All samples were processed by a system of wet sieving and flotation; carbonised plant remains being collected in a 250 µm sieve and scanned using a binocular microscope.

Cereal grain

The concentration of cereal grains was low with all samples containing no more than five identifiable grains per sample. The cereal assemblage consisted almost entirely of barley (*Hordeum* sp.), however one grain of emmer/spelt (*Triticum dicoccum/spelta*) and one of oat (*Avena* sp.) were also present.

Weed seeds

The weed seed assemblage was very sparse with only seeds of knotgrass (*Polygonum* sp.) and buttercup (*Ranunculus* sp.) recovered. The plant spices represented are indicative of waste-places and are most likely to represent taxa growing close to the site.

Discussion

Despite the limited area exposed, important evidence for the development of the Burgh by Sands vicus and fort was obtained from the excavation. The pottery assemblage is typical of military-related sites and the features must therefore derive from the civil settlement attached to a fort, rather than a rural settlement. The position of the site, on the road leading to the *porta decumana* of the Burgh II fort, leaves little doubt that it is this fort to which the settlement relates.

Reeves (2002) describes the east-west alignment of plots and buildings within the area previously excavated by Carlisle Archaeology, suggesting that they were laid out on a road running south from the Burgh II fort. This alignment can be seen in almost all the linear features on the present site, which undoubtedly represents a continuation of the settlement originally identified. As no plans of the Carlisle
Archaeology excavations are available, little can be said about the character of the present excavation area in relation to the site as a whole. However, the presence of structures on the site is implied by beamslots, foundation trenches and small postholes. Only modest quantities of brick and tile were recovered, and the buildings may therefore have been predominantly timber-framed; however, buildings with tiled roofs apparently stood nearby, as tegula fragments and fragments of dressed sandstone were recovered from a number of features.

Scant evidence is available from the small area excavated for the social status of the Amberfield vicus and the activities with which it was associated. The environmental remains shed little light on the question of whether such sites on the Wall were involved in food production, or imported grain from the surrounding settlements or further south. Cropmarks of settlements and field systems that may be broadly contemporary with the vicus are recorded on Cumbria SMR to the north of Moorhouse (NGR NY 332 576, not illustrated) and further to the north at Copt Hill (Fig. 2, Site 7). A triple-ditched enclosure on the high ground to the east of Powburgh Beck (Fig. 2, Site 8) produced Antonine pottery. Metalworking is one craft activity that was undoubtedly carried out nearby, although no structures associated with it were identified.

The pottery and other finds indicate that this part of the vicus was probably occupied from the mid second century onwards, which has implications for the dating of the Burgh II fort. Austen’s arguments for Burgh II being a later addition to the Wall, post-dating the Vallum, rather than part of the original phase of construction, may be valid, but the dating evidence from the excavation makes the 3rd century origin proposed for the fort highly unlikely if it is accepted that the Amberfield site is related to Burgh II. The present evidence would tend to suggest that it was constructed sometime in the later Hadrianic era.

There is no evidence for occupation of the Amberfield vicus continuing much beyond the end of the second century. After this time, extramural settlement may have contracted to the area around the east gate of the fort, between the Wall and the Vallum, where much of the material from the Vicarage Garden excavations (Evans and Jones 1980; Mattingly, Jones and Evans 1982) was apparently of mid-3rd/early 4th century date. The contraction of settlement from an early maximum extent to a late 3rd century concentration around the east gate, and its disappearance early in the fourth century seems to be a fairly typical history for a Hadrian’s Wall vicus.
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