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1 Summary

Rescue excavations at Henley Wood, Yatton, North Somerset, were undertaken during the 1960s in advance of quarrying. The site was a small promontory, overlooking the North Somerset Levels and the Bristol Channel, adjacent to the major hillfort of Cadbury Congresbury; it was in an area with dense settlement from the prehistoric period onwards.

The earliest finds were Neolithic flints, although none were associated with features. There may have been Beaker burials on the site, found in earlier explorations.

There were late Iron Age finds – some pottery, at least one brooch, a Dobunnic coin, and probably the remarkable bronze figurine. The presence of the latter may suggest that religious activity began on the site in pre-Roman times. It is possible that a ditch across the eastern part of the promontory dates from this time. It is however more likely that this was the eastern boundary of the precinct of a Roman temple, the temenos ditch, probably with a bank on its inner side.

Within the temenos, a number of superimposed Roman temples were built. Details of the first building are obscure, but it is interpreted as a shrine, perhaps of the 1st or 2nd century AD. The second was a two-cell structure with an eastern entrance, with a third century floruit. The third was a typical double-square Romano-Celtic temple, probably built in the late 3rd or earlier 4th century and remodelled after AD 367–75. A fourth structure, also probably of 4th century date, lay in the northern part of the precinct, and may have been polygonal.

The temenos ditch was filled in the 4th century and possibly later with material cleared from within the precinct. The temenos and its filled-in ditch were later used as a cemetery, but the relationship between temple and burial remains ambiguous. The cemetery, originally of up to approximately 90 graves, was of individuals of both sexes and all ages. They were mostly orientated west to east (heads to west) with few if any gravegoods. Calibrated radiocarbon determinations and other evidence suggests that the cemetery was in use between the 5th and 7th centuries AD.

There was a wide range of finds from the site, classified in this report into thematic categories. They included items directly related to the structures excavated; many may have been associated with religious observance. The most significant in this context are a bronze figurine, copper alloy octagonal finger rings (one inscribed), a copper alloy ‘leaf, a fragment from an inscribed stone panel and deposits of animal bones.

Sommaire

Des fouilles de sauvetage à Henley Wood, Yatton, Avon, furent entreprises pendant les années 60, avant l'ouverture d'une carrière. Le site est un petit promontoire surplombant la Grande Plaine du nord du Somerset et le canal de Bristol, adjacent à l'importante place fortifiée de Cadbury Congresbury, dans une région de dense peuplement depuis l'âge de fer – un peu de poterie, au moins une broche, une pièce do bunnicque et une remarquable figurine en bronze. La présence de cette dernière indique peut-être que des activités d'ordre religieux commencèrent sur ce site avant l'époque romaine. Il se peut qu'un fossé au travers de la partie orientale du promontoire remonte à cette époque. Mais il est néanmoins plus probable que c'était la limite orientale de l'enceinte d'un temple romain, le fossé temenos, probablement avec un talus sur le côté intérieur.

Un certain nombre de temples romains superposés furent construits à l'intérieur du temenos. Les détails de la première structure sont obscurs, mais on l'interprète comme un lieu de pèlerinage datant peut-être du 1er ou du 2ème siècle. La seconde était une structure à deux cellules du 2ème ou 3ème siècle, dont l'entrée était à l'est. La troisième était un temple romano-celte typique en forme de double carré.
construit à la fin du 3ème siècle ou au début du 4ème siècle et remodelé après 367-375. Une quatrième structure, datant également de la fin du 3ème siècle ou du début du 4ème, se trouvait dans la partie nord de l’enceinte et aurait pu comporter des éléments structurels polygonaux.

Le fossé *temenos* fut comblé au 4ème siècle et peut-être plus tard avec des matériaux enlevés de l’intérieur de l’enceinte. Plus tard, le *temenos* et son fossé furent utilisés comme cimetière, mais le rapport entre le temple et le cimetière reste ambigu. Le cimetière qui, à l’origine, comprenait environ 90 tombes, contenait un mélange de sépultures d’hommes et de femmes, dans des tombes orientées pour la plupart d’ouest en est et contenant peu ou pas de matériel funéraire. Des déterminations calibrées au C14 et d’autres documents suggèrent une floraison du cimetière au cours des 5ème-7ème siècles.

Le site a produit un grand éventail de découvertes, classifiées en catégories thématiques dans ce rapport. Elles comprennent des articles qui ont un rapport direct avec les structures mises au jour; nombre d’entre elles auraient pu être associées à des observances religieuses. Dans ce contexte, les plus significatives sont la figurine en bronze, les bagues octogonales en alliage de cuivre (dont l’une porte une inscription), une “feuille” en alliage de cuivre, un fragment de panneau en pierre portant une inscription et des gisements d’os d’animaux.

### Übersicht


Es gibt eine Reihe von Funden an dieser Stätte, die in diesem Bericht in thematische Kategorien eingeteilt sind. Darunter sind Gegenstände, die sich direkt auf die ausgegrabenen Strukturen beziehen; viele davon haben auch mit religiösen Ritualen zu tun. Die bedeutendsten in diesem Rahmen sind die Bronzefigurinen, die polygonalen kupferlegierten Fingerringe (einer ist eingeschrieben), ein kupferlegiertes ‘Blatt’, ein Fragment einer eingeschriebenen Steinplatte und Reste von Tieren.

* Dobunni: ein alter britischer Stamm, der im 1. Jahrhundert AD in der Gegend, wo die beiden Flüsse Avon und Seven zusammenfließen, lebten.
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3 Introduction

3.1 Background to the excavations

Extension of Henley Quarry in 1961–2 exposed foundations and burials. They were noted by the late J Pullan of the Clevedon Archaeological Society; some excavation was subsequently done by the society, initially under the guidance of Philip Rahtz. Large scale work under the aegis of the (then) Ministry of Public Building and Works (now HBMC) took place over 17 weeks in 1964, 1968, and 1969. This was directed by the late Ernest Greenfield, with the help of four paid workers, one or two supervisors, and a few volunteers. A total of c 943 square metres was excavated. The temples have since been totally destroyed by the quarry.

3.2 Previous knowledge and condition of the site

The site is part of a larger area riddled by mining for iron ore, of 18th century and probably earlier date. Local finds of skeletons and other material have been summarised elsewhere (cf Fowler, Gardner and Rahtz 1970, 9; Burrow 1981, 187, ft'nt 53; and MF13.1). A few sherds of Roman and prehistoric pottery appear to have been found in the wood adjacent to the site in 1879 (Proc Somerset Archaeol Natur Hist Soc 70.1 (1924), lxxiv–lxxv). The prehistoric sherds include three sherds of three different Beakers now in Taunton Museum.

Tree cover around the site included (on the south side) many large yews, possibly of ancient and sacred origin (cf Ross 1974, Ch 1; there is a grove of yews to the south of the Roman temple at Pagans Hill – see Rahtz 1951).

3.3 The form of the report

The report comprises five main parts. Sections 3 and 4 introduce the site and excavation. In the second part, sections 5–12, seven areas of excavation are presented; each comprises evidence, interpretation and salient finds. The third part of the report concerns the cemetery, section 13; and the fourth the finds, section 14. The fifth part draws on all the previous material in a final synthesis and discussion, section 15. This printed text (PT) summarises fuller data in microfiche (MF). Numbering of text sections and figures is common to both (see contents lists).

3.4 Location of the finds and archive

These are housed at Woodspring Museum, Weston-super-Mare, accession number 1986/541.
4 The site and its setting

4.1 Location, topography and resources

The temple and cemetery (ST 4429 6520) were on a prominent spur, adjacent to the hillfort of Cadbury Congresbury, in NW Somerset. The site lay just above the 61m (200ft) contour, close to the NW edge of the Carboniferous Limestone plateau of Broadfield Down, at a point where there are minerals, including iron ore (cf 3.2), in the limestone. It looked westwards over the North Somerset Levels to the coast of the Bristol Channel (Fig 1). From here, the Levels and coast with South Wales beyond are visible; also Failand Ridge and another Cadbury Camp above Tickenham (Fig 5).

Below the spur to the north, the River Kenn drains the northern part of the Levels, and to the south is the River Yeo (Fig 3). At Congresbury, the latter was bridged by an ancient crossing which could be reached by sea-going boats as late as c AD 1900 (cf Fig 3) (cf Fowler, Gardner and Rahtz 1970, 45, fnt 3, re the wharf close to here). St Andrew's church (Fig 3), on a slight knoll NW of the village core, is reputedly the site of St Congar's foundation, although such an association cannot be demonstrated before the 10th–11th century (Rollason 1978, 64–5). Congresbury was the site of a Saxon minster, probably on the same spot, which was given by Alfred to Asser (Radford 1961–2, 35, 41; also cf 15.8).

The surrounding area was well settled in the Iron Age (cf Fowler, Gardner and Rahtz 1970, Fig 1). There was prolific activity, both secular and religious, in the Roman period (cf Figs 1, 5; Fowler, Gardner and Rahtz 1970, 11; Leech and Leach 1982, Fig 8.3 for area to south; Rahtz 1982a, 181), which continued to be well attested in the post-Roman period (cf Rahtz 1982a, Fig 1). Local Roman sites included a villa of some importance at Wemberham, Yatton; and another possible one close to Henley Wood, at Woodlands (VCH Somerset 1 [1906], 307, 370; Branigan 1976, 124). There was an early field system on Broadfield Down itself (Fowler 1978). The former positions of the coastline, and the relative land and sea levels in relation to prehistoric and Roman settlement in the North Somerset Levels are still a matter of debate (cf Burrow 1981, 12).

The resources of the area, in both economic and social terms, have been considered (in theory) by Ian Burrow (1981, 172–6; 1982, 97) (see also CADREX 1992, 224–6). Apart from the nearby coastal resources and access to the western seaways, the Levels provided summer grazing, wildfowl and fish. The wooded hillslopes to the east yielded fuel and timber, and provided pannage for pigs. There was high quality arable land to the south, and upland grazing on Broadfield Down to the east. The potential range of resources, trade contacts, and upland/lowland symbiosis was similar to that delineated by Clarke in his classic study of the Glastonbury Lake Village (Clarke 1972).

Burrow has also pointed out the broad coincidence between a theoretical Thiessen polygon centred on Cadbury Congresbury hillfort and the area enclosed by the boundaries of the three principal parishes in the area, with the addition of the grazing area to the east (Fig 4, based on Burrow 1982, Fig 9.15). He is here suggesting the continuity of resource territories from the Iron Age to historic times (cf Burrow 1981, 174). These must be considered as much in relation to Henley Wood as to Cadbury Congresbury.

Turning now to the immediate topography of the area, the side spur on which the temple and cemetery stood away sharply to west, north, and east (Fig 3 and Pl 1). To the south is a shallow gulley close to the line of the parish boundary and separating the site from the hillfort of Cadbury Congresbury (Fig 2). A rough path along this was marked on a map of 1739–40 (Vilstar 1739–40), described there as leading ‘to the quarries’ (inf F Neale). Today this track provides the easiest access to both sites; it could have done so in the Roman period and later, but there is no evidence of a subsidiary track or hollow-way leading off to the temple or to the temenos enclosure, although it is directly adjacent to the later cemetery.

Indeed the wider communications around the temple are quite uncertain. While the view, and the direction from which it was most prominent, was to the west, entrance to the temples was on the east side (at any rate in the last two phases); the entrance through the excavated sector of the temenos ditch must also have been gained from the east. The temenos ditch extended across the neck of the spur in such a way as to suggest that any access except from the east would have been highly improbable; an eastern approach must be assumed of which no trace exists today (cf Pagans Dill, where the eastern way up to the temple is very obvious [Rahtz and Harris 1956–7, 231]. This argument is relevant not only to the approach from the district around, but also from the hill fort.

4.2 The hillfort of Cadbury Congresbury and its relationship to Henley Wood (Figs 1–4)

The area is visually dominated by the hillfort of Cadbury Congresbury. The two sites lie on either side of the present parish boundary between Congresbury and Yatton (Fig 2). Excavations on the hillfort in
Figure 1 General location maps
Figure 2 Detailed location plan
Figure 3 Local topography
1968 and 1970–3 showed that it originated in prehistoric times, but that it had been reused, with additional earthworks, in the late and/or post-Roman centuries. The occupants were of high status, able to use ceramics and glass imported from the Mediterranean and elsewhere (CADREX 1992).

There are links between the two sites. Both yielded some Neolithic material. There was possible contact in both the Iron Age and Roman period. Some of the material found at Cadbury Congresbury may have been removed from Henley Wood; and finally and most importantly, there is a possibility that the cemetery on the temple site was that of at least some of the post-Roman inhabitants of the hillfort (see 15.8 below).

4.3 The place-name, by Margaret Gelling

There is no detailed place-name survey for Somerset, so no early spellings are conveniently available for minor names such as Henley Wood; for the moment it is only possible to assume that it is identical with other well-documented examples of these modern forms. Henley may reasonably be classed with numerous Henley, Hanley, Handley names, which mean high wood. With no early spellings available there cannot be certainty, but the meaning 'high wood' seem particularly appropriate to this example.

4.4 Temples in Somerset and neighbouring areas (Fig 5)

Henley Wood is part of the densest concentration of temples so far located in Britain. It has been suggested (Rahtz and Watts 1979) that this may not be entirely disassociated with the dearth of evidence for Roman Christianity in Somerset (Thomas 1981, Chs 4 and 5), notably in comparison with Gloucestershire or Dorset. Martin Carver has, however, suggested that the number of temples may instead have been directly related to the strength of Christianity (Carver 1986, 99).

Early Christian memorial stones are also absent from the area. There was until recently no positive evidence of Christianity in Somerset until the end of the 7th century, with the possible notable exception of Wells (cf Aston and Burrow 1982, 121) and perhaps Ilchester (Leach 1982 and 1994). Cases can also be made for both Glastonbury Tor (Rahtz 1991, 32) and
Figure 5 Roman temples and shrines

Cadbury Congresbury (CADREX 1992) as early monastic centres. In 1990, however, a silver amulet cross with an equal-armed *chi-rho* punched onto the central disc, probably of the later 4th or early 5th century, was found in a west-east grave in a cemetery at Shepton Mallet (Leach 1991).

Many of the temples in the west are close to Roman roads, although there is no known road close to Henley Wood. Minor roads have been postulated to cross at Pagans Hill, a little to the east, and that extending west from the latter site may well pass close to Henley Wood.

Rahtz and Watts (1979) have discussed the origins of the temples and shrines in the west, and the modes by which they, or at least their sites, continued to be significant religious centres in post-Roman times. The most positive evidence for such continuing use comes from finds in the temple well at Pagans Hill, a bucket and an exotic 7th century glass jar (Rahtz et al. 1958; Rahtz and Watts 1991). The temples on Fig 5 have also been discussed by Rodwell and others in a volume surveying the whole subject in Britain (Rodwell ed. 1980) which amplifies and extends the data in Rahtz and Watts 1979.

Post-Roman religious activity has to be considered not only in relation to continuing use of the temples
or their sites, but also to cemeteries; at Henley Wood such mortuary activity is secondary to defined late Roman contexts.

4.5 Late and post-Roman cemeteries in Somerset (Fig 6)

The cemetery at Henley Wood belongs to a class first defined by Phillips (1966) as 'sub-Roman', and further classified and extended by Rahtz (1968 and 1977). These cemeteries are of late Roman or later date; principally in the west; not clearly pagan Anglo-Saxon or Christian; not associated with churches or monasteries; and sparse in gravegoods. The graves are regularly orientated west to east, and often in rows. The type-site is Cannington; here the cemetery, like that at Henley Wood, may be directly associated with the reuse of a hillfort. (Rahtz, Hirst and Wright in prep).
5 The excavations (Figs 7–9)

5.1 Excavation method (Figs 7–8)

In 1962 the surface of a strip of ground on the SW side of the site was bulldozed. This was then hand-excavated, together with the main area of excavation to the east; for details see MF 5.1, 6.3 and 13.1. Fig 7 shows the extent of the area explored.

Figure 7 Site plan
5.2 The recording system (Fig 8)

Details of this are provided in MF 6.4 (temple) and MF 13.1 (cemetery). Layer descriptions recorded in the field are in quotation marks.

Throughout the 1964–9 excavations, finds were given bag numbers on site and were then catalogued by individual ‘HW’ numbers. Material numbers, ST1, C2 etc, were subsequently also assigned.

Other elements of the recording system included area plans, ancillary sections and monochrome photographs, the latter generally taken at an advanced stage of excavation.

Figure 8 Excavation cuttings, baulks, section lines, fixed points
5.3 Post-exca
vation procedures
(Fig 9)

Full details of the basic archive and of analytical
procedures are in MF 5.3. Most of the data were
derived from Greenfield’s finds lists, photographs
and field plans and sections; an overall framework
was, however, available in his interim reports. The
photographs were especially valuable for determin-
ing the positions of skeletal remains in graves, and
for structural detail of the temples.

The primary post-excavation procedure was the
compilation of stratification tables (MF Tables 9–11,
13 and 17–19). The excavation was planned in a
complex series of areas and baulks (Fig 8). For
convenience in post-excavation analysis, and in the

---

Figure 9 Post-exca
vation areas
following text, these were simplified into seven areas (I–VII) as shown on Fig 9. Context references are cited thus: V.13.L2 which means Layer 2 in Cutting 13 within Area V.

Finds have been re-classified thematically by PL as follows, with their relevant abbreviations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Furnishings/Fittings FF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>:dress</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Utensils/Household UH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:ornaments</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Buildings/Services BS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: toilet etc</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>Religious/Votive RV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: recreation</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Industrial I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools/Weapons</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td>Environmental E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Area I (Temples ?1–3)

6.1 Summary of periodisation and chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 0</td>
<td>Recent geology; and any activity earlier than ?Temple 1</td>
<td>Iron Age and earlier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>?Temple 1</td>
<td>Possibly late Iron Age, but probably earlier Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Temple 2</td>
<td>3rd century AD or earlier; <em>floruit</em> in 3rd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3i</td>
<td>Temple 3i</td>
<td>Post-AD270–90, or less probably 367–75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3ii</td>
<td>Temple 3ii</td>
<td>Post-AD367–75; before earliest burial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Decay and destruction of Temple 3; overlaps Phase 5</td>
<td>Part at least probably demolished by c AD600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Burials within Temple 3</td>
<td>Probably both pre- and post-dating Phase 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6</td>
<td>Any activity post-dating Phase 5</td>
<td>Up to modern times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Introduction (Figs 7, 9)

Three structural phases are described below, followed by the evidence for the decay of the final building, and by the burials in this area. This section is concluded with some general remarks, although consideration of this sequence within the context of the site as a whole is deferred until Section 15.

6.3–5 Excavation method, recording and post-excavation work (Figs 7, 8, 10–13)

For detail, see MF6.3, 6.4, 6.5 and MF Table 9 etc. In discussion of structures, ‘approximately west-east’ is used in relation to orientation, though they are actually closer to WSW-ESE.

6.6 Structural phases (MF Table 2)

6.6.1 Phase 0 (Figs 10, 12, 13)

The Carboniferous Limestone beneath Area I formed an east-west spine, the ground falling away from north to south, and from east to west (S1 and S2, Figs 11–12). There were several ‘steps’ in the bedrock (see especially section S2, Fig 12). They were all filled with reddish clayey soil (I. 210), similar to buried soils found elsewhere on the site. While this is basically a natural layer in and on the Carboniferous Limestone, artefacts extended quite deeply into it. Features filled with this material were likely to be natural, but could be the result of human activity earlier than Phase 1, such as quarrying or building or other activity.

6.6.2 Phase 1, Structure 1 (Figs 7, 10, 14, 20)

6.6.2a The evidence from Phase 1

The main evidence for this phase is derived from the 1964 Interim Report (1), where Phase 1 is described as ‘a simple square or rectangular-shaped structure of stone foundation. The size is indeterminate (due to later reconstructions and ore mining) but was at least 12 ft [3.7m] east to west. An entrance may be suggested on the east side.’

This description must have been based by Greenfield on feature 1.260 on Fig 10. This was a truncated west-east linear feature c 2.65m long, set into the bedrock. Grave 12, of an infant, placed on its left side in a hole (adjacent to wall 1.256), may have been associated with this or with Structure 2 (for the discounted radiocarbon determination from Grave 12, see 13.4.4 below).

6.6.2b Interpretation of Phase 1

No other wall foundations could be associated with 1.260. It is nevertheless regarded as part of a rectilinear structure, the other elements of which must have been under later walls, or destroyed by their construction. 1.260 is thus interpreted as the south wall of a structure, the minimal internal dimensions of which were c 2.6m east-west and c 3m north-south, giving an internal space of c 8sq m (Fig 20). The location of any entrance is uncertain, but is likely to have been to the east, as in subsequent structures.

The location of Structure 1 below two later temples (6.6.3–4 below), whose linear plans and approximate orientation it shared, suggests that it too may have
had a religious function, perhaps from its size a shrine rather than a fully-developed temple. The lack of domestic features and materials may strengthen a religious interpretation (cf Ellison 1980, 309), although the possible association of an infant burial is not conclusive (cf Leech 1980, 336).

On the basis of this tentative interpretation, Structure 1 is subsequently referred to as ?Temple 1 (6.7.2 and section 15). Positive evidence for function is, however, lacking.

6.6.2c The dating of Phase 1

The dates of construction, use and demolition of ?Temple 1 are uncertain, other than that they pre-date Structure 2, for which a 3rd century *floruit* is suggested (cf 6.6.3c). An earlier Roman or even a late Iron Age date is possible for these events; there are finds which reflect activity on the site during these centuries (cf MF6.7.2 and 15.4). For a fuller discussion see MF 6.6.2.

6.6.3 Phase 2, Structure 2 (Figs 7, 10–12, 14–15, 19; Pls 1–3)

6.6.3a The evidence from Phase 2

Structure 2 consisted of two rooms or cells, A and B, linked as a rectangular structure; elements of this lay beneath later structures (see Fig 10), and are shown on Fig 14, where postulated walls are also reconstructed. An angled freestanding structure,
I.257, lay within Cell A, and two external foundations, I.2589, extended outwards from Cell A’s east wall.

The foundations were all of local Carboniferous Limestone; the principal walls were perhaps more regularly cut than those of Phase 3, with dressed outer faces and rubble cores. Wall I.211 for example appears to have been set on bedrock, built from the north against a face of buried soil. There were internal and external offsets, and the junctions of blocks tended to be superimposed (cf Sl, Fig 11; and P1.3). A list of the dimensions of Structure II is given in MF Table 1.

Wall I.256 is shown on Figs 14 and 10 as abutting wall I.211, as this is how it was drawn by Greenfield. Photographs suggest however that it may originally have been bonded. Posthole I.274 may have been associated with it.

On the east side of Cell A foundations I.258 and 259 seem not to have been bonded with wall I.255, at least at foundation level.

I.257 was a free-standing foundation in Cell A, centred on the entrance. Further symmetry is evident in that the distance of the east face of I.257 from the east wall I.255 is twice, that of the distance of its west face from the central wall I.256. I.257 appears (like I.211 as seen on Sl, Fig 11), to have been abutted by the later layer I.L9 and covered by layers I.L8 and L8a, so that it was sealed below later floor levels.

Other internal features include possible patches of flooring (1.270, 271, 285, Fig 14). Posthole I.274, already discussed in relation to ?Temple 1, may instead have been associated with Phase 2, as may an animal burial (I.F20), comprising at least three sheep and foetal bones. Externally, I.F18 (Fig 10) may have been a feature outside Structure 2 to the SW; finds from I.F18 include an ?earlier 1st century AD brooch from its base (BZ15: 14.5.2a–9 and Fig 89.23); and pig and sheep bones (the latter including foetal).

Painted plaster was recovered from I.L9, which is interpreted as the destruction level of Structure 2 (Sl, Fig 11 and 14.9.2c). This is discussed more fully in 6.6.3b below. Other finds from I.L9 include coins, a counter and human infant, pig and sheep bones, (MF Table 9). Finds were concentrated in, if not exclusively from, the top of the layer.

### 6.6.3b Interpretation of Phase 2

Interpretation of Phase 2 is more positive than for Phase 1. Structure 2 is presumed to have succeeded ?Temple 1 while the latter was still visible. It is reconstructed as a rectangular two-celled building on Fig 14 (restored on Fig 15) (c 8m x 6m externally), with a substantial eastern porch. The internal space at foundation level was c 33.3sq m (c 6.80m x 4.90m), with Cell A wider by lm than Cell B. The two cells are assumed to have been built at the same time. Access from A to B may have been at the northern end of wall I.256, ?posthole I.274 being associated with a doorway here, although this may be of Phase 3.

The superstructure may not have been of stone: the foundations were not as wide as those of Structure 3; the postulated destruction layer I.L9 contained very little stone and is more likely to have been derived from a plaster and wood or cob superstructure; and I.L9 did not contain roof tile fragments. The finds of plaster in both cells suggest that both were roofed. Both cells were decorated in a similar manner with green curvilinear designs, bands of red ochre, and red/pink/blue/ and blue-grey spots on a cream-white background (14.9.2c).

The external ground level to the south of Structure 2 was about the same level as the highest bedrock in the entrance area. Fragments of interior stone floors (P12), close to the bedrock, are visible in photographs. It appears that there was a floor level common to both cells, similar to that of the east exterior.

Structure 2 is interpreted as a temple on the basis of its location directly beneath the typical Romano-Celtic temple represented by Structure 3; it is accordingly referred to as Temple 2. It belongs to a class of rectangular buildings divided into two cells (Lewin 1966, 75). The eastern, outer room was larger and presumably more important. The central feature, I.257, may have been the base for an altar here, or for a cult figure (Lewin 1966, 44; Henig 1984, 41; Boon 1989). Its importance is further emphasised by its possible relationship to the temenos ditch, as discussed below. The possibility that Grave 12 was a foundation burial has already been mentioned; there was also a human infant rib from I.L9. The animal bones and other finds, including coins and counters, may also have had cult significance (cf Sections 14–15 below).

As already intimated, I.L9 is interpreted as the destruction level of Temple 2, stratified above its floor level in both cells (cf Fig 11). The bottom part of the layer may reflect either slow disintegration or the swift stripping of wall material and plaster, after the removal of most of the floor but before the walls were lowered. The upper part of the layer may reflect trampling associated with the demolition of the walls and subsequent preparations for a new building. A controlled demolition of Temple 2 rather than gradual decay is favoured; this may be the reason why I.L9 was confined within Temple 2 (cf Sl, Fig 11). A suitable occasion would have been preparatory to the construction of Structure 3 (see also 6.6.4f).

Temple 2 was set in a planned temenos. If the angled edges of the north and south sides of foundation I.257 are extended eastwards, they converge in the area of the causeway, across the temenos ditch, 21m away (cf Fig 7, 10.6.4, and 15.5). I.257 may indeed have been visible from this entrance to the site.

### 6.6.3c The dating of Phase 2

The structural features of Temple 2 were stratified between those of ?Temple 1 and Temple 3. The
Figure 11 Section S1: south-north through temples, D-C
Figure 12 Section S2: west-east through temples (reversed), B-A

Figure 13 Section S3: north face of 1962 bulldozed edge, E-F
principal dating evidence comes from layer I.L9 in the eastern cell (A) (MF Table 2.1). Here there were twelve 3rd century coins, the latest of which are AD270–290; these provide a date after which I.L9 was deposited of AD270. In the inner western cell (B) there was a later coin of AD335–41. This was however 15cm below the surface of I.L9 in a root-disturbed area, so its later evidence is discounted (MF Table 2.2).

The coins in cell A were found only in the upper third of the layer, perhaps trodden into its surface while this was in a plastic condition. They may be derived from loss at the time of demolition, or disturbance of earlier deposits; or they may have accumulated during a period of abandonment or decay of a derelict structure.

The terminus post quem of AD270 for I.L9 may, nevertheless, be too early as coins of c AD290–320 are relatively rare in Britain (Reece 1972, Fig 1 and Table 1). The absence of the relatively common Constantinian coins in such a large group is taken however as good evidence that the floruit and perhaps also the construction of Temple 2 were within the 3rd century, or possibly earlier (see also 15.4).

A fuller discussion of Temple 2 is in MF6.6.3.
6.6.4 Phase 3, Structure 3 (Figs 7, 10–13, 16–19; Pls1–3)

6.6.4a Introduction

As Structure 3 was the latest in Area I, more evidence survived, allowing the definition of two sub-phases, 3i and 3ii, except within the cella, an important point, as discussed below. Features which cannot be assigned to either 3i or 3ii are referred to a generalised Phase 3 (MF Table 9). Later robbing limits most of the evidence to that from ground level or below.

6.6.4b The evidence from Phase 3i

The plan of this phase, as restored, is that of a double square, a cella with surrounding ambulatory; the
outer square was c 14.2m externally, the inner c 7.6m. The outer walls were set slightly into bedrock (cf S2, Fig 12) with variable depths and offsets to compensate for the unevenness of the underlying rock. The inner and outer faces were of Carboniferous Limestone blocks, with a core of smaller material and soil; joints were staggered between courses, and courses aligned in adjacent walls. The cella foundations were similarly variable, extending down into deeper pockets of soil, and with variable offsets. Full details of the dimensions of structures are given in MF Tables 3–4.

The entrance through both squares was from the east. Outside the outer east wall there was a heavy metalling (I.L11) and two foundations (I.F11 and I.F17). Finds from I.L11 include two finger rings (BZ10, BZ12; 14.5.4b and Fig 89.41-42), coins (including some later than AD350) and much samian (also cf 6.6.7, MF Table 9 and MF 14.8.3b–4).

In the eastern ambulatory, close to the cella wall, were two further foundations, I.251 and I.252, set either side of the axial line of the entrance; and a small feature I.265, by the north face of Phase 3ii blocks, I.238. Feature I.252 may have been overlain by possible subsequent flooring, I.273 (Figs 10, 16).

The east exterior surface may have been slightly higher than the surface of the east ambulatory, here at the level of the highest bedrock (cf S2, Fig 12). Feature I.275 may have been a patch of surviving stone flooring of this phase in the east ambulatory. Similar floor patches were better preserved in the south and west ambulatory, both bedded on make-up or on I.L10 (S1, S2, Figs 11–12). A comparison of S1 and S2 (Figs 11–12) shows considerable differences.
in level between the east, west, and south parts of the ambulatory, of up to c 0.35m.

Within the ambulatory were four or five animal burials, of sheep, ox (including foetal), pig and goat (I.1962/F9, I.1962/F11, I.F15, I.F16 and I.281; also see I.F18, 6.6.3a (Table 59)). There were also one or two animal burials in the cella, possibly of Phase 3; these were of sheep, including foetal bones (I.F20 – also see 6.6.3a above; and ?I.276) (Table 59; MF 6.6.4-5).

Other features include I.268, 269 and 278, probable posthole or postpad settings in the south ambulatory. ?Posthole I.274 in the north ambulatory, has already been discussed in relation to a possible Phase 2 inner doorway, but it may be of Phase 3.

6.6.4c The evidence from Phase 3ii

There is evidence for modification to the basic arrangements of Structure 3i. Although grouped together here, all these alterations may not have been strictly contemporary. They include reflooring of the ambulatory, additions to the east face of the east cella wall, and possible alterations to the eastern entrance and cella floor.

The floor levels in the ambulatory were raised by c 0.15m of ‘occupation silt, mortar, rubble and wall plaster’ (I.L6 on S1 and S2, Figs 11–12). Finds from I.L6 include a finger ring (BZ8; 14.5.4b and Fig 89.39) and coins, the latest of which is dated AD350–60 (MF Table 9). The actual floor may have been provided in the east cella, possibly of Phase 3; these were of sheep, including foetal bones (I.F20 – also see 6.6.3a above; and ?I.276) (Table 59; MF 6.6.4-5).

Other features include I.268, 269 and 278, probable posthole or postpad settings in the south ambulatory. ?Posthole I.274 in the north ambulatory, has already been discussed in relation to a possible Phase 2 inner doorway, but it may be of Phase 3.

6.6.4d The evidence from the cella

The level of the cella floor must originally have been at least as high as the surface of I.L9, the destruction level of Temple 2, and the tops of the surviving structures of that phase. Within the former area of Temple 2, I.L9 was sealed by I.L8 ‘brown sandy soil and rock’. Outside the area of Temple 2, I.L8 continued, but was here designated by the excavator as I.L8a, lying on the old g-round surface, I.L10. Finds from I.L8a were more varied than those from I.L8; they included the only fragment of window glass from the site (14.9.2b) two bone pins (14.5.4d and Fig 90.56) and a smashed sheep palate. Coins of the 3rd and 4th centuries were found throughout I.L8 + L8a, the latest of which (C128) was of AD367–75 (for all finds in I.L8 + L8a, see MF Table 5).

On this layer was ‘pitched rubble’ (designated both as I.L2 and I.280, but referred to hereafter as the latter). The precise extent of I.280, the pitched rubble, is uncertain, since its outline as plotted on the plan of Structure 3 (Fig 16) extends not only over the robbed east wall of the cella, I.F14, but also over the edge of the apparently later disturbance I.F19 (Fig 10 and 6.6.5b below), both of which are stratigraphically unlikely.

Finds from this rubble include a red deer antler fragment (B02; cf 14.12.4), a bone pin head, two bone counters, coins, and a votive copper alloy leaf (BZ3, Fig 110.160) (see MF6.6.4d for full discussion of I.L2/I.280.)

6.6.4e Interpretation of Phase 3

Elements of the lower parts of Temple 2 were incorporated in the construction of Structure 3, in places being retained as footings. This, and a shared orientation and entrance, strongly suggest continuity of both function and usage. Structure 3, hereafter Temple 3, is a typical concentric square Romano-British temple, as defined in plan (cf Lewis 1966, 27; Wilson 1980, 7). Its size and proportions are summarised in Fig 18. The building was of average size for temples of this type, at neither extreme (Lewis 1966, 25). The plan reflects functional differences between the cella which was the preserve of the deity, and the ambulatory; the latter is seen as a series of processional passages, separating the ‘sacred and profane’ and providing space for the display of votive offerings (cf Lewis 1966, 23; Henig 1984, 37–8).

This function may be reflected by a few objects from the temple which could be votive. Possible items include finger rings, counters and the numerous coins (cf Section 14). More positive is the copper alloy leaf (14.7). Animal burials and other animal bones are also often associated with a religious site as blood sacrifices (cf 6.7.3, 14.12.4, and Henig 1984, 131).

Some or all of the freestanding structures of Phase 3 may either have marked the site of such sacrifices, or have provided the foundations for columns or statues (cf Lewis 1966, 43; Henig 1984, 38). Those on the east exterior of the ambulatory may have been for an altar, rather than for the porch suggested. Those in the eastern ambulatory are more likely to have served a ritual function; there may have been a further cult focus in the cella (MF 6.6.4e–5).

Temple 3 was carefully laid out. The entrance, for instance, was placed approximately symmetrically on its east side (cf Lewis 1966, Table 1). Features I.F11 and I.F17 divide the east ambulatory wall into thirds. A reconstruction can also be suggested in which I.251 and I.252 supported either columns or non-structural features which sat at the outer edges of the central third of the cella east wall (cf Fig 19). In Phase 3ii, I.238 and its postulated northern partner more clearly divided the cella facade into approximate thirds.

The exterior levels were variable, with possibly a slight drop down from the east exterior into the east ambulatory.

In the cella, two interpretations of its floor level
maybe suggested. In the first, the stratification as shown on S1 (Fig 11) is taken at face value, I.L8+8a being primary make-up; and I.280 the base for the cella floor. The second interpretation is based on a more complex interpretation of section S1. Although I.L8 (+L8a) lay directly on I.L9, the interface of these layers, now designated as I.411 on S1, may mark a truncation of material formerly on I.L9, or at least a temporal hiatus. It is possible, for instance, that the cella initially had a suspended (?wooden) floor, hypothetically referred to as I.411.1, with a physical gap between it and I.L9 and I.L10. In this second interpretation I.L8+L8a and I.280 would be the make-up and base for a secondary floor. The coin evidence from I.L8+L8a makes the second interpretation more than a theoretical possibility; this problem will be discussed in more detail below (6.6.4f).

The floor level of the cella was in either case above
that of the ambulatory. There may have been one or two steps (of wood or stone) across the gap of nearly a metre between I.251 and I.252 and the east cella wall, with a rise of 0.25m–0.45m or more. The angular pitched stone of I.280 would have been too rough to have been itself a floor; it must have been covered by flagstones or more probably wood.

Little survived to indicate detail of the interior of Temple 3 (cf Henig 1984, Ch 6). Parts at least were plastered and painted in both Phases 3i and 3ii. Pieces of plaster similar to those from I.L9 of Temple 2 (14.9.2c) were found overlaying the ambulatory and in the robbing trenches for the cella walls as well as in I.L8a, though none was certainly from the cella.

For the superstructure there is no direct evidence, but suggestions can be made on the basis of the foundations and loose structural fragments, especially from overlying levels (6.6.5–6 below; cf Lewis 1966, 16). A minimum height for the cella is suggested by its slightly raised floor, which constituted a mass of at least 16 cubic metres, which would have had to be retained in stone. The absence of any layer representing cob and timber construction also argues for stone being used to the full height, as does the volume of layer I.L3 (c 71 cubic metres) (Phase 4, 6.6.5b). The presence of heavy Pennant stone tiles is usually associated too with stone walls, as is Bath freestone coping. There is insufficient evidence relating to doorways to indicate whether or not the east facade above the level of dwarf walls was of stone. If I.F11 and I.F17, and doubtfully I.251 and I.252, are reconstructed as part of porch structures, neither pair need have been attached to a solid wall (cf Lewis 1966, 37; Wilson 1980, 8); the postulated columns in both cases could have been paired by similar columns above the foundations of adjacent walls I.246 and I.235.

The cella entrance may have held a door, the jamb represented by hole I.265. A door between I.238 and its assumed northern equivalent would be slightly less than 2.55m wide, allowing for the door casement. This is within the customary range of 2.44–2.7m (8–9ft) found by Lewis (1966, 37).

?Posthole I.274, if of Phase 3, may have been part of a doorway in the north cella wall, but is more likely in this phase to have had some use in the north ambulatory.

The walls of the ambulatory appear to have been wider than those of the cella, but this cannot be used by itself as evidence of a difference in height or load-bearing capacity (cf Rodwell 1980, 223).
The coins in I.L9, above Temple 2 provide a date of AD270–90 or later for all layers above. These include make-up layers I.L8+L8a of Temple 3, which are dated in their deposition to AD367–75 or later by coin C128.

In the first hypothesis discussed above, in which I.L8+L8a are interpreted as a primary make-up for Temple 3, there would have been a hiatus of several decades between the end of Phase 2, in the late 3rd or possibly early 4th century, and the later 4th century date for Temple 3 suggested by the location of C128. This may seem improbable for two reasons: firstly that there is a locational and structural continuity between Temples 2 and 3; and secondly that there are numerous Constantinian coins on the site. While the latter could all have been current in their deposition to AD367–75 or later by coin C128.

The roofs were of Pennant sandstone tile (ST12; 6.6.5 below, 14.9.2a, Fig 108.142). The cella apex was perhaps surmounted by a cylindrical stone finial (ST13; 6.6.5 below, 14.9.2a and Fig 108.143). The interior was decorated with elaborate designs on painted plaster. There may have been a central focus with a type of stepped podium, flanking shallower central steps. The benches were rough as found, and may have been covered with wood or stucco.

6.6.5c Interpretation of Phase 4

Some detail of the process of decay and destruction can be reconstructed from sections S1–S3 (Figs 11–13).
In the south and west ambulatories, any continuous flooring was mostly removed before roofing tile fell. There was no evidence of roofing tile in the east ambulatory (it is possible that this had a different post-temple history see 6.6.6 below), or in the cella itself.

The west cella wall was robbed from the west, together with the southern part of the east cella wall (see S2, Fig 12). An exception to the otherwise drastic robbing was the east ambulatory wall, I.246 (S2, Fig 12), which survived to two or three courses.

The origin of LL3 was variable, and may represent a complex sequence of dilapidation and demolition. I.288 may represent a working area where stone was cleaned of its mortar (cf Brean Down, ApSimon 1964–5, 222); or the mortar material may be the residues of wall plaster.

I.Fl9 may have either pre- or post-dated demolition. Greenfield suggested it was an ‘oven base or large hearth’ (cf iron working pit at Brean Down, ApSimon 1964–65, 208–9); or a treasure-seeking pit (cf ApSimon 1964–65, 223).

6.6.5d The dating of Phase 4

All coins in the robbing trenches and rubble were earlier than the latest sealed coins for the latest phase of the temple. The use of the temple may well extend into the 5th century, with its decay and demolition continuing later than this (cf 15.5 and 15.7). A terminal dating for some of the demolition appears to be provided by the calibrated radiocarbon determinations for some of the graves in the area of the south ambulatory (see 6.6.6d below). It is possible however that robbing continued after burial had ceased (cf 15.7).

A fuller discussion of Phase 4 is in MF 6.6.5.

6.6.6 Phase 5 (Figs 7, 10–13, 30)

6.6.6a Introduction

There were five graves in the area of the southern ambulatory. Part of one further disturbed burial, Grave 1, in the cella is unlikely to have been in situ (cf MF Table 20).

6.6.6b The evidence from Phase 5

Grave 62/3, one member of a double grave, is shown on 53 (Fig 13) (also cf S1, Fig 11) as being cut from a high level, and through demolition material that had obliterated the south ambulatory wall; this probably also applied to Grave 62/2, the other of this pair. Graves 5A and 5B, another double grave, in the SE corner of the ambulatory, and orientated approximately north–south, were recorded as being ‘inserted in rubble L3’; they lay on Pennant sandstone, including roofing tile. Grave 6 was adjacent to the inner side of the south wall of the ambulatory; only part of the skeleton survived – the part of the body adjacent to the wall had been removed.

6.6.6c Interpretation of Phase 5

At least two episodes of burial in the south ambulatory can be suggested (three if the two double graves were not contemporary), distinguished by their relationship to the demolition debris of the walls of Temple 3.

Grave 6 is assigned to the first phase. The south ambulatory wall must still have been visible, standing to above ground level when the grave was dug alongside it, determining its orientation to that of Temple 3 (also cf 13.2.16). It is inferred that half the skeleton was removed during the subsequent demolition of the wall (below), after the flesh had decayed.

The other four graves (two pairs) appear to post-date the wholesale removal to below ground level of the south ambulatory wall; the rubble through which all four were dug also implies that at least elements of the main walls were no longer standing.

The loss of at least some of the major walls may be the reason why the orientation of these graves had no relationship that of the temple. Orientation, however, may have been determined by other, unknown factors; and it is possible that the rubble referred to above was derived from the demolition of only part of the building. The cella space and perhaps the east and north ambulatory passages may still have been ‘available’.

The location of the five ambulatory graves separates them from the main body of the cemetery. The north-south orientation of Graves 5A and 5B is also in contrast not only to the general west-east orientation of all other graves at Henley Wood, but also to Graves 62/2 and 62/3 (13.2.16). The presence of two pairs of graves amongst these five burials may also be significant, as may the concentration by sex (three male, one ?male, the other unknown – see 13.2.11), age (predominantly young adults – see 13.2.11h) and the presence of particular internal grave features (13.2.15). These topics are more fully explored in relation to the cemetery in Section 13. They could have chronological significance, but if so, this is not visible in radiocarbon terms (cf 6.6.6d and 13.4 below).

Burial was confined to a restricted area of the former temple. There may have been obstacles to the use of the rest of the temple area, in terms of the character of collapsed material; or even, as hinted above, because parts were still in use.

The location of these burials, whatever its rationale, must set them apart (cf Sections 13 and 15). Among the many possible explanations, in a Roman or later context, is that of a locus sanctus (eg Bullough 1983) or the ruined structure may have been seen as some kind of ‘funeral garden’ (cf Henig 1984, 195). Burials within former temples as well as other ‘ruined or abandoned buildings’ are not unusual (cf Leech 1980, 338) (also see 15.8).
6.6.6d The dating evidence of Phase 5

A full discussion of all grave dating is given in 13.4 below. Calibrated standard level and high precision radiocarbon determinations from four of the ambulatory graves extend, with no apparent chronological separation, at two sigma from AD230 to 600; and at one sigma from AD270 to 540 (also see 13.4.4).

On the basis of the argument in 6.6.6c above, Graves 62/3, 5A and 5B provide a terminus ante quem for the demolition of at least part of Temple 3ii of AD600 at two sigma and of AD540 at one sigma.

A fuller discussion of Phase 5 is in MF6.6.6.

6.6.7 Phase 6 (Figs 7, 10)

This comprises activity later than the graves. This may include further robbing of the temple structure (cf 6.6.5d and 15.7). Otherwise, in the temple area, all that can be identified is mining activity (1.239 and 1.263); there was a single medieval sherd in LL1 (cf 14.14).

An important residual find incorporated in the topsoil was ST1, an inscribed fragment of a Purbeck limestone panel (cf 6.6.4e above, 14.10.3 and Fig 110.159). BO13 and BO18, fragments of red deer antler, also came from L1 in Area I (also see MF 6.6.7; MF Table 9).

6.7 Area I: general comments and discussion

6.7.1 Location

The characteristics of location that made Henley Wood attractive as a sacred site are an important aspect of setting the temples in context. These are discussed in relation to the evidence from the whole site in 15.2, as such considerations are relevant to all religious use of the site including the mortuary aspects.

6.7.2 Phases 1–3, structures and sequence

The general orientation of Temples ?1–3 is also that of the ‘promontory’ on which they stood (cf Fig 3). The three buildings (Fig 19) exhibit a progressive enlargement (cf Fig 20) and aggrandisement while shifting slightly southwards, possibly also an increased use over time of more durable building materials (cf Wilson 1975, 16).

Their use of such local materials as limestone and Pennant sandstone reflects the usual practice in Romano-British temples (cf Lewis 1966, 33). The indigenous stone was not however amenable to carving as was that, for example, in the Cotswolds where oolitic limestone was used widely even for major pieces of temple sculpture (cf Henig 1984, 163). This is reflected at Henley Wood in the use of imported Purbeck limestone for the panel fragment and Bath oolite for finishing details of the buildings (cf 14.10.1 and 14.9.2a).

The presence of painted wall plaster cannot be used as an index of wealth or sophistication as it was prevalent in such contexts (Lewis 1966, 33); nor, on the other hand, can lack of mosaic be used to suggest rusticity – the floors of the nearby elaborately planned octagonal temple at Pagans Hill were also of Pennant sandstone (Rahtz 1951). The closer approximation to classical form exhibited in the successive plans may offer an index of Romanisation amongst the population the buildings served (cf Henig 1984, 128).

The excavated sequence in this part of the site opens in Phase 1 with evidence which is lacking in sufficient detail to delineate the status of the structure represented. The context of use of ?Temple 1 and the question of whether it represented the first possible religious use of the site are further considered in 15.3–4.

The nature of the sequence is more secure with Temple 2. Its plan does not indicate the full adoption of Romanisation and may be an important link with what has been described as ‘an essentially native Celtic continuity’ (Rahtz 1981, 181; also cf Lewis 1966, 77).

Temple 3 marks the adoption of a Roman idea, albeit transmuted into a Celtic form. Parallels to the slightly raised cella (as distinct from a raised podium for the whole building) are not plentiful, but this may be related to accidents of survival (cf Lewis 1966, 34).

6.7.3 Religion and cult

The nature of religious observance from Area I, as from elsewhere at Henley Wood, must be reconstructed from the material evidence of building plans and from portable items, the interpretation of both of which relies on the established background of religion in Roman Britain and elsewhere (eg Henig 1984).

Henig argues that Romano-Celtic architecture provided the form within which the ‘age-old customs of the indigenous people’ could continue (Henig 1984, 157). This, the material expression of Roman toleration and syncretism (eg Henig 1984, 13), is the background for the elements of continuity proposed in Area I in relation to both Temples ?1 and 2, and Temples 2 and 3, considerations which arc relevant when assessing the degree of Romanisation of ritual (cf Henig 1984, Ch 3).

Besides the character of the plan, the other main guides at Henley Wood to the outward religious observances are provided by material interpreted as votive in character (cf Lewis 1966, 45–8; Henig 1984, 145-52) – in particular, the votive leaf and animal bone assemblage from the temple area, A number of other finds – brooches, finger rings, pins, counters and coins – may also have had votive significance (cf section 14, 15.6; Lewis 1966, 47 and Henig 1984, 151).

Animal bones, both from discrete deposits and from more ambiguous contexts, may have been associated with Temple 2 (6.6.3a) and definitely
with Temple 3 (6.6.4b and 6.6.4e). Sheep, pig and foetal remains occurred in ?Phase 2 or 3 as well as in Phase 3; in the latter there were also goat and ox (including foetal ox). There is also a fragment of antler from I.L2 of Phase 3ii (6.6.4d) and a further two pieces of antler from I.L1 (6.6.7). This, too, may also have had a ritual significance (cf 14.12.4 and 15.6).

It is argued later in this report that material cleared from Area I had been deposited in the temenos ditch (10.6.3). The significance of all such material from the site is assessed with other evidence for cult practice in 15.6.
6.7.4 Post-Temple 3

The nature of the demise and final demolition of Temple 3 is ambiguous, as is the relationship of these events to the cemetery as a whole, matters which are further considered in Sections 13 and 15.

These topics, both within the immediate site context but also over a wider geographical area, are of importance in that they open up the chronological span during which the temple complex as such could have operated and provide a plausible social milieu, not fundamentally different from the Roman (cf Rahtz 1982a, 185), in which it could have operated. These models also provide scenarios for change and eventual loss of function (cf Section 15).
Figure 21 Areas II–VII
Area II, of c.165 sq m, lay on the southern limit of the excavation zone (Fig 21), and was partly bulldozed before excavation. It was on the periphery of both the temple and the cemetery areas.

Stratification was shallow here, being only topsoil on bedrock. An area of intact bedrock (11.353) was to the south of the temenos ditch. There was a pit, 1962/F7, on the south edge, probably a treehole. The eight or nine graves in Area II are discussed in Section 13 below.

Area II may have included part of the southern end of the temple precinct (cf Section 8 below). II.353, may have marked either the southern end of the temenos ditch or a causeway across the ditch; if the latter, it may have been resumed further south as VI.410 (cf Fig 21, 10.6.1 and Section 11). Any gap here may have been a primary crossing of the ditch, before the construction of the later causeway further north (Section 10).

Finds were few; they include nine or ten coins with a date range mainly between AD250–349.

Further details of Area II are contained in MF7 and MF Table 10.

---

**Figure 22 Area II**
Figure 23 Area III
8 Area III (temple precinct)  
(Figs 7–9, 21, 23, 24; MF Tables 62–65, 67, 73, 74)

8.1 Introduction

Area III comprises the area of c 288sq m between the temples to the west and the temenos ditch to the east (Fig 21). This includes the space in front of the temple entrances and the ground flanking the causeway (V.380) across the temenos ditch. To the north it merged into the metalling around Structure 4 (Section 9 below). There were also some burials and treeholes in this area.

8.2 The evidence from Area III (Fig 23)

There was a gentle fall in the strata from west to east. The area was described by the excavator as mostly densely metalled with limestone laid either on the old ground surface or on the bedrock. Towards the NE end, two phases of metalling could be distinguished; the lower was very compact, fronting Structure 4 (see 9.1 below). The figurine BZ66 was found in this area, ‘in soil amongst stones on the surface of bedrock’ (III.10.350, Fig 23).

Features include defined ‘edges’, formed of larger stones (III.355, 359 and 379) and short lengths of more positive drystone alignments (III.358 and 364). The excavator described III.355 as ‘wall edging to cemetery’. There were also a multiple sheep burial (111.360); a depression in the rock (111.368); and modern treeholes and mining or quarrying disturbances (III.362 and III/IV.376–378). The thirteen graves in this area are discussed in Section 13 below.

8.3 Finds from Area III (Fig 24)

Finds of all thematic categories, and of most materials, were present in Area III (MF8.3 and Section 14). Coins were mainly of the first half of the 4th century AD (cf Fig 24).

The most notable find was the female figurine BZ66, probably dating to the 1st century AD (cf 14.10.2 and 15.3). The precise context and associations of this are explored in MF8.3.2; other finds from the same area as BZ66 included mid-4th century material and part of a 2nd century brooch (BZ65; 14.5.2a–3 and Fig 88.12).

8.4 Area III, interpretation and general comments

Area III, lying between the temples to the west and the temenos ditch and the causeway to the east (Fig 21), was an area traversed by pilgrims, but it may also have contained minor structures.

Possible structures may be represented by the stone alignments III.358, 359, 364 and 379. These could have been, for instance, for booths or stalls or even something more substantial. The location of the figurine and the sheep burial could be considered in this context, as could the absence of the graves in the whole central part of Area III (cf 13.5 and 15.7). The concept of III.355 as a wall or edge bounding the cemetery is discussed in relation to the graves in 13.5 below.

The wide utilitarian range of finds from Area III reflects its position central to all the other ‘activity areas’. The suggested high proportion of styli, glass vessels, and ceramic table ware is discussed in MF8.4.3 (also cf 10.6.3).

One outstanding problem of Area III is the north-south strip of ground adjacent to the temenos ditch. It is not clear that any of the defined metallings extended over this area and the finds plots are also blank for this strip (Fig 24). There may have been a bank, as suggested on Figs 23–24, on the inner side of the temenos ditch (cf 10.6.1). A fuller discussion of Area III is contained in MF Section 8.
Figure 24 Area III – finds and contexts
9.1 Introduction

Area IV strictly comprises the area bounded by the walls of Structure 4, which had been heavily truncated by mining (Figs 7, 9). Other related contexts are however included with Area IV, and less certain ones with Areas III/IV.

Structure 4 was defined by Greenfield, whose description (in an interim report) is worth quoting in full, as indicating his beliefs at that time: 'At the NE end of the area, two phases of metalling were found superimposed. When the later surface [IV.385], contemporary with Temple 3, was removed, an area of compact metalling [IV.386] was found fronting the fragmentary remains of a building (4) [Structure 4] of octagonal shape. Only the SW edge of this building remained, the remainder having been destroyed by quarrying ['mining edge', IV.378, on Fig 26]. This was represented by a short length of foundation [IV.384.1], composed of limestone slot, laid without mortar. On the east side of this was a gap, some 2.13m in width, which formed an entrance [IV.384.2]. A slot [IV.384.3] to take a timber doorsill in alignment with the foundation was found between the exterior metalling [IV.386] and the interior floor level [IV.384.4] of small to large greenstone slabs. An external width of c 9.1m can be provisionally suggested for the building. Dating evidence (coins and pottery) suggest that this building is probably contemporary with Building [Temple] 2 . . . . Both buildings (2 and 4) can be dated provisionally to the late 2nd and 3rd century AD. A few scraps of pottery of Iron Age date were found beneath ‘Building 4’ when it was destroyed.'

This hypothesis will now be scrutinised.

9.2 The evidence from Area IV

(Fig 26; Pls 12–13)

The only context defined as pre-dating Structure 4 is a make-up, IV.401, underlying elements of the structure; make-up IV.398 may also have been an intact pre-Structure 4 context.

The elements of the structure referred to in 9.1 above are reproduced on Fig 26 from the excavator’s drawing; the context numbers in the 300s have been added during post-exavation work. The main com-
ponents of Structure 4 were IV.384.1, part of the south wall; IV.384.2–3, the entrance gap and slot (not defined on field drawings); IV.384.4a, b, c, the interior floor level of 'greenstone' (see 9.4); IV.384.5, a postulated wall adjacent to the west end of IV.384.1 at 140° as implied by the excavator and drawn by him as a dotted line; and IV.384.6, a complementary edge to the east of the entrance, shown by the excavator as an edge to the paving.

Of all these elements, IV.384.1 was the only definite walling element. From plan and photographs it can be defined as a foundation 2m long, of limestone slab facing with a rubble core, surviving to a maximum of two courses, with a possible offset on the south side. The other two walls were more tenuous; but if correct they provide a minimum diameter for the building of 9m.

The entrance, IV.384.2, was well-defined on photographs (Pl 13). Its southern edge was formed by the slot IV.384.3, probably in the same plane as, or slightly north of, the south face IV.384.1. The slot may have held a timber sill beam, or it may have held a threshold stone; the excavator's statement as to its length of 2.13m can only be taken at its face value. This distance would have made the slot extend nearly to the next 'corner' of the 'octagon'.

On the interior, IV.384.4a was the most coherent area of floor paving. IV.385 was beneath interior paving. Outside, IV.385 was the upper metalling and IV.386 the lower, of compact, small limestone and soil; it extended at least 1.8m to the south of the structure.

Five other features may also have been associated with Structure 4: IV.F101, F102 and F105 were small postholes to the south and SW, while IV.F106 and F107 were larger postholes, inside the postulated structure.

Other ill-defined and unlocated layers and features are discussed in MF9.2.3–4. Some are known from plotted finds contexts such as the coins on Fig 27; but their stratigraphic relationship to the features discussed above is unclear.

9.3 Finds from Area IV (Fig 27)

IV.398 contained Iron Age pottery that may have been in situ; and also middle to late Neolithic flints (Fig 86.9 and MF14.4.2). Area IV contained most of the sparse Iron Age pottery from the site (cf MF14.4.3).

Most materials were found in Area IV, but at a low density. In the thematic range, there was little personal material, but there was more related to building/services. A complete upper quernstone had been built into Structure 4 (ST68; 14.6.2b and Figs 26 and 92.96). Coins were mainly of the late 3rd and earlier 4th century.
Context IV.401, below Structure 4, contained a sherd of pottery fabric A3, for which 3rd- and 4th-century parallels can be cited (14.8.3b–4).

There was wall plaster with dark red-ochre pigment in posthole IV.Fl06; this was similar in matrix to some of that from the temenos ditch (cf MF 10.5.2), where the range includes cream-white plaster decorated with pink or red-ochre borders and panels (cf 14.9.2c); all of these may indicate the decoration of Structure 4.

9.4 General comments

The concentration of Neolithic flints and Iron Age sherds may indicate prehistoric use of this area, perhaps of a religious character (as at Uley; Woodward & Leach 1993 also cf Beaker sherds, 3.2).

That Structure 4 was a building, as believed by the excavator, is supported by the entrance arrangements and by the presence of painted wall plaster, the use of which would have necessitated a roof. An octagonal or even polygonal plan for Structure 4 cannot however be substantiated, although it remains a possibility; topographically there would have been room for the rest of an octagon to the north before the ground fell away.

Other structural evidence for Structure IV could be adduced from the filling of the temenos ditch, which may have contained material derived from here (cf 10.6.3 and 14.8.3b–6, iii). In addition to the plaster noted above (9.3), this included, in the northern part of the ditch, Bath oolite roof coping, mortar, nails, and metal fittings or furnishings, and ‘greenstone’ (probably a local variant of the Carboniferous Limestone – inf P Leach) (cf MF10.5 and 14.9.2a). The three octagonal rings, one with a ‘deity’ inscription (cf 10.5.2 and14.5.4b), also found in this part of the temenos ditch opposite Structure IV, may similarly relate to its function (and possibly even reflect its plan) (cf 15.7).

Parallels for an octagonal or polygonal reconstruction can be cited from both secular and religious contexts. The size of the entrance suggests a building of more than domestic size. Structure 4 may thus have been another temple. A mausoleum or mausoleum-cum-shrine would be another possible interpretation. Such polygonal forms can be paralleled in both pagan and Christian contexts (cf Thomas 1981, 206; and the Summit Structure at Cannington – Rahtz, Hirst and Wright in prep).

Parallels are however readily available in temples themselves (Lewis 1966, 30–2). These include nearby Pagans Hill (Rahtz 1951), and there are now two additional examples in the west; a polygonal structure within the temenos at Uley, associated with Mercury (Woodward and Leach 1993, Fig 9) and phases of the great temple to Apollo at Nettleton (Wedlake 1982, Fig 2). The presence of more than one temple or religious structure within a temenos is also well-known, and can be again well illustrated at Uley and Nettleton.

Structure 4 appears to have been dismantled, and its remains buried under later metalling.

9.5 The dating of Structure 4
(Fig 27, MF Table 12)

Dating is hampered by a lack of securely sealed contexts. Two coins, however, would provide a date for Structure 4 if they were reliably sealed; they are compatible with the slender evidence of the single sherd of pottery fabric A3 below Structure 4. Coin C459 was found in the primary metalling outside Structure 4, and suggests a date of AD293–96 after which the metalling was laid; a further coin (C380) from IV.354, a patch of soil beneath interior paving, provides a date of AD337–41 after which this floor was laid. While neither coin provides a secure date, it seems probable that the structure was of 4th century date, a conclusion that is compatible with the general range from the area, as shown in Fig 27.

9.6 The relationship of Area IV to Area I

Structure 4, and any possible predecessors, must be considered as part of the temple sequence in the temenos. While Structure 4 could have been contemporary with Temple 2, or an early phase of Temple 3, there is a possibility that it was the main cult focus of the site during part at least of the Constantinian period (cf 6.6.4f and 15.5). In the discussion of Temples ?1–3 above (6.6.4e–f), attention was drawn to the stratigraphic problems associated with Temple 3. There a complex hypothesis was favoured which allowed no hiatus in the Temple 3 sequence in the 4th century. If, however, this argument is not accepted, and a hiatus in the temple sequence in the earlier 4th century is believed possible, then Structure 4 might have filled that gap. This would have represented a shift of focus within the temenos, perhaps associated with a different cult (cf 10.6.3 re animal bone assemblage from upper part of the temenos ditch). Such a shift was not however permanent since there is clear evidence for the use of Temple 3 in the later 4th century and for the disappearance of Structure 4 probably during the same period (cf 15.5); though there were four coins of the later 4th century in this area (Fig 27).

A further discussion of Area IV is in MF Section 9.
Figure 28 Areas V–VII
10 Area V The temenos ditch
(Figs 7–9, 21, 28, 29; Pls 15–18; MF Tables 14–16)

10.1 Introduction
Area V, of c 86sq m, comprises the area of the temenos ditch, with two successive crossings. The stratification here was deep (up to 1.2m) and dense in both finds and graves.

10.2 The temenos ditch, V.F30
This was 1.8–3.7m wide, and 0.6–1.2m deep; it was of broad square section depending on natural rock cleavage planes; it was defined for 36.6m to the quarried NE end. The filling at the north end was soil and stones, with deposits of occupation debris. A built causeway (V.380) was defined by removing the ditch fill on the NE side; there was also a possible bridge abutment W.382) north of the causeway and earlier than it.

Photographs (eg Pl 16), and section S4 (Fig 29) demonstrate the irregular nature of the ditch, jagged on the east side, although the west side was smooth in places, due to the character of the rock planes.

10.3 Stratification within V.F30
(excluding V.380 and 382)
Section S4 (Fig 29) (not precisely located) shows the five principal layers at one point across V.F30 (L1–L5, also see MF10.3). At the north end of the ditch, V.L6 was at its base. V.373, towards the northern end, was described as 'lower hearth', probably on V.L5 (a further '?hearth', V.366, was noted south of the causeway, high in the filling). Layer V.L3 occurred widely along V.F30; it overlay V.380 (see below)). Graves 14, 19, 20 and 21 (prefix BUR on the section) are also indicated on this section, probably cut from the top of V.L2.

The 27 graves in the ditch are the densest concentration in the cemetery; they are discussed in Section 13.

10.4 Features V.382 and V.380
(abutment and causeway)

10.4.1 V.382
The abutment V.382, the earlier of these two features, was defined by the removal of V.380. It was
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described as being built against the west face of the ditch, into a slight recess and partly sealed by the NE sloping side of V.380. In plan, it was drawn as a bow-shaped stone mass; V.382.1 and 2, its back and front faces, with a straighter face, V.382.3, to the SW. There was possibly a continuation, V.382.4, to the NE of these (with a possible posthole V.383 in between), but this had either tumbled down or had never been built. The structure comprised unmortared, roughly square, blocks and undressed lumps of stone of varying sizes; there was no Pennant sandstone or 'greenstone'. The work was roughly coursed with uneven joints; five courses survived on the back of the bow-shaped part, V.382.1, a total height of 0.64m to the ditch base. 'Fine grey silt' was recorded in the make-up and packing, probably that of V.382.2. This contained the only finds that can be related to V.382. There was only a minimal deposit between V.382 and the base of the ditch.

10.4.2 V.380, the causeway

The causeway V.380m, found between V.L3 and V.382, was described as being 'constructed of many tons of loose, small to large rock slab and irregularly-shaped lumps, which had been dumped into the ditch, making a roadway 3.7m wide crossing the ditch'. Both edges of the causeway sloped down to its base; the whole was 7.6m from NE to SW, the sides sloping down at c 45°.

The extent of the causeway in plan is uncertain. The lines shown on Fig 28 on either side of the arrow for V.380 are likely to represent rock planes, and do not indicate any part or edge of the causeway (these are described further in MF Table 17.380). It is evident that the causeway was on a massive scale; its sloping sides show that it was piled into a largely empty ditch.

10.5 Finds from Area V

10.5.1 General

Finds in the ditch fill comprise the greatest range of both materials and thematic categories of any area, a high density even allowing for the greater depth of stratification. They yielded pre-3rd century material, including coins, 1st century brooches and the one Dobunnic coin from the site. The coins in general reflect the range of those of the site as a whole. The majority of the brooches from the site were found here.

The distribution of the finds along the length of the ditch is shown in MF Table 16, with a markedly northern concentration (MF 10.5.1); their contexts within the stratification are discussed in the next section.

10.5.2 Context details (MF Table 17)

The lowest layers, including V.L6, contained some 4th century items among the wider range of 1st to 4th century material. V.L6 also contained a sheep jaw.

V.L5 was prolific, again including 4th century as well as earlier material; there was wall plaster comparable with that from Structure 4 (9.3 above), mortar and finds of most categories. WP14 is comparable with WP18 from Structure 4 (9.3 above). The animal bone included sheep, pig and ox, the latter including newborn.

V.L4 yielded a range similar to V.L5, again with wall plaster and mortar. The one coin was of the 4th century (C395, AD310–13); and pottery Fabric A6, absent from V.L5; this is dated to the later 4th century (14.8.3b–4). Once again 1st century material was present, also pre-Roman Iron Age pottery. Animal bone comprised ox, sheep, pig and (probably intrusive) rabbit.

V.L3 had a similar range of finds to V.L5 including ox and pig bones and additionally fish. There were also additional and different pottery fabrics, and coins ranging from AD117–38 to AD337–41.

V.L2 was the most prolific layer in V.F30. Finds included two of the octagonal finger rings, one of which is inscribed and thought to refer to a deity (BZ37 and BZ58; 14.5.4b and Fig 89.38 and 36); coins range from AD98–117 to AD350–3.

Animal bone from V.L2 comprised sheep, pig, ox and fish; and from V.L2/L3 bird, fish, dog, pig, ox and deer.

V.L1 included 25 coins, extending from a Dobunnic issue (cf 14.6.3) to AD364–78; another octagonal finger ring (BZ50; 14.5.4b and Fig 89.37); and a brooch of Moravian origin (BZ62; 14.5.2a–7 and Fig 88.16). There were bones of sheep, pig and hare.

Of the features in V.F30, the ‘fine grey silt’ probably associated with V.382 included 4th century sherds (MF10.5.2). V.380 contained few finds, but these included four coins between AD196–215 to AD330–45 (two), and 2nd–4th century pottery (MF10.5.2).

10.6 Area V, interpretation and discussion

10.6.1 V.F30 as a negative feature

V.F30 was cut through intractable bedrock and must have been costly of labour and resources. The excavated material may have been used for building and/or for making lime mortar; or perhaps as the basis for a bank (cf 8.4 and Fig 23). Such a bank could have been used later to construct the causeway V.380, or perhaps eventually have contributed to the general in-filling of the ditch.

The former extent of the ditch is not certain. To the north, any possible extension had been removed by mining (cf section 12 and Fig 28). To the south, II.353 (the area beyond the ditch, Figs 21 and 28 (cf section 7)) may represent either an entrance causeway across the ditch (left undug) or ‘dead’ ground beyond its southern limit; there was a possible continuation.
of the ditch, VI.410 (Figs 21 and 28), beyond II.353 but this cannot be verified (cf Section 11).

The excavated length extended well to the south of the known buildings to its west. The ditch apparently extended across the slight spur on which the temple complex stood (cf Fig 3). If II.353 was a causeway entrance to the temenos, it would have been much off-centre.

The function of the ditch is more fully discussed after its dating has been considered (cf 10.6.4 below).

10.6.2 Interpretation of V.382 and V.380

If V.382 was the abutment on the west side of the ditch to support one end of a wooden bridge, it lacks, in excavation, a partner on the east side. It cannot be demonstrated that the abutment was an original feature of the construction of the temenos ditch. There was 4th century material probably associated with it (10.5.2).

If the ground around II.353 (at the south end) did not provide the original access into the temenos (cf Section 7), there must have been some other means of crossing V.F30; and the area of V.382, opposite the temples, where there was certainly a later crossing, would appear to have been suitable. The reason for not leaving an unexcavated causeway may have been to allow for drainage or for some more ritual factor (cf 10.6.4 below).

The causeway V.380 was perhaps wider than would have been needed even for wheeled vehicles; this may have been necessary to achieve stability of what was no more than a dump of rubble; or there may have been a ceremonial need for a wider entrance.

The period in which the causeway was in use lay between the earlier abutment and the later burials, Grave 49 and 52, which cut it. The latest coins in V.380 were two of AD330–45, although the context is hardly a sealed one. Taking account of the material later filling the temenos ditch, it is suggested that the causeway was in use with Temple 3i (cf Tables 75 and 76 below).

10.6.3 Material filling V.F30

The circumstances under which the ditch began to fill in the 4th century or later are unknown. Perhaps it was initially well maintained, any weathering of the sides being cleaned out, and there may have been more than one cleaning episode before filling proceeded unchecked. Theoretically, the ditch could have been filled all at once, or gradually; and it could have been filled systematically or haphazardly.

It is argued in detail in the MF text (MF 10.6.3b) that, apart from slight weathering and silting on the base, the contents of the temenos ditch represented in situ stages of filling. These stages were followed by interludes of relative quiescence with features such as the ‘hearth’ (10.3) either representing activity within the ditch or more probably discrete deposits dumped on exposed surfaces.

As layers V.L5–L1 have much in common, the finds from V.L5 have been used in a case-study in the MF text that looks at the possible source of artefacts within the ditch (cf MF Table 14 and MF 10.6.3c–2). There are links, for example, between pottery sherds from the same vessels found in Area V and Area I, and to a lesser extent Areas III and IV. The animal bone from V.L5 – sheep, pig and new-born ox – is similar to that from Area I (6.7.3 and 14.12.4). Many of the objects listed in MF Table 14 were broken. This is not surprising if they were rubbish, but could also have resulted from ritual breakage (cf Henig 1984, Fig 70). The large number of bracelets, rings, pins, beads, pendants and especially of brooches may reflect the character of the cult (cf 14.5.2a–10 and 15.6). Another striking feature of the whole assemblage in the ditch is the presence of so much early material mixed with late, implying the shifting of soil and other associated finds that had accumulated throughout all the temple phases. The temenos ditch thus appears to have provided a disposal area for redundant votive offerings and other religious paraphernalia (cf Section 14).

The changing character of the animal bone assemblage (V.L5, L5a, L4 cf V.L3, L3–L2, L2, L1) may suggest that, within this sequence of discrete layers, there were two broad ‘episodes’, or two dumps from varying sources.

The lowest levels of V.F30 contained 4th century material. The latest coins in its top levels, of AD350–3 in V.L2 and of AD364–78 in V.L1, demonstrate that these layers were deposited in the later 4th century or later. That V.L1 may have been somewhat later than V.L2 is hinted at not only by the time-gap between their latest coins but also by the presence of three other coins later than AD348 in V.L1, whereas the coin of 350–53 in V.L2 is the only one of thirteen dated after AD350 (for a full list see MF Tables 16, 17, and 71).

If this argument is accepted, then the lower layers of the ditch would have been accumulating (taking the known buildings and allowing for use of the causeway) late in life of the use of Temple 3i and perhaps Structure 4. The upper filling is suggested to be contemporary with Temple 3ii (cf Table 76).

In the process of being filled, the temenos ditch was apparently losing any symbolic significance or otherwise changing its function before burial began, that is the advent of burial did not signal this change.

10.6.4 The date and function of the temenos ditch

In the absence of any residues of a bank, there was no sealed level which would date the construction of the ditch. As a temenos boundary (Lewis 1966, 131–2), it separated the temple precinct from the area outside to the east; and together with the break
of slope on other sides (perhaps augmented by fences or other barriers) enclosed the precinct. It could therefore have been a feature of a religious complex throughout the life of the site, beginning in the earlier Roman period or perhaps even in the late Iron Age. In this last context, the possibility of the ditch being defensive, defining the promontory, should not be entirely discounted, even though there is a hillfort in close proximity (cf 15.3).

Its construction could thus have been earlier than that of ?Temple 1 – the difference in orientation of V.F30 and the buildings in Area I may be significant. Or it could have been contemporary with either ?Temple 1 or Temple 2. The direction of the entrances to the temple structures and the ditch crossings should be noted here (see Fig 7), although the difficulties of correlation are apparent from the attempted sequence in Section 15 (also cf 6.6.3b).

**10.6.5 General Comments**

To summarise, the temenos ditch may have originated in the Iron Age and/or in conjunction with the postulated precinct associated with ?Temple 1; an origin as the precinct of Temple 2 is also possible, in the 3rd century. It may have had an internal bank, with an (undug causeway) entrance at the south end, or with constructed crossings further north.

Later, in the 4th century (or later?), the dump causeway V.380 was inserted into the ditch as a crossing point opposite Temple 3i and near Structure 4, and possibly secondary to both (any bank perhaps being demolished at least partly at this time); subsequently the ditch was filled with material derived from within the precinct.

Finally, the deep fill of the ditch was used to bury a number of people, as part of a cemetery extending into the area around it.

A fuller discussion of Area V is in MF Section 10.
Area VI comprised the strip of ground, of 156sq m, to the east of the temenos ditch, bounded to the east by the irregular edge of the modern mining (Fig 28). The southern part was a continuation of Area II; it contained several graves. In the northern part, the upper 0.2m–0.3m of stratification was common to that in Area V. The two graves in this northern part were both anomalous: Grave 41 as it was empty, and Grave 45 because it was an outlier (Section 13). The former may have been emptied during earlier ‘explo- rations’, but cannot be securely correlated with known accounts (cf MF 3.2 and MF13.1). There were four other graves in Area VI. The ‘stone edging’ VI.375 could have been part of the cemetery’s eastern boundary (cf 13.5.1) or merely a mining feature.

VI.410 may represent the resumption of the temenos ditch to the south of II.353, but this cannot be verified (cf 10.6.1). The only other features in Area VI were associated with recent mining.

There were fourteen coins from Area VI, ranging from AD260–68 to two of AD364–78, but concentrate between AD250–90.

Area VI is important in demonstrating that archaeological deposits continued, albeit thinly, to the east of the temenos ditch.
Area VII comprised the ground on the extreme NE of the area excavated, at the northern end of the temenos ditch, extending northwards for 4+ m (Fig 28). This area had been disturbed and truncated by mining. The area is important in showing that Neolithic flints extend this far (MF14.4.2); also that the northern extremity of the temenos ditch lay beyond the excavated area, the equivalent of V.L3 continuing through this area. No graves however were found in Area VII.

The density of coins here is similar to that in Area III; all nine date between AD253–9 and AD270–90. This may imply disuse and lack of frequentation of this area during the 4th century, or it may reflect the source of the material found here.
Figure 30 Plan of cemetery with body positions
13 The cemetery (Fig 30–85, including MF; Tables 20–55, including MF; Pls 20–27)

13.1 Introduction (Fig 30)

Before the excavations at Henley Wood in the 1960s, one grave may have been emptied in the 18th–19th century; and a few graves, probably less than a dozen, were lost in quarrying on the SW side of the site. No graves have been reported since that time (MF13.1). It is thus likely that the major part of the cemetery was excavated.

The background to the class of cemetery to which Henley Wood belongs has been outlined in 4.5 above. Here a descriptive 'fingerprint' of that cemetery is presented. This is based on MF Table 20, which classifies what were considered appropriate data in the early 1980s (cf Clarke 1979 and Chambers 1980); the assumed theoretical background has been widely discussed elsewhere (eg Rahtz, Dickinson and Watts eds 1980 and specifically in relation to similar cemeteries, Rahtz, Hirst and Wright in prep). Likely modes of investigation and types of explanation are suggested, but interpretation remains at an elementary level. Such a description should nevertheless enable comparisons to be made with other cemeteries broadly of this period in the west, especially Lankhills (Clarke 1979), Poundbury (Farwell and Molleson 1993) and Canning-ton (Rahtz, Hirst and Wright in prep).

The burials and graves are described first, then finds in graves and the cemetery's chronology; finally wider aspects of cemetery planning and organisation are considered. The full data on which this commentary is based is contained in MF Section 13, following the order of MF Table 20. Table 24 illustrates the standard pro forma used in the field and Table 25 shows the classes of data contained in MF Table 20. Table 26 provides the key to the statistics shown on Fig 31, and Table 27 similarly for Fig 32. Grave 12 is omitted from this section (except in 13.4.4, radiocarbon determinations) as it is not considered to be part of the cemetery (6.6.2–3 and Fig 10).

13.2 Comments on the classes of information in MF Table 20

13.2.1–2 Area and cutting

See Fig 8.

13.2.3 Grave number

The 1962 graves were numbered 1962/1–15; in some cases this referred only to the skeleton, the grave having a separate feature number (eg 1962/F1). The

Table 24 Grave recording form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HENLEY WOOD, YATTON, SOMERSET, 1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRID SQUARE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single/double grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave depth from surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lining slabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeleton disarticulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeleton face down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position of arms and hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze objects No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other objects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAVE NUMBER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes

(i) Grave 12 omitted throughout as it is not thought to be part of the post-temples cemetery.

(ii) Totals of 70 are obtained by including each skeleton of the double graves separately and 36bis; Grave 41 was empty and therefore cannot provide all categories of data. Totals of 72 include the second bodies in Graves 62/8 and 51, for which certain categories of information are available. The suggested extra bodies from MF Table 34 and HW1687 (MF13.2.10) are omitted because of lack of data.

(iii) 'Type of burial' has been omitted from the pie diagrams, as all are inhumations.

(iv) Except for sexing and grave lining, all qualifications have been omitted on Figs 31 and 32. They can be found on MF Table 20.

(v) ‘U’ throughout = unknown.

1. Part of body present
   A – most or all
   B – substantial part
   C – parts only, articulated
   D – parts only, disarticulated

2. Bone preservation
   A – very good
   B – average
   C – poor

3. Single and double graves
   S – single
   D – Double (NB the two infants in Grave 51 have not been included in double graves as the second body was only identified during post-excavation study – it was not apparent as a double grave during excavation)

4. Articulation
   A – articulated
   D – disarticulated

5. Sexing
   M + ?M – male
   F + ?F + ??F – female
   U includes 8.3% (6) and 12.5% (9) which are unsexable because they are infants and juveniles respectively.

6. Age
   I – infant
   J – juvenile
   Adults:- A.1 – 17–25
   A.2 – 25–35
   A.3 – 35–45
   A.4 – 45+
   A.5 – unaged adults
   \[72.2\%\ (52)\]

1964–9 series were numbered 1-52 (+ double graves 5A, 5B etc; 122; 36 bis), referring to skeleton, grave and grave filling.

13.2.4 Quality of excavated data

This refers to whether the grave was fully excavated or not, and is intended to qualify the reliability of information in the next two columns.

13.2.5 Part of skeleton present; scale of disturbance (Figs 31.1 and MF Figs 33–34)

Fig 31.1 shows that a substantial part of the skeleton was present in 70% of the burials. Most of the burials were relatively undisturbed; there is, however, some evidence of displacement by post-depositional factors (see 13.2.12 below). There is no evidence of burial or reburial after flesh had decayed or after storage or burial elsewhere. Disturbance by later graves is
Figure 31 Cemetery statics – 1 (cf Table 26)

Figure 32 Cemetery statics – 2 (cf Table 27)
### Table 27  Key to cemetery statistics – 2, Fig 32 (cf Table 26)

#### 1. Body position
- S = supine

#### 2. Leg position
- E = extended
  - EU = one leg extended, the other unknown

#### 3. Arm position
- C = chest
  - This comprises:
    - chest (C) 1
    - chest + unknown (CU) 2
    - chest + pelvis (CP) 4

- P = pelvis
  - This comprises:
    - pelvis (P) 9
    - pelvis + unknown (PU) 2
    - pelvis + extended (PE) 3
    - pelvis + right thigh (PRT) 1
    - pelvis + left thigh/pelvis (PLT/P) 1

- W = waist
  - This comprises:
    - waist (W) 9
    - waist + extended (WE) 2
    - waist + chest (WC) 2

- E = extended
  - This comprises:
    - extended (E) 2
    - extended + unknown (EU) 3
    - extended + right thigh (ERT) 1
    - extended + left thigh (ELT) 1
    - extended + thigh (ET) 2
    - extended + extended/right thigh (EE/RT) 1
    - extended + pelvis/left thigh (EP/LT) 1
    - extended/thigh + waist (E/TW) 1
    - thigh (T) 2

#### 4. Skull position
- C = central
  - This comprises:
    - central (C) 16
    - central/half right (C½R) 1

- L + ½L = left + ½ left
  - This comprises:
    - left (L) 8
    - ½ left (½L) 8

- R + ½ = right + ½ right
  - This comprises:
    - right (R) 3
    - ½ right (½R) 4
    - ½ right/right (½RR) 1

#### 5. Grave lining
- CO = continuous lining
  - This comprises:
    - definite (d) 1
    - probably (pr) 9
    - possible (po) 6

  Of these 16, 4 are rock-cut = not tapering (= possible)
  The remaining 12 are non rock-cut:
  4 are tapering (1 definite, 2 probable, 1 possible)
  5 are not tapering (= probable)
  3 are unknown (2 probable, 1 possible)

(cf MF Table 31)
- PA = partial lining
  - This comprises:
    - probable (pr) 1
    - possible (po) 13

  Of these, none is rock-cut
  Non rock-cut:
  3 are tapering (1 probable, 2 possible)
  8 are not tapering (= possible)
  3 are unknown

(cf MF Table 31)
- NVL = no visible lining

#### 6. Grave depths
- I – measured from surface in cms
  - I.1 20–29
  - I.2 30–39
  - I.3 40–49
  - I.4 50–59
  - I.5 60–69

- II – measured below bedrock in cms
  - II.1 20–29
  - II.2 30–39
  - II.3 40–49
  - II.4 50–59
  - II.5 60–69
possible in the cases of Grave 26 (by 122) and Grave 21 (by 20).

MF Figs 33–34 shows the distribution of these data; there is no obvious correlation between this and grave depth (Fig 50).

13.2.6 Bone preservation (Figs 31.2 and MF Figs 35–36)

This is based on photographs, and on observations by Justine Bayley. In 71.4% of the skeletons, preservation was ‘very good’ or ‘average’. No correlation has been observed between this and grave depth (Fig 50) or grave linings (Fig 52); poor preservation was found only in adult skeletons (cf MF Figs 35–36, 50 and Figs 37 and 41).

13.2.7 Type of burial

All burials were inhumations.

13.2.8 Single/double (Fig 31.3)

84.6% of the burials were in single graves; 7.7% were double burials. The latter occurred in the area of the south ambulatory of Temple 3, and in the northern part of the cemetery (Fig 30 and Pls 20, 22, and 26). Those in the temple area represent extreme orientations of burial at Henley Wood. The others share the general orientation of neighbouring graves (cf Figs 54, MF Fig 55 etc). Of the skeletons in these five double burials, four were certainly male, and two probably; one was possibly a female; the remaining three were unknown. The pairs were of two males; male and ?male; male and ??female; male and unknown; and the other unsexed. Ages ranged from juvenile to adult; in four of the double graves, pairs were of similar age, while the fifth comprised a Juvenile and the oldest adult in this group of double graves.

All the skeletons in these double graves were supine, with legs extended; arms and skull positions were varied. Grave depths tended to be similar to their neighbours. Three of the double graves appear to have been at least partly lined, as do their neighbours (Fig 52). Graves 5A and 5B (in the SE corner of the temple ambulatory) were the only graves in the cemetery to have ‘ear-muffs’ and a ‘pillow’ (cf 13.2.14 below).

There are four effective radiocarbon determinations from three double graves (for Graves 62/3, 5A, 5B, and 38B, 13.4.4 below). These fall within the general range of the site series (cf Fig 74).

While all these double interments could have been made at the same time, there is slight reason to think that at least Graves 34A and 34B may have been of different dates, if only by a few days or months.

The two areas in which double graves were found, in the former temple and in the northern part of the temenos (the latter, among mainly lined graves), may have been different from the rest of the cemetery (also cf 13.2.16 below). The double graves in the ambulatory area may have also been distinctive in terms of orientation (cf 13.2.16 below), internal grave features (cf 13.2.14 below), age (cf 13.2.11h below), and possible concentration of male burials (cf 13.2.11h below); the present discussion of their dating cannot however distinguish them from the general site range (cf 6.6.6c and 13.4).

13.2.9 Articulated/disarticulated (cf 13.2.4 and Fig 31.4)

Articulation, or the lack of it, is related to the completeness and degree of disturbance of the skeletons in the graves, the latter covering all stages of post-depositional factors from burial to recent events, including minor disturbance during modern quarrying.

13.2.10 Number of individuals represented

The total number of excavated persons represented is 75 + ?2. This includes the defined graves and also the very few disturbed burials, partly incorporated within the known graves. Most of these ‘extra’ individuals can be accounted for in relation to known burials, and in general there is only slight evidence of either dispersal of bodies or incorporation of earlier burials into later graves (but also see 13.6).

13.2.11 Human biological details

(Figs 31.5–6, 37–47, including MF; MF Tables 28–34), incorporating summary of human bone report by J Bayley (written in 1974), AM Lab, HBMC(E); with comments by LW

13.2.11a Introduction (LW)

The skeletons were not examined in situ, but only some years after the excavation. From the estimated total number of excavated individuals of 75 + ?2, 61 individuals and several other deposits of bone were examined by Justine Bayley. Her full report, with editing and comment, is included in MF13.2.11. Most of the data relevant to the cemetery have been extrapolated into MF Table 20 and incorporated within the discussion below.

13.2.11b Post-excavation methodology

Each skeleton was recorded by pro-forma (MF Table 30); this comprised measurements, the presence or absence of non-metrical variants, pathological changes, and the dentition.
Sex was determined from the morphology of the skeleton; uncertainties are indicated on MF Table 20 (Fig 37). Age at death was determined on the basis of a number of different types of evidence (Fig 41). For juveniles the most accurate indicator is that of teeth eruption (Brothwell 1972a, 59); for immature individuals the evidence used is that of epiphysial fusion (Brothwell 1972a, 60; Lockhart et al 1959, 142–3); and for mature adults the degree of dental wear, based on a scale suggested by Brothwell (1972a, 59).

**13.2.11c Description of the population as a whole**

Using these data, a population summary table can be constructed (MF Table 28 and cf Fig 43). This shows that few adults lived to what would nowadays be considered as old age and the majority died in their 20s or 30s. The low number of infants and juveniles suggests that not all those who died were buried in the cemetery with the adults (cf Fig 44).

The sample size is not sufficiently large for the
13.2.11d Skeletal measurements

The living stature of all the adult individuals was estimated from long bone measurements using the regression equations of Trotter and Gleser (as quoted in Brothwell 1972a, 102). The mean stature for males was not unexpectedly greater than that for females, though there was considerable overlap between the two distributions. Females had statures in the range 149–168cm (4'11"–5'6") and males 162–182cm (5'4"–6").

13.2.11e Skeletal and dental anomalies

The skeletal and dental anomalies are recorded on
Figure 43 Age pyramid

MF Table 29 and the distribution of some of these on Fig 46. These discontinuous morphological traits are thought to be genetically linked and do show considerable differences in frequency between different groups (Brothwell 1972a, 96). While gross differences in frequency can be used to discriminate between two or more populations it is not possible, given the present state of knowledge, to use the occurrence of specific traits as indicators of familial links between individuals within one small group such as this cemetery. It is however worth pointing out that the frequency of lower spinal anomalies (extra vertebrae and altered function) noted here is higher than is often found. Most of these skeletal anomalies would not have been apparent in life and would not have had any effect on the individual concerned.

13.2.11f Pathology and trauma

Pathological and traumatic bone changes were relatively rare. Two individuals (Burials 47 and 48) had well healed fractures of their left clavicles. Burial 62/2 had a pit in the medial condyle of the right femur, probably due to osteochondritis dissecans. Many of the older individuals had slight or medium osteophytes round the joint and on the vertebral bodies, degenerative changes commonly found in mature individuals. Burial 48 also showed far more severe changes in the left hand and wrist with several bones fused together and two cervical vertebrae were also fused.

13.2.11g Dental pathology

Dental pathology is easier to measure than that affecting the rest of the body as the changes produced are usually visibly in the surviving skeleton. The dentition available for study were far from complete, with just under 1300 tooth positions surviving out of a possible maximum of over 2000. 2.2% of the teeth positions had been lost before death and of these 1.6% showed signs of caries. Of the surviving teeth 10.3% show signs of caries. Burial 9 had a large cyst at the front of the palate, just behind the upper incisors.

13.2.11h General comments on human biology (LW)

This section is a commentary on the distribution of the human biological traits, and there are also some comments on the relationship of the biological data to other aspects of the archaeology of the site.

Fig 31.5 shows the proportions of male, female, and unsexed skeletons, and Fig 37 their distribution. The location of male and female graves is not even, but it should be noted that there were more males than females (however cf MF13.2.11c). Some concentrations of the same sex occur as possible rows, and
there were more males than females in the northern part. The large numbers of unsexed skeletons, however, limit any conclusions about sex distribution. One point that may be significant is that of the five definite graves in the temple south ambulatory area, three were male, one possibly male, and the other unknown (cf male skeleton in the annexe of the Brean Down temple, ApSimon 1964–5, 211). There is no visual correlation between sex and either grave depth or grave lining (Fig 37 cf Figs 50 and 52).

Fig 31.6 shows the age make-up of the cemetery, and Figs 39–42 including MF the distribution, in general and in detail. Adults were present in all parts, but there appear to have been concentrations of older adults and infants. Eight of the nine adults in the 35–45+ age group were in a small area at the south end of the temenos ditch and to its west; they were not, however, otherwise related by orientation or rows. There were two small concentrations of infant burials, both on the inner periphery of the graves to the east of the temples (cf MF Fig 39). This may have been due as much to lack of soil depth here as to the presence of boundaries or liminal zones. The orientation of infant Grave 22 is unique (cf 13.2.16).
The total number of infants is, as often, much less than it should be (contrast the high number at Bradley Hill, Leech and Leach 1982, 65). Wherever the rest were buried, it was certainly not within the excavated area.

The juvenile graves were similar to those of the adults although they too seem to be under-represented. They were buried amongst adults, and were well defined; they could be lined and their grave fillings had a similar range of finds. It is possible that the younger component, of the age group 1–9, was less carefully placed in relation to rows and orientation. Three of the five graves in the temple south ambulatory area were of young adults; a fourth was 35 or under (MF Table 2 and Fig 41).

Figs 43 and 44 show that amongst the known population the highest female death rate occurred between the ages of 17–25, followed closely by those of 25–35. The majority of male deaths fell evenly between the ages of 17–35. The life expectancy of men
and women was similar, but a few more men lived longer than women. The average age at death of the adult population was 27.1 for females, and 29.2 for males (JB in MF 13.2.11).

### 13.2.12 Position of body (Figs 32. 1–4, 48 and 49)

There are problems in distinguishing body position as intentionally laid out from that caused by post-depositional factors, such as body movement and the decay of body containers (although there is no definite evidence of the latter).

Rolling of the skull and perhaps slight collapse of arms flexed over the body were the most common post-burial movements at Henley Wood.

In 82.9% (Fig 32.1) – all known cases – the body was supine (contrast Lankhills [Clarke 1979] and Cannington [Rahtz, Hirst and Wright in prep]).

In 71.4% (Fig 32.2), Legs were extended, with a further 4.3% having one leg extended but the other unknown. Legs were straight, with a very few that may have crossed at the ankles.

Arm positions are summarised in Fig 32.3. Flexing across chest, waist, or pelvis, comprise together 51.4% (10%, 18.6%, and 22.8% respectively). Extended arms account for 20%. The variety in arm positions is probably due at least in part to post-depositional factors; but it is also possible that some differences in layout were intentional (cf Rahtz, Hirst and Wright in prep).

Skull positions are shown in Fig 32.4, but as pointed out above, these are not likely to be significant.

### 13.2.13 Material grave cut into

Graves were cut into bedrock, as in the area between the temple and temenos ditch; into the temples; and into the temenos ditch filling. Grave cuts were difficult to recognise, except in the bedrock. The presence or absence of grave lining, and its character, is increasingly seen as an important facet of late Roman and later mortuary behaviour, especially in relation to the western British cemeteries.

The most convincing case of deliberate lining was Grave 13 (Pl 23), where the stones of the lining were clearly distinguishable from the soil surround. Undressed blocks formed a tapering, coffin-shaped interior outline, with separate head and foot stones, which may have been dressed.

A few graves had internal features. Graves 5A and 5B, in the SE corner of the ambulatory of the final temple, had stones associated with the heads (cf Pl 22). Grave 5A had several pieces of ?limestone around the head, reminiscent of ‘ear-muffs’ recognised elsewhere (cf stones at head and shoulders, Leech 1980, 341); and in Grave 5B, the skull appeared to be lying on a ‘pillow’ of pieces of Pennant sandstone. At Barton-on-Humber in a Christian Saxon context, a grass-filled pillow with chalk ear-muffs below was found (cf Rodwel1 and Rodwell 1982, 301), which highlights the possible loss of such organic material at Henley Wood. At Barton, such head features were associated with both coffin and uncoffined burials. Pillows and supports at the sides of the head, as with the fully-developed head-recessed coffins of the Roman and medieval periods, may have been designed to lessen head-rolling, which seems to have been frequent at Henley Wood (cf 13.2.12 above).

The function of grave lining could have been to stabilise the grave sides during the ceremony of interment. The tapering graves, both lined and unlined, could have been intended to simulate coffins, as may the sub-rectangular linings. Partial linings may be likened to ‘token’ coffins (cf the early monastic graves at Bordesley Abbey – Rahtz per comm). Unlike coffins, however, such linings would not have protected the body from the grave fill.

The presence or absence of grave lining, and its character, is increasingly seen as an important facet of late Roman and later mortuary behaviour, especially in relation to the western British cemeteries.

### 13.2.15 Grave filling

It is assumed that the grave fill consisted of the material dug out to make the grave and then put predictably sub-rectangular. A few were tapering, all in Area V, with three together at its south end resembling coffins (Fig 52 and Pls 23, 25).

The depth of graves was recorded as from the surface of the bedrock (Figs 32.6 and 50). There is no obvious correlation between depth and lining or sex, but there is some relationship to possible rows, adjacent graves being dug to similar depths (Fig 50), perhaps because they were constructed through similar material.

Partial or complete Lining in local undressed stone, at the level of the skeleton, was postulated during excavation (cf Pls 20, 21, 23, 24, 27) (see Fig 32.5 for proportions of degrees of lining). They were found in most parts of the cemetery (Fig 52); notable among them are the double graves in the northern part of the cemetery (cf 13.2.8 and 13.2.16).

The most convincing case of deliberate lining was Grave 13 (Pl 23), where the stones of the lining were clearly distinguishable from the soil surround. Undressed blocks formed a tapering, coffin-shaped interior outline, with separate head and foot stones, which may have been dressed.

A few graves had internal features. Graves 5A and 5B, in the SE corner of the ambulatory of the final temple, had stones associated with the heads (cf Pl 22). Grave 5A had several pieces of ?limestone around the head, reminiscent of ‘ear-muffs’ recognised elsewhere (cf stones at head and shoulders, Leech 1980, 341); and in Grave 5B, the skull appeared to be lying on a ‘pillow’ of pieces of Pennant sandstone. At Barton-on-Humber in a Christian Saxon context, a grass-filled pillow with chalk ear-muffs below was found (cf Rodwel1 and Rodwell 1982, 301), which highlights the possible loss of such organic material at Henley Wood. At Barton, such head features were associated with both coffin and uncoffined burials. Pillows and supports at the sides of the head, as with the fully-developed head-recessed coffins of the Roman and medieval periods, may have been designed to lessen head-rolling, which seems to have been frequent at Henley Wood (cf 13.2.12 above).

The function of grave lining could have been to stabilise the grave sides during the ceremony of interment. The tapering graves, both lined and unlined, could have been intended to simulate coffins, as may the sub-rectangular linings. Partial linings may be likened to ‘token’ coffins (cf the early monastic graves at Bordesley Abbey – Rahtz per comm). Unlike coffins, however, such linings would not have protected the body from the grave fill.

The presence or absence of grave lining, and its character, is increasingly seen as an important facet of late Roman and later mortuary behaviour, especially in relation to the western British cemeteries.
SUMMARY OF BODY POSITIONS
(Numerals = grave numbers)
(for qualifications see MF Table 20)
SUMMARY OF BODY POSITIONS (cont)
(Numerals = grave numbers)

Figure 49 Summary of body positions (cont)
back, surplus being mounded or spread around, though there is no evidence of this.

**13.2.16 Orientation (Figs 54–70, including MF; MF Table 38)**

Taking into account various sources of possible error, the orientations shown on Fig 54, of the foot end of the grave, expressed as degrees east of north, have an accuracy of plus or minus c 5°. Fig 54 shows the range of those known (uncertain ones include all but one of the infants). 77.5% of graves lay between 50–120°, within which the largest cluster was between 70–79°.

The data for orientation are principally from adults. It may be noted, however, that the orientation of Infant Grave 22 is unlike that of neighbouring graves (cf 13.2.11h). It may not have been regarded as important to orientate infants, although at
Bradley Hill it was the practice to do so by the later 4th century (Leech and Leach 1982, 75).

The general regularity highlights those graves which lay outside the norm (for their location in the cemetery, see Fig 30). At one extreme, west of south at 230° was the infant (Grave 22) referred to above. The other aberrants were the two double graves within the area of the south ambulatory; Graves 62/2 and 62/3 at 142° and 143° and Graves 5A and 5B at 10° and 12°; the latter may be of special interest for other reasons (cf 6.6.5 and 13.2.8). Grave 6, also in this area, was at 117°, at one end of the main orientation block; the isolated Grave 47 was at 113°, the penultimate grave in this block. These two could well have been merely outliers of the cemetery, but may have been in some way different.

Apart from the extremes of orientation, the plan (Fig 30) suggests two groups of orientation among the main block of graves – a northern one to the east of Temple 3 with feet south of east; and a southern one,
Figure 54 Grave orientation (foot end)
whose orientations were principally to the north of east (for extensive discussion, see MF13.2.16).

A difference between such 'northern' and 'southern' cemeteries may also be hinted at by the uneven distribution of specific traits – of double graves in the 'northern' cemetery (cf 13.2.8), where there were also more males than females (cf 13.2.11 and Fig 37) and of tapering graves (cf 13.2.14) in the 'southern cemetery'.

While the orientation of individual graves may have been affected by the problems of the planes of the bedrock, the orientation in general is clearly deliberate – some graves cut right across bedding planes. Factors controlling this may have included, for the northern part of the cemetery, the orientation of Temple 3 as a building or as a ruined structure (cf 6.6 above); indeed its presence or former presence may have been the reason for the cemetery being located in this spot (cf 6.6.6c and 15.7), so its influence on cemetery orientation would not be unexpected (also cf 13.5.2). The influence of the temple structure on orientation did not, however, extend to the two double graves in the south ambulatory. These are quite diverse, both from each other, from the temple orientation, and from the general pattern of the graves to the east.

The southern part of the cemetery is not so obviously related to the temple area. Its burials may have been aligned on some other structure in line of sight with either the foot or head end of the graves; or in relation to a former southern boundary; or to some more distant reference point such as either of the two 'religious' structures at Cadbury Congersbury, which lie roughly in the direction towards which the feet in the graves of the 'southern cemetery' at Henley Wood were pointing (CADREX 1992, Figs 2 and 159).

Other factors that have been suggested elsewhere to have influenced the alignment of graves are sunrise and sunset (Rahtz 1978). The major block of feet orientations on Fig 54 lies on either side of east. 55 of the graves (that is all except 5 whose orientations are known) lie within the solar arc of sunrise (50–130° east of north). Philip Rahtz comments: There is a bunching north of due east; this contrasts with the similar diagram for Cannington, where there is a bunching south of east (Fig 69 and Rahtz, Hirst and Wright in prep). At the latter site, there is a clear horizon to the east, allowing good observation of sunrise. At Henley Wood, however, it is the western horizon (the coast) which is more easily observed, where sunset could be noted. If the reference point at Henley Wood is reversed, however, so that it is the heads which are being orientated to sunset, as in Fig 70, the patterns for the two sites become more similar in relation to the solstices.
It can thus be argued that the solar arc was influential in establishing grave orientation at Henley Wood even if it was not the exclusive factor. The overall pattern of orientation may help with the concept of two parts of the cemetery, a 'southern' and a 'northern'. Indeed the northern group (feet tending to south of east) are comparable to Cannington, as in Fig 69.'

Whether these suggested influences are correct or not, it remains to consider how orientation was actually established in each case. Each grave may have been individually orientated, for example, or general alignments may instead have been established for each area of the cemetery, perhaps within plots or rows. Discussing Roman surveying, Dilke has pointed out that orientation techniques and terminology were common to both Roman surveyors and augurs, direction being established via the sun at sunrise, midday or sunset. He has also drawn attention to the unintentional discrepancies that could arise from the use of 'as fallible an instrument as a portable sundial' (Dilke 1971, 86; and 56–8). Such knowledge and associations may have been part of the general late and post-Roman milieu in Somerset.

Whatever the full explanation for orientation at Henley Wood and its relationship to grave rows (13.2.11 below), cemetery organisation (cf 13.5.3 below) and perhaps chronology (cf 13.4.5 below), Fig 54 meanwhile illustrates the pattern of the cemetery's orientation, which can be compared with that of other similar sites, to establish similarities or the reverse, whether these can at present be explained or not.

13.3 Finds in grave filling
(Figs 71–72, including MF; MF Tables 39–49)

Artefacts were recorded in the fills of a number of graves. While some at least of these could be
Figure 71 Candidates for gravegoods

gravegoods, especially those near the body, in no case was this certain; some or all could be merely residual, derived from the soil through which the graves were cut or with which they were backfilled.

It is however important to attempt to evaluate the possibility of there being gravegoods in cemeteries of this type, in which they are normally considered to be absent or sparse, by comparison especially with Contemporary Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in areas further to the east. The same problem was encountered at Cannington (though here there are a number of graves with definite grave goods).

Candidates for gravegoods are shown on Fig 71; and tabulated in detail in MF Table 40. A detailed discussion of their location in relation to the skeleton or in the grave fill will be found in MF 13.3.2, together with how the items found match with those which might be predicted (cf MF Table 39).

Julian Richards assessed potential residuality by comparing potential gravegoods with those from
the site as a whole, using computer-assisted statistical procedures (see MF 13.3.3 for details). The only positive conclusions were that coins in graves fell below the expected level, suggesting selective removal by the original grave-diggers; and that the number of animal bones was above the expected level, perhaps because they were added to grave fills.

A final point may be made: that if any of the finds in graves are believed to be gravegoods (such as the four beads from graves – cf 14.5.4e), this is relevant to any discussion of the extent to which Roman artefacts survived to be so deposited in the post-Roman centuries.

13.4 The chronology of the cemetery (Figs 73–79, including MF; Tables 50–52 including MF)

13.4.1 Introduction

The chronology of both the cemetery as a whole and of individual graves is based on:-

(i) the relationship of individual graves to the stratigraphic and structural sequence of the site, including the level from which graves were cut
(ii) finds in grave fills which provide a date after which the grave was dug
(iii) radiocarbon determinations

13.4.2 Chronological data for each area of the cemetery

The data relating to the chronology of the cemetery are presented diagrammatically on Fig 73 and are discussed in detail area by area in MF13.4.2.

Fig 73 shows the date after which each grave was dug, using stratigraphic and artefactual evidence related to the levels through which the graves were cut; and radiocarbon determinations. The stratigraphic dating is in nearly all cases by coins, the issue of which cannot be. The radiocarbon dates, directly derived from body residues, are expressed as a range, calibrated (cal AD) at one and two sigma levels of probability,

13.4.3 Comments on area data (but excluding radiocarbon determinations)

There are few stratigraphic relationships between graves and the temple phases of the site. The graves in the temple south ambulatory area should post-date the date of inception of Temple 3ii (after 367–75; cf Table 52). Those in the temenos ditch should be later than its fills, the upper of which are dated by coins to the later 4th century or later (Table 52). The latest dateable object, from any grave, or indeed from the site as a whole, is from Grave 32 in the temenos ditch (C301, AD388–402). Some or all of the graves should accordingly be of the later 4th century or later; no later date can be provided by any artefact on the site (unlike Cannington, where there are 5th to 7th century finds in graves or associated levels). In particular, there are no post-Roman ceramics imported from the Mediterranean or Gaul, which are numerous at nearby Cadbury Congresbury.

13.4.4 Radiocarbon determinations

Fifteen radiocarbon determinations were made by the Isotope Measurement Laboratory at Harwell (hereafter Harwell or HAR), through the good offices of A Jill Walker. Harwell also provided the calibration to cal AD dates, based on Stuiver and Pearson (1986). Ten of these were measured at standard level, and five at high precision. The results are shown on Fig 74, listed below (Table 50), and mapped on Fig 75, with the range of dates, at one and two sigma levels of probability. One of the standard determinations (HAR-5583) was superseded by a high precision determination (HAR-8758) on the same material; there are thus fourteen effective determinations.

The assays were done on adult human bone (except for the infant from Grave 12), with, as far as possible, material from the same part of the bodies. The selection of the samples was based on problem-oriented, judgement sampling (Fig 75) using the criteria that all areas should be represented, with the full range of age and sex; pivotal graves representative of groups or possible rows, or at the extremes of orientation should be included, as should graves with distinctive characteristics, such as double burial, lining, or distinctive location.

The calibrated range for the standard level determinations extends at one sigma from cal AD255 to cal AD690 and at two sigma from cal AD140 to cal AD765. The high precision calibrated determinations, from restricted areas of the cemetery and to which narrower standard deviations are attached, extend from cal AD345 to cal AD540 at one sigma and from cal AD600 to cal AD600 at two sigma (but see below on the effect of combining three of these determinations). The high precision determination for Grave 12 (cal AD 600–1020 at two sigma) is discounted in this discussion, as this burial is not part of the cemetery; it is stratigraphically related to either ?Temple 1 or Temple 2 (6.6.2–3) and should thus be earlier than the 4th century.

In non-statistical terms, Fig 74 provides a visual impression of the maximum overlap which provides a core of confidence for the floruit of the cemetery. Using the full two sigma range, this extends for the standard level determinations from cal AD440 to cal AD600; and for the high precision determinations from cal AD415 to cal AD450. If only the determinations from the ambulatory of Temple 3 are considered from the latter, the maximum overlap is between cal
## Figure 73 Cemetery chronology (all sources except Antonine pottery)

### Table: Cemetery Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Grave</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>AD Time</th>
<th>HENLEY WOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I TEMPLES (GRAVE 12 OMITTED)</td>
<td>62 2</td>
<td>Post-dates Temple 3</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62 2</td>
<td>Cuts L3</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62 3</td>
<td>Post-dates Temple 3</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuts L3</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C14</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Post-dates Temple 3</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cuts L3</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C14</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Post-dates Temple 3</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C14</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NW sideambulatory wall of Temple 3 still standing</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C14</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III/VI</td>
<td>62 13</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C14</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>&quot;cut into III.350 or 358&quot;</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>&quot;cut into III.350 or 358&quot;</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>C14</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>&quot;cut S1 L&quot;</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>&quot;cut S1 L&quot;</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cuts V31 (and thus F30)</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V TEMENOS DITCH F 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Near F 30</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Path F 30 and cuts V31</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>&quot;cut from V31 or surface L2&quot;</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Path F 30 and cuts V31</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>&quot;cut from V31 or surface L2&quot;</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Path F 30 and cuts V31</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&quot;cut from V31 or surface L2&quot;</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Path F 30</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Path F 30</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C14</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Path F 30</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Path F 30</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Path F 30</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Path F 30</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Path F 30</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Cuts causeway V 380</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Path F 30</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Path F 30</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Path F 30</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>700-75</td>
<td>670-65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- Date after which grave should be less certain.
- L4 = Latest dateable feature.
- Path post-dating cutting of F 26.
- Cuts S1 L = cuts metalling to south of Structure 4.
- C14 calibrated dates of one and two sigma.

(Suiter and Pearson 1986)
Figure 74 Calibrated radiocarbon determinations
Table 50 Radiocarbon determinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grave</th>
<th>Harwell ref (Har-)</th>
<th>Uncalibrated date</th>
<th>Calibrated date (based on Stuiver and Pearson 1986)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Years BP</td>
<td>BP-1950  ± 1 sigma  ± 2 sigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Determinations measured at standard level (1984)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62/3</td>
<td>5588</td>
<td>1630 ± 80</td>
<td>ad320    AD270–535  AD230–600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5589</td>
<td>1430 ± 80</td>
<td>ad520    AD555–665  AD430–760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5B</td>
<td>5583</td>
<td>1350 ± 70</td>
<td>ad600    AD635–690  AD565–790*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5584</td>
<td>1530 ± 70</td>
<td>ad420    AD430–605  AD390–650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5585</td>
<td>1510 ± 70</td>
<td>ad440    AD440–620  AD400–660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5586</td>
<td>1590 ± 90</td>
<td>ad360    AD380–560  AD240–640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38B</td>
<td>5662</td>
<td>1550 ± 70</td>
<td>ad400    AD420–595  AD350–640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5587</td>
<td>1420 ± 80</td>
<td>ad530    AD560–665  AD440–765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5590</td>
<td>1590 ± 80</td>
<td>ad360    AD390–555  AD255–630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>6084</td>
<td>1660 ± 90</td>
<td>ad290    AD255–447  AD140–600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Determinations measured at high precision (1988)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62/13</td>
<td>8760</td>
<td>1650 ± 40</td>
<td>ad300    AD345–425  AD260–450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>8762</td>
<td>1580 ± 40</td>
<td>ad370    AD420–540  AD395–565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>8758</td>
<td>1590 ± 40</td>
<td>ad360    AD415–535  AD385–555*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8759</td>
<td>1550 ± 40</td>
<td>ad400    AD435–535  AD415–600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8761</td>
<td>1190 ± 90</td>
<td>ad760    AD680–970  AD660–1020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NB HAR–8758 is a replicate check measurement for HAR–5583; and HAR–8758 supersedes the earlier determination, being at higher precision. Note that HAR–5583 and HAR–8758 calibrated do not even overlap. The difference between these two C14 determinations highlights the perils that arguments based on individual determinations may encounter.

AD415–cal AD555. David Jordan (AM Lab, December 1989) suggests that three of these dates (HAR-8758, 8759 and 8762) can be combined to give a date of cal AD429–536 at one sigma, or cal AD417–548 at two sigma. The effect of this would be to narrow the range for these ambulatory graves slightly, but still within the range of earlier 5th to mid 6th century.

While the overall range of radiocarbon determinations extend at two sigma over seven centuries, the area of overlap suggests a central period of use of the 5th to 7th centuries, and more probably the 5th to 6th centuries, for the life of the cemetery; a range consistent with the stratigraphic evidence discussed above. The graves in the south ambulatory of the temple appear to be close together in time; in the 5th to mid 6th centuries, There is no other hint in these determinations of chronological movement across the site, such as a time difference between the ‘northern’ and ‘southern’ cemeteries.

13.4.5 General discussion of chronology of cemetery

It is unlikely that interments were made on the site while the temple was a functioning institution in Roman terms (cf Lewis 1966, 6; Henig 1984, 155). While the final phase of Temple 3 was certainly after AD367–75, there is uncertainty about how long it continued in use, and its condition when burial began, sometime probably in the 5th century. There is however clearly discontinuity in function between the end of the use of the temple and the start of the cemetery. The possibility has been outlined above that the graves in the south ambulatory, that is in a temple wholly or partly in ruins, are among the earlier on the site (cf 15.7–8). These can also be related to some extent to the stratigraphic sequence (cf 6.6.6 above).

It is not clear whether burial was continuous or sporadic, although the evidence for cemetery organisation should favour the former. The favoured chronology of the cemetery in relation to the temple sequence is summarised in Table 52.

13.5 Spatial organisation of the cemetery

13.5.1 Boundaries

No definite physical boundaries to the cemetery such as fences, hedges, or ditches, were found, and may never have existed. Gravestones extended to the edge of the excavated area on the east and south sides. On
the east side, graves were mainly confined to the temenos ditch, although this may have been simply a matter of convenience; the ditch probably still showed as a depression, and it would soon have been realised that this area contained deeper, looser material.

The tenuous feature VI.375 (Figs 21 and 28, cf Fig 7) could have marked the eastern boundary (cf Section 11). As there were no graves in the far north of the excavated area, Graves 44, 47, 50 and 51 may have been close to the northern boundary.

In the central area, the traces of an approximately east-west slightly curving feature of undressed limestone blocks (III.355) (Fig 21, cf Fig 7), to the north of Graves 4, 7, and 8 (cf 8.4), were suggested by the excavator to have been part of a cemetery wall; alternatively, it could have been part of the temple complex or a later construction. If it was part of the cemetery layout, it could have provided a barrier across this part of the site, to the north of which graves did not extend,
13.5.2 Physical relationship to the Roman temples

The cemetery was not laid out on a pristine piece of ground; instead the broad units of space had been defined by features of the temple complex, which influenced its layout. This is especially true of the temenos ditch. The depth of material may not have been the only criterion for choosing this area. The temple too, or the ruins of what was left of it, offered deeper soil and stones (cf S1 and S2, Figs 11 and 12), but the only definite burials were in the area of the south ambulatory. This location may in any case have been distinct from the rest of the cemetery (cf 13.2.8, 13.4.5, and 15.7). Graves were sparse for such a large area and the lack of burials in the rest of the temple is striking. It may have still been in use, or sacred, or taboo in some way (especially when Grave 6 was dug); or the area where the temple had been may have been obstructed by heavy rubble (cf 15.7).

The layout of the temple precinct may also have been influential in determining where graves were not put – they are conspicuously absent from the central part of what is interpreted as the former temple precinct, Area III (Section 8; cf Fig 30). There may have been insufficient depth of soil here, or the area may have retained its function as a movement zone. Entrance by way of the bridge and causeway (10.4) had become unnecessary as the temenos ditch was no longer a negative feature, having been filled in, and this approach was actually impeded by Grave 49 (Fig 30, cf Fig 7). Access may have shifted to the north, explaining the gap in the burials between Graves 43 and 52 (Fig 30). An open area for casual meeting or for more formal assembly, or even a market or fair, would be indistinguishable archaeologically from a general route way.

Another explanation however could be that this area housed structures, represented in part by 111.358, 359, 364, and 379 (cf 8.4). If these features

---

**Table 52 Interpretative summary of cemetery chronology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area I, temples</th>
<th>Area V, temenos ditch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selected aspects of general sequence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Selected aspects of general sequence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graves</strong></td>
<td><strong>Graves</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple 3ii – TPQ 367–75</td>
<td>V.F30 filling during C4; ?graves cut post-V.L2, for which TPQ is 350 or post-V.L3, for which TPQ is 337 (cf Fig 73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cf Fig 73)</td>
<td>Internal sequence has not been established nor has precise relationship with graves in Area I.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grave 6 – 7Temple 3ii out of use, but still standing; calibrated C14 (high precision) extends at latest to AD535 at one sigma and AD600 at two sigma (cf Fig 74)

Demolition of at least part of Temple 3ii

Grave 62/3 (+ 62/2); calibrated C14 (standard level) extends at latest to AD535 at one sigma and AD600 at two sigma (cf Fig 74)

Graves 5A and 5B; calibrated C14 (high precision) extend to AD540 and AD535 respectively at one sigma and to AD565 and AD555 respectively at two sigma (cf Fig 74) (NB only HAR-8758 used re Grave 5B). Orientation of these two pairs different
were parts of buildings either of the temple period or of the cemeteries, these would have been a major factor in the layout of the cemetery.

13.5.3 Alignment and rows  
(Figs 80–85, including MF; MF Tables 53–55)

The restricted range of orientation and its apparently orderly spatial distribution within the cemetery (13.2.16) suggest regularity of alignment, as does the almost total lack of intercutting graves (cf Pls 20, 21), despite close spacing of burials in some parts of the cemetery.

The cemetery plan (Fig 30, cf Pl 20) also suggests that orderly alignment is reflected by the presence of approximately parallel rows or lines of graves, side by side rather than head to toe. Because west-east burials at Henley Wood were orientated deliberately, this apparent arrangement in rows could have been
fortuitous. That rows were indeed intentional is suggested by the regular placing of bodies so that heads were roughly in line; in the regular rows suggested in the models below there are no cases of the feet of one grave being level with the waist of another. But although putative lines can be discerned, their precise alignments and constituent graves are in some cases doubtful.

Models of possible row arrangements are illustrated in Figs 80, 82 and 84. Model 1 is centred on the average orientation of all graves, omitting extremes of orientation (cf MF13.2.16; and for details of all models, see MF 13.5.3). It divides the cemetery into a northern and a southern zone, similar to the limits suggested by orientation on MF Figs 61–64 and potentially embraces visually outlying graves, providing the 'best fit' of these models.

The development of a satisfactory row model(s) would provide an important entree into the detailed structure of the cemetery. Rows could then poten-
tially be described in terms of sex, age, grave characteristics and chronology. Such rows are a major feature of aligned west-east cemeteries in late Roman and Migration period cemeteries in Britain and Western Europe (cf Bullough 1983, 183); and in the context of this cemetery, it should be noted that rows are also a prominent aspect of the larger cemetery at Cannington.

13.6 General comments on and discussion of the cemetery

The preceding exposition of the burial data has provided a descriptive and quantitative account of one cemetery, which has enabled its characteristics to be presented graphically (cf Thomas 1981, 234–5). Archaeologically, the cemetery enjoyed two major
advantages over many others – it had not been disturbed by later activity (bulldozer activity was minimal) and it is also estimated to have been fairly complete.

Henley Wood was a small, compact, rural hilltop cemetery in the British west, of extended west-east inhumations that overlay an earlier religious site but was not directly associated with later settlement, either religious or secular (cf Thomas 1981, 235).

It comprised a minimum of 75 individuals (cf 13.2.10), with a suggested maximum in the order of 90. The cemetery was mixed in terms of sex and age, although some elements were under-represented in the excavated population, especially infants, juveniles and, to a lesser extent, women.

Bodies were laid out with care (cf Bullough 1983, 184). They may have been clothed (cf 14.5.2b–4–5), but are more likely simply to have been wrapped. If there were gravegoods, they were of minor items and certainly none was richly accompanied (cf Bullough 1983, 193). Animal bones may have been significant in mortuary ritual (Bullough 1983, 188). Any othergravegoods are indistinguishable from residual Roman material derived from the earlier temples complex.

Bodies were interred, the vast majority singly, in graves that were probably marked (although lacking recognisable marker stones (cf Thomas 1971, Ch 4)), or at least distinguishable from their surrounds, perhaps for a time indicated by grave mounds. Most graves were sub-rectangular pits, but a minority tapered like coffins (whether coffins as such were used cannot be answered with certainty). The rough linings are reminiscent of cist-type graves (cf Thomas 1981, 235).

As well as possible associated buildings (cf 15.7), there are indications of overall planning and control of the cemetery, as manifest in the compactness of burial area, of orientation (focused on east, towards which the feet faced), of row alignments and location of individual graves. There was very little intercutting of graves; this was, in terms of the lack of superimposed graves, a one generation cemetery.

There are also suggestions of two distinct groupings within the cemetery, at present principally defined by orientation and alignment of rows, but further supported by the uneven distribution of double graves, tapering graves, males and the older population. If real, these groups may have coexisted; or they may instead have constituted separate episodes of burial that are not distinguishable on available chronological criteria, The ambulatory graves may have formed a third group.

The broad chronology of the cemetery, based on radiocarbon determinations, centres on the 5th and the 7th centuries, and perhaps more narrowly on the 5th-6th centuries.

There remains the hypothesis that the cemetery is that of the post-Roman inhabitants of the Cadbury Congresbury hillfort, or some of them; the dating for the Henley Wood cemetery is not inconsistent with this view: the floruit of the post-Roman phase of the hillfort was in the 6th century. The association is discussed further in CADREX 1992, 244–47.
14 The finds

14.1 Introduction

Processing and identification of portable finds recovered from all operations at Henley Wood has led to the adoption of a dual, cross-referenced classificatory system. The original generic classification of finds by material has been superseded for the purposes of this report by their presentation in thematic/functional categories. Initially, the excavators, following conventional finds classification systems for Romano-British material, grouped and identified the finds according to materials of origin or manufacture. Every object having been first identified by a unique site-specific number, ie HW1–HW3898, subdivision was then made into material categories listed in numerical sequences, thus: Stone, ST1, ST2, etc, etc (cf 5.2). Listing in these groups has been retained for the archival finds indices (ARC 3; cf MF14.3.2) and for storage of the material (ARC 5). The only major exception to this system of subdivision is the coarse pottery, which is identified by Henley Wood finds numbers alone (eg HW2773).

Subsequent re-examination of all material has resulted in the creation of an archival index card or pro forma record of data relating to each individual item (ARC 3.6). Part of this re-examination has involved the re-classification of material according to thematic/functional categories. The following analysis and presentation of the finds, with reference to a spatial and chronological framework for the site, is made on that basis. Items selected for illustration are integrated into the published account where appropriate, as are the reports of specialist contributors. In some instances the full texts of the latter appear only in microfiche as indicated in the contents list, as does the complete index of finds (cf MF14.3.1–2).

14.2 Thematic classification

Bearing in mind the not infrequent difficulties in precise attribution, either through ambiguity in identification or functional diversity, primary thematic category definition has been relatively broad. Eight major category groups are defined below, subdivided where possible or appropriate. Thus for example items classified under Tools and Weapons should initially subdivide clearly into these two groups, although even here uncertainties and ambiguities of identification justify their combined grouping. A further subdivision of tools may then be possible according to specific functions, eg agricultural, spinning/weaving, wool or leather working, etc. The attribution of a proportion of the material to particular category groups will inevitably be subjective, according to condition, context, or perceived interpretation, but it is intended that at least the broader first level thematic classification will embrace all items.

This system of analysis has not been specifically devised as a comprehensive scheme for Roman/Roman-British artefacts in general, although it is clearly applicable beyond the bounds of Henley Wood. In this instance its application is based upon a scheme originally devised to encompass and order a large body of finds from a comparable and largely contemporary site at West Hill, Uley, Gloucestershire (Woodward & Leach 1993). A separately conceived though very similar scheme has already been adopted at Colchester (Crummy 1983). The methodological and comparative advantages of employing such thematic/functional finds classificatory systems should become more apparent with the publication of both Henley Wood and Uley, and it is hoped that this approach will provide a model for future Romano-British excavation finds reports.

The following eight categories of material are defined to encompass all the Roman/Romano-British finds. Prehistoric, medieval and post-medieval material is dealt with in separate sub-sections.

14.3 Thematic category groups

Personal (cf 14.5)

Items relating to dress, including garments, their fittings and accoutrements, including brooches, buckles, studs, hob nails, etc; similar items of identifiable military character; personal ornaments including pins, rings, amulets, etc; toilet, surgical or pharmaceutical instruments, eg combs, strigils, probes, etc; objects for leisure and recreation, eg gaming counters and boards, toys, etc.

Tools/Weapons (cf 14.6)

Implements and equipment used in productive occupations or transactions, identifiable or otherwise; eg knives, chisels, saws, spades, scythes, hones, weights, spindlewhorls, etc, etc. Often subdivisible as for agriculture/animal husbandry, wood, stone, leather, metal-working, etc, textile manufacture, weights and measures, writing (implements & survivals); and currency.

Weapons, military and civil (hunting, etc), where distinguishable.
**Fittings/Furnishings (cf 14.7)**

Functional or decorative fittings relating to containers, lids, doors, furniture, vehicles, animal harnesses, etc, and their rare survivals. To include handles, studs, sheathing, hinges, locks & keys, clasps, terminals, mounts, etc. Specific attributions within this group may often be difficult, and there will probably be overlaps with other groups.

**Utensils/Household (cf 14.8)**

Containers used in storage, preparation and presentation of food, drinks & liquids, and for lighting, including pottery, wood, leather, stone, metal, etc, and/or any other surviving identifiable parts. Other household implements connected with food, light or heating may inadvertently be assigned to other categories unless specifically identifiable, eg knives, spits, candlesticks, cutlery, fire irons, etc.

**Buildings/Services (cf 14.9)**

Structural components including masonry, floor, wall, and roofing materials, drains, pipes, nails, cleats, staples, etc, and any surviving perishable materials.

**Religious/Votive (cf 14.10)**

Inscriptions, dedications, furnishings, votive offerings, cult objects, coffins and fittings, gravegoods (the last associated with mortuary behaviour).

**Industrial (cf 14.11)**

Waste products associated with manufacturing processes, including glass/metal-working slag, bone-working, pottery manufacture, salt production, etc, or any surviving perishable materials.

**Environmental (cf 14.12)**

Faunal assemblages (animal, snail, etc, and human remains); macro and microscopic plant, insect, etc, samples; soil and mineral samples.

Where a subjective interpretation and classification of certain items has proved impossible it has been necessary to designate a further Miscellaneous category (14.13) for unidentifiable objects or those of indeterminate function.

14.4 Prehistoric (cf MF14.3.1–2)

14.4.1 Introduction

Among the finds from Henley Wood two small groups of material are identifiably prehistoric in origin. As such these are more usefully considered outside the scheme of thematic classification for finds adopted in this report. This treatment may be justified on two counts – because the particular system of thematic ordering devised is less appropriate to material originating prior to the late pre-Roman Iron Age and because of the disassociation of these finds from any recognised stratigraphical phases on the site.

The relevant material comprises two apparently unrelated assemblages of worked flint and pottery. The former probably originated in the late 3rd millennium BC, while the latter should be of later pre-Roman Iron Age manufacture. Neither group can be associated with any identifiable structural or stratigraphical phase of activity on the site, and thus their presence and possible significance requires further consideration (also see 3.2).

14.4.2 Flint, by the late Anne Everton

A small assemblage comprising 24 implements and utilized flakes, 15 waste flakes and cores, and 3 burnt flakes was examined. A subdivision of the material into three groups – A, B and C – was made upon the basis of an apparent correlation between patination, flake size and surface texture. Diagnostic tools in Groups B and C suggest middle-late Neolithic industries, while the differences in patination between the three groups could indicate more than one period of occupation. In the absence of recognisable contemporary structural or stratigraphical associations these flints provide the only evidence of some intermittent and perhaps transitory middle-late Neolithic occupation of the area.

A full text and catalogue of the material is available in MF 14.4.2 and a selection of items from each group are illustrated on Fig 86; Nos 1–5, Group A; Nos 6–11, Group B; Nos 12–18, Group C.

14.4.3 Iron Age pottery

Among the ceramic assemblage collected at Henley Wood a handful of sherd s (less than 20) appear to be of pre-Roman Iron Age manufacture. All are small sherd s of handmade fabrics, predominantly calcite or limestone tempered, and variably fired. One small rim sherd and the general character of the other body sherd s invites comparison with the much larger assemblage from the nearby Cadbury Congresbury hillfort (now see CADREX 1992, 145–7). The lack of structural or stratigraphical associations further limits the inferences which may be made from this pottery, although the subsequent religious character of the site and its proximity to an Iron Age hillfort invites comment. The possible evidence of a pre-Roman native shrine or religious enclosure at Henley Wood is discussed more fully in 6.6.2, 6.7 and Section 15, but the presence of pottery analogous to that from
Figure 86 Flints, Groups A–C 1–18
the hillfort, albeit in very small quantities, may well be explicable in such a context.

None of the Henley Wood pottery is illustrated in this report. The identified sherds are indexed and briefly described in MF14.4.3.

14.5 Personal (cf MF14.3.1–2)

14.51 Introduction

Within this category, group subdivisions are made upon the basis of perceived function. Thus items specific to dress, their fittings and accoutrements are defined in 14.5.2. Dress items of specifically military character merit a further subsection in 14.5.3, but could arguably form a part of a separate category group linking all items of military equipment such as weapons or other fittings. Objects of a more personal nature subdivide into ornaments, some of which could be defined as relating to dress (14.5.4); those specific to the toilet (14.5.5); and those of a recreational character (14.5.6).

Degrees of uncertainty or overlaps between defined sub-groups within the category may sometimes arise, but overall a valid grouping of material for consideration is achieved. The primarily religious function of Henley Wood does however introduce a further dimension into the functional categorisation of its finds assemblage. While items of specifically religious or votive character are rarely identifiable on this site (see 14.10 below), the secondary assumption of such attributes by several categories of material must be seriously considered. This may apply in particular to items within 14.5, whose personal nature enhances their suitability as votive offerings in a religious context. In certain instances this otherwise secondary attribute may at Henley Wood have been the prime one, in so far that certain items could have been produced specifically and primarily for religious purposes (eg rings). Nevertheless all the material is grouped within this category according to its perceived original utilitarian function, and the potential for secondary or alternative use is then considered individually for each sub-group where appropriate.

14.5.2 Personal: dress

14.5.2a The brooches, by Sarnia Butcher

14.5.2a–1 Summary

A total of 33 brooches or brooch fragments were recovered; 7 were of iron (plus one doubtful specimen), 1 was of silver, and the remainder were of copper alloy. Of these, 27 specimens are illustrated and are listed below.

A full description of the brooches will be found in MF14.5.2a, together with a report on the metallurgical analysis of the collection by Justine Bayley (MF14.5.2a–11); where the alloy is named in the following account its description is taken from this report.

14.5.2a–2 Early hinged brooches

Fig 87 No 6 (BZ83) Context: V.17.L3
Plain tapering bow brooch in bronze (sensu stricto) dated to the mid 1st century AD by parallels from SW Britain.

Fig 87 No 7 (BZ77 and BZ84) Contexts: V.17.L1 & V.17.VL3
The upper half of a bronze ‘Maiden Castle’ brooch, datable to the first half of the 1st century AD

Iron brooches probably all of the same general type, which occurs in SW Britain in the 1st century AD.

14.5.2a–3 T-shaped brooches

A group distinguished by M R Hull in his unpublished corpus to include a varied collection of types, all inter-related, which can be seen as the regional development of the ‘Colchester’ brooch.

Fig 87 No 8 (BZ85) Context: III.15.350
Tapering bow with grooved sides and vestigial crest on the flat head panel; the pin hinged in a narrow tube.

Fig 87 No 9 (BZ70) Context: V.18.373
Plain tapering bow, hinged pin.

Both these brooches are of leaded bronze and show many features which recur in other south western brooches (cf the collection from Nornour, Hull 1968), yet no close parallels can be quoted. On typological grounds they are probably to be dated to the late 1st or 1st half of the 2nd century AD.

Three brooches which belong to a group occurring mainly in SW Britain; details vary but the distinctive common features are their large size, a cast headloop, a highly arched profile and a harp-shaped catchplate. Most considerations point to a date in the later 2nd century but this is not proved. Nos 10 and 12 are of leaded bronze, No 11 of leaded gunmetal.

14.5.2a–4 Headstud brooch

Fig 88 No 13 (BZ31) Context: V.13.377
A sub-group of this common type with diagonal cross on the head seems to be confined to SW Britain (cf Hull 1968, 40–2). It probably dates from the 2nd rather than the 1st century AD. Leadend gunmetal, enamelled.

14.5.2a–5 Trumpet brooch

Fig 88 No 14 (BZ38) Context: III/V.14.4.Grave 39/F30
The head only of a large brooch with spring in a ‘box’ behind the plate; such brooches usually belong to the 2nd-century development of the type. Leadend bronze.
Figure 87 Brooches 1–10
Figure 88 Brooches 11–22a
14.5.2a–6 Knee brooch

Fig 88 No 15 (BZ69) Context: ?III/17.350
Part of a small knee brooch with facetted foot. Although knee brooches are well-known on the German limes where they are regarded as ‘soldiers’ brooches’ (cf Bohme 1972, 20), this version may be of British origin. The date is probably Antonine (cf Camelon, Maxfield forthcoming). Leaded bronze.

14.5.2a–7 Sheath-footed brooch

Fig 88 No 16 (BZ62) Context: V.18.L1
A most unusual silver brooch which combines P-shaped-profile, facetted foot and sheathed catch, which are all features of brooches of the later imperial period in the west, with a one-piece construction for the spring: a 1st-century feature in Britain. There are numerous parallels from eastern Europe (Peskar 1972, 122–5) and it appears to originate in Moravia, where the type is dated from the last quarter of the 3rd century to the end of the 4th.

14.5.2a–8 Plate brooches

Fig 88 No 17 (BZ53) Context: IV.7/IV.19.19.L1
Flat brooch in the shape of an eagle with folded wings, in the attitude of tearing at some prey held between its feet, although this is not shown. The wing and eye are enamelled. There are several close parallels for the plate, all from Britain. None is dated by context but the enamel technique is commonest in the 2nd century. Leaded gunmetal/brass.

Fig 88 No 18 (BZ72) Context: III/IV. 21.350
Disc brooch with applied repoussé plate. Apart from a beaded border, no details of the decoration are preserved. Several types have been found in Britain, notably those which show a Hadratomic coin-type (Woodchild 1941), quite often from religious sites. The date is likely to be 2nd century. Leaded bronze.

Fig 88 No 19 (BZ49) Context. V.18.L1
Disc brooch with enamel in concentric rings. Similar brooches from Britain and the continent usually have millefiori decoration; the date is probably 2nd or early 3rd century. Leaded bronze/gunmetal.

Fig 88 No 20 (BZ36) Context: VI.13/14.1.L1
‘Tutulus’-shaped disc brooch. There are parallels from Augst, Zugmantel and Kerben, most having glass or enamel decoration (Riha 1979 Nos 1591–3, Bohme 1972 No 967, Exner 1938, Pl III 60); some of these were found with pottery of the later 2nd and early 3rd centuries. Leaded gunmetal/brass.

Fig 88 Nos 21 & 22 (BZ1 and BZ4) Contexts: I.2.L1; & II/III/VI.L1
Disc brooches which probably both had conical glass central settings originally, although only the collar now survives. The oval and circular ones are similar in most respects and seem to be a British type. They are usually found in late contexts, the earliest being Fishbourne (Cunliffe 1971, 106 No 7, from a late 3rd or early 4th-century robber trench) and Zugmantel (Bohme 1972, 43 No 1132, presumed to antedate the end of the occupation c AD290).
A number of them come from religious sites, eg Lewesbury, Uley, Hockwold, Carrawburgh, Cold Kitchen Hill, Nettleton, Springhead, Farley Heath, Thistleton and probably Nornour. No 21 is a gunmetal and No 22 a leaded gunmetal, the method of gilding also differs (see MF14.5.2a–11).

Fig 88 No 22a (BZ61) Context: V.18.L1
A plain brooch in the shape of a swastika. Justine Bayley comments that the debased silver alloy of which it is made is not usually found in modern objects (which this otherwise resembles) and that the use of a soft solder is another indication of antiquity (see MF14.5.2a–11). The swastika does appear on Roman brooches: several are known from Britain, the Rhineland and from Dura Europos (Frisch and Toll 1949, 64).

14.5.2a–9 Penannular brooches, with a contribution by Elizabeth Fowler

Fig 89 Nos 23, 24 & 25 (BZ15; BZ45; and BZ71) Contexts: I.4.F18; V.17.L1; V.18.373.
Small penannular brooches with the terminals reflexed over the ring. They occur on sites of the first half of the 1st century AD (eg Hod Hill, Brailsford 1962, E11, E16 and E17) but are also found in later contexts. No 24 is copper alloy, the others are gunmetal.

Fig 89 No 26 (BZ54) Context: V.17.L2
Corroded, not dateable. Bronze/gunmetal.

Fig 89 No 27 (BZ33) Context: V.14.F30, w/s
Elizabeth Fowler has contributed the following note (and a full discussion in MF14.5.2a–9).

Bronze penannular brooch with engraved pin, pinpoint, hoop and animal-like head. Condition good. This belongs to Fowler Type E, small zoomorphic (Fowler 1963, 99–103) No close parallels exist for the brooch but it shares certain similarities (the engraved pinpoint, the ribbing on the hoop and the animal-like heads) with brooches from sites as far apart as Traprain Law in Scotland and Minchin Hole in Wales. Other brooches from sites in Gloucestershire, Oxfordshire and Berkshire suggest an area of production of Type E brooches looking forward to the large Type F brooch best represented in Ireland. Close dating is not possible because of the lack of good associations for any of these brooches but what evidence there is may point to a 2nd or 3rd-century date for some of them.

14.5.2a–10 General comments

As with most collections of brooches from Roman Britain the majority of these date from the 1st and 2nd centuries AD, when the wearing of brooches seems to have been the general custom. Most of the bow brooches originate in SW Britain although there is one (BZ62) which probably comes from the barbarian areas beyond the Roman frontier in eastern Europe. The plate brooches are also nearly all of British types but of less local origin. In the present context their use as votives has to be considered. Brooches have been found in votive deposits elsewhere and are usually abundant on temple sites. Although most of the brooches from Henley Wood were found in the temenos ditch (cf 10.5 and MF Fig 120), this may well be the result of systematic clearance of votive foci surrounding the temple (cf 10.6.3).

Parallels from other religious sites are amongst those quoted in MF14.5.2a; these are more numerous for the plate brooches. The swastika (BZ61) and the eagle (BZ53) are both well-known with a central setting. BZ1 and BZ4 seem to be particularly frequently associated with religious sites.

All these types however also occur in secular contexts and it seems most likely that the Henley Wood brooches arrived on the site as the personal possessions of individuals who felt that they were appropriate gifts. There is no suggestion that they were manufactured nearby simply as votives since
Figure 89 Penannular brooches 23–27, miscellaneous items of personal dress 28–34, bracelet 35, and finger rings 36–46
the range of types present is quite typical for any Romano-British site.

14.5.2b Miscellaneous items of personal dress

14.5.2b–1 Iron buckles

Fig 89 No 28 (IR100) *Context: V.19.L1–L2*

?Belt buckle, plain oval, rectangular cross-section.

One other in badly corroded fragments (IR6); *Context: III.B.Grave 11; (not illustrated).*

14.5.2b–2 Bronze hook

Fig 89 No 29 (BZ24) *Context: V.C.L3*

?Clothing hook of coiled bronze wire.

14.5.2b–3 Bronze stud

Fig 89 No 30 (BZ25) *Context: V.D.L2*

Button or stud from a belt or apron. This piece could be of military origin *(cf Colchester, Crummy 1983 Nos 4174, 4204–5, 4207–8)* and could alternatively be catalogued under 14.5.3.

14.5.2b–4 Iron hobnails

Fig 89 No 31 a–c (IR39) *Context: III/VI.B.Grave 17*

Further examples (not illustrated) are fully listed in MF14.3.1. In Romano-British contexts hobnails may be components of either shoes or sandals. No *in situ* evidence for footwear was recovered at Henley Wood although the presence of hobnails in Graves 2, 13 and 17 might point to shoes or sandals accompanying some burials. Overall the sparsity of hobnails from the site probably represents only their casual loss during wear.

14.5.2b–5 Iron boot protectors

Fig 89 Nos 32 and 33 (IR36 & 93) *Contexts: V.C.Graves 20/21, u/s; and V.17.L2*

Further examples (not illustrated) are listed fully in MF14.3.1. As with hobnails (above), boot protectors are indicative of leather footwear, presumably occurring as a result of casual loss in wear. Two examples in association with Graves 20 and 21 may once again be a clue to footwear within some graves.

14.5.3 Personal: military dress,

with a contribution by Martin Henig

Apart from a bronze stud (No 30 above) the only unequivocally military dress item was part of a silvered bronze mount. Whether this represents casual loss by a visitor to the Henley Wood shrine or a votive is impossible to determine.

Martin Henig provides the following note:

Fig 89 No 34 (BZ80) *Context: V.17.L3*

Part of a silvered bronze mount with opposed pelta-like features, a notch in the centre of the pelta, and the stub of a stud or rivet behind. Military, 1st century AD. For a similar example from Cirencester, see Webster 1982, 111–12, Fig 37, No 108.

14.5.4 Personal: ornaments

14.5.4a Bracelets

Portions of six bracelets or armlets were identified, one of shale and the remainder of copper alloy.

Fig 89 No 35 (BZ64) *Context: V.18.L3*

Part of a three-strand twisted wire bracelet with one terminal hook

This example and the remaining fragments (not illustrated) are listed fully in MF14.3.1. All appear to represent types of common occurrence on Romano-British sites, the bronze examples broadly dateable to the 3rd or 4th centuries AD *(cf Colchester, Crummy 1983, 36–4.5; Winchester, Clarke 1979, 301–11).* The quantity and condition of these fragments do not suggest any deliberate deposition of bracelets on this site in either a votive or funerary context.

14.5.4b Finger rings,

by Martin Henig

With one exception, all twelve finger rings examined were of copper alloy and are illustrated below. Further details are given in MF14.5.4b.

Fig 89 No. 36, Pl 34 (BZ58) *Context: V.18.L2*

Inscribed octagonal copper alloy ring; the inscription occupying the exterior facets, *viz IS/O/N/V/N/X/iiii*.

similar rings from Roman Britain at Oswlebury (two rings inscribed C/N/V/X/I/O/I/S and I/O/V/X/S/I/iiii respectively), and one at Caistor St Edmund *(I/X/S/A/O/P/O/C/O/iiii).*

R P Wright suggests that such rings were produced and sold at the Romano-Celtic temple site at Henley Wood, Yatton, and indicate the name of the local deity *(Wright 1970a, 311, No. 28; Wright 1970b, 257–9; Wright and Hassall, 1971, 300, No. 64).*

While the name of the deity here is obscure, the occurrence of rings as votive gifts and as charms bestowing the protection of a deity, is a frequent phenomena *(Hassall 1980, 84–6)*. An octagonal silver ring from Kongen near Esslingen, West Germany, is inscribed I/O/V/I/O/P/T1/M *(‘Tovi Optimio’)* *(Henkel 1913, 44 and P1 XVI No 310).*

Fig 89 No. 37 (BZ50) *Context: V.18.L1*

Octagonal copper alloy ring, the exterior, facets ornamented with double transverse lines and cross-hatching at each angle of the facet. For the type in Britain see Atkinson 1916, 40 No. 5, Pl XI. 5.

In the Rhineland *(cf Henkel 1913 71–2 and P1 XXVII Nos 651–68).*

Fig 89 No. 38 (BZ37) *Context: V.17.L2*

Octagonal copper alloy ring, exterior facets plain. It possible that both Nos 37 and 38 were intended to be inscribed as No 36. Certainly their presence at Henley Wood adds weight to Wright’s interesting suggestion above.

Fig 89 No. 39 (BZ8) *Context: 1.4.L6*

Thin copper alloy ring with an open hoop and nicked ornamentation around the hoop edges.

Fig 89 No 40 (BZ9) *Context: 1.4.7204*

Part of a copper alloy ring, flattened hoop largely missing,
projecting shoulders and a circular bezel setting containing traces of enamel.

**Fig 89 No. 41 (BZ10) Context: I.5 Ext. E.L11**
Incomplete copper alloy ring; flattened hoop expanding to and oval bezel setting containing traces of decayed enamel.

**Fig 89 No. 42 (BZ12) Context: I.6 Ext. E.L11**
Part of a copper alloy ring; thin flattened hoop, largely missing. Circular containing a convex pale green glass setting.

**Fig 89 No. 43 (BZ23) Context: V.C.F.31**
Thin copper alloy ring with a bent and broken hoop, expanding to an almond-shaped bezel impressed with a palm frond device.

**Fig 89 No. 44 (BZ30) Context: III.C.L1**
Part of a copper alloy ring with an incomplete flattened hoop expanding to an oval bezel setting.

**Fig 89 No. 45 (BZ58) Context: V.18.L3**
Incomplete copper alloy ring ring with a thin broken hoop and triangular shoulder. The oval bezel contains a pale green glass setting ornamented with three projecting bosses. Not illustrated (BZ17) Context: II/II.A.u/s
Small, plain, flattened hoop fragment of a copper alloy ring.

The three octagonal rings provide some of the clearest evidence for votive deposition. The most likely date of manufacture for all these rings seems to be within the 3rd century AD. This would appear to relate them to Temple 2 rather than Temple 3. The suggestion by Wright (1970a, 311–12) that such rings were produced and sold at Henley Wood, and indicate the name of local deity (obscure in this instance) may be supported by their find spot in the northern end of the *temenos* ditch. The other rings are however scattered more widely across the site (MF Fig 116). The latter are all trinkets such as might be found on any site with a largely ‘artisan’ and ‘lower class’ clientele. Copper alloy rings were cheap, and when ornamented with enamel or set with glass (sometimes in the form of imitation intaglios and cameos) they could even appear to be stylish. Perhaps, like the octagonal rings, such objects could be purchased from booths or shops near the temple and thus assume votive significance.

The disadvantage of copper alloy is that it corrodes fairly quickly when worn and stains the fingers, rendering it unattractive, even as dress jewellery, to those who could afford rings of more precious metal.

**14.5.4c Miscellaneous rings**

**Fig 89 No. 46 (BZ46) Context: V.17.L1**
Ring of three-strand twisted copper alloy wire cut at both ends. Part of a bracelet cut down to form a finger ring. Not illustrated (BZ28) Context: V.D.L3–L4
Small plain copper alloy ring, ?chain attachment.

**14.5.4d Pins**

A total of 28 complete or fragmentary pins were recovered, 2 of jet, 14 of copper alloy and 12 of bone. The full catalogue is given in MF14.3.1, of which the following are a selection.

**Fig 90 No. 47 (J2) Context: V.18.L2**
Damaged jet pin in two pieces, with facetted cuboid head (Crummy Type 2, Crummy 1983, 27.450).

**Fig 90 No. 48 (BZ5) Context: I.5 Ext. E.L1**
Complete copper alloy pin; globular head incised with close-set radiating lines, and closed-set radiating lines spiralling part way down the shaft (Crummy 1983, 30, 499).

**Fig 90 No. 49 (BZ6) Context: I.5 Ext. E.L1**
Silvered copper alloy pin in two parts, tip missing; with a spatulate head above a twisted neck.

**Fig 90 No. 50 (BZ14) Context: I.3.L10**
Part of a copper alloy pin, shaft tip missing, with a flat spherical head (Crummy 1983, 29. Type 3).

**Fig 90 No. 51 (BZ16) Context: I.3a 4/5.L5**
Complete copper alloy pin, shaft bent, plain round head (Crummy 1983, 29. Type 3).

**Fig 90 No. 52 (BZ47) Context: V.14.L2**
Complete copper alloy pin, wedge-shape spatulate terminal – possibly a toilet instrument.

**Fig 90 No. 53 (BZ55) Context: V.17.L3**
Part of a ?silvered copper alloy pin with a plain rounded head (Crummy 1983, 29. Type 3).

**Fig 90 No. 54 (BZ63) Context: V.18.L3**
Complete copper alloy pin with a pale green glass setting in a rectangular flanged head (Brodribb, Hands & Walker 1973, Fig 55.204).

**Fig 90 No. 55 (BZ74) Context: V.18.L4**
Part of a copper alloy pin with a globular head incised with radiating lines, and incised around the upper shaft (Crummy 1983, 30, 499. Miscellaneous Type).

**Fig 90 No. 56 (CB10) Context: I.3a 3/4.L8**
Complete carved bone pin; conical head decorated with raised lozenges, above a single reel (Crummy 1979, 162. Type 5).

**Fig 90 No. 57 (CB22) Context: III.16.L1–L2**
Complete carved bone pin bead separating two reels (Crummy 1979, 162. Type 6).

**Fig 90 No. 58 (CB29) Context: III/IV.21.350**
Complete carved bone pin with a plain conical head (Crummy 1979,159. Type 1).

**Fig 90 No. 59 (CB43) Context: III/IV.16.21.350**
Complete carved bone pint with a plan globular head (Crummy 1979, 161;Type 3). The association of such pin types with some Romano-British burial elsewhere (eg Colchester, Winchester or York) provides the best indication of their predominant function as hairpins (Crummy 1983, 19). Their use for other purposes, such as dress pins, is also possible, although no such direct evidence was recorded at Henley Wood. No particularly significant distribution pattern of recovery was apparent (MF Fig 116) and their presence is most likely the result of casual loss rather than deliberate votive or funerary deposition (but cf 15.6). The contexts of the Henley Wood assemblage are mostly 4th century or later and this dating is supported from sites elsewhere, eg Crummy Type 2 (jet), late 3rd–4th century; Crummy Type 3 (copper alloy and bone), post-AD200. Crummy Types 5 and 6 (bone) 3rd–4th century (Crummy 1983, 19–30).

**14.5.4e Glass beads, by the late Dorothy Charlesworth**

The following identifications of Romano-British types are based upon notes by the late Dorothy Charlesworth. The complete list of beads in MF14.3.1–2 includes further specimens which are not illustrated. All will originally have been components of necklaces or armlets, and most probably represent casual loss (cf MF13.3.4).

**Fig 90 No. 60 (GL2) Context: III.B.Grave 8**

The full catalogue is given in MF14.3.1, of which the following are a selection.
Figure 90 Pins 47–59, glass beads 60–64, miscellaneous ornaments 65–66, and personal instruments 67–70
Short cylindrical bead of translucent blue glass. 3rd–4th century AD.

**Not illustrated** (GL4) Context: I.4.L5
Fragment of a small spherical bead of pale green translucent glass.

**Fig 90 No 61** (GL11) Context: III/V/VI.C.L2
Flattened short cylindrical bead of opaque dark green glass. 3rd–4th century AD.

**Fig 90 No 62** (GL12) Context: V.C.L3
Long cylindrical bead, rectangular section, of banded dark green-blue opaque glass. Not closely dateable.

**Fig 90 No 63** (GL13) Context: VI.B.Grave 26
Standard spherical or barrel bead of translucent pale yellow-brown glass enclosing gold foil. Late 3rd–4th century AD.

**Fig 90 No 63a** (GL21) Context: V.14.L2
Spherical bead of translucent pale green glass, not closely dateable.

**Fig 90 No 63b** (GL22) Context: V.14.L2
Double segmented bead of translucent pale green glass. 3rd–4th century AD.

**Fig 90 No 63c** (GL24) Context: V.13. Grave 34
Cylindrical, short flattened bead of opaque dark green glass. 3rd–4th century AD.

**Fig 90 No 64** (MISCL) Context: V.10/13 Grave 30
Gadrooned melon bead, of a turquoise frit with a decayed off-white surface. 1st–2nd century AD.

**14.5.4f Miscellaneous ornaments**

**Fig 90 No 65** (BZ35) Context: III. Ba12/15.L1
Part of a small zoomorphic copper alloy terminal, possibly from a large pin or armlet, representing a bird’s head.

**Fig 90 No 66** (L8a) Context: V.18.L1
Small triangular cut of sheet lead, one arm pierced for suspension as a pendant.

**14.5.5 Personal: recreational**

**14.5.6 Personal: recreational**

**14.6 Tools and weapons**

**14.6.1 Introduction**
Figure 91  Gaming counters 71–82, and stone implements 83–91
specific activities and pursuits of a commercial, industrial and agricultural nature. By no means can all the items be assigned exclusively however; some may have been employed in a variety of ways, while the exact purpose of others is frankly obscure. Even the distinction between a tool and a weapon may not always be readily apparent. Given the predominately religious status of Henley Wood, overtones of secondary function may also be implied in the presence of certain items on the site.

Given these uncertainties it seems most appropriate to group this fairly broad range of material together, sub-dividing only according to the most obviously perceived functional categories. The likely applications of particular groups of implements are then considered briefly under each heading, and in particular any potential religious or votive connotation. Coinage from the site is also considered here, the subject of a separate sub-section (14.6.3), but a category of material whose potential for secondary adaption for votive purposes on a religious site is one of the most obvious (cf Lewis 1966, 47).

14.6.2 Implements

14.6.2a Hones and whetstones

The presence of hones and whetstones at Henley Wood implies the sharpening of implements in active use on the site. These will have been predominantly knives and other bladed tools, several of which were recovered and are presented under further sub-headings.

Fig 91 No 83 (ST3) Context: I.6.L3  
Small cylindrical, fine-grained sandstone hone fragment.

Fig 91 No 84 (ST4) Context: I.5.L5  
End segment of a large tabular, ferruginous sandstone hone.

Fig 91 No 85 (ST10) Context: I.4.L6  
End segment of a cylindrical, micaceous sandstone hone.

Fig 91 No 86 (ST23) Context: III.11.L2  
Part of a small cylindrical, fine-grained sandstone hone.

Fig 91 No 87 (ST30) Context: III.10/11/12.357  
Large complete tabular hone or whetstone of calcareous sandstone.

Fig 91 No 88 (ST31) Context: III.10/11/12.357  
Complete tabular hone or whetstone of calcareous sandstone.

Fig 91 No 89 (ST36) Context: V.D.L2–L3  
Small irregular hone or whetstone of fine, hard micaceous sandstone, one end missing.

Fig 91 No 90 (ST38) Context: III.12.350  
Segment of a small sub-rectangular, fine-grained sandstone hone.

Fig 91 No 91 (ST55) Context: V.18.L5  
Two pieces of a complete, subrectangular hone or whetstone of ferruginous sandstone.

14.6.2b Quernstones

Portions of at least five rotary quernstones were recognised and recovered in the excavations, one complete topstone, parts of two others and two fragments of different bottom stones. Their presence on the site is difficult to account for as a reflection of their original function, although this should not be entirely ruled out and may indeed reflect the servicing requirements of a successful religious complex. The discovery of the complete top stone (ST68, No 96), used as a component of Structure IV (cf 9.3), gives one clue to their possible reuse at Henley Wood as building stones. All were apparently made of stone obtained relatively locally, and could have been brought from a local Romano-British domestic site. With the exception of one piece all are illustrated here, a complete catalogue appearing in MF14.3.1.

Fig 92 No 92 (ST7) Context: I.3.L2  
Segment of an upper quernstone in a coarse Triassic pink sandstone conglomerate; diameter c 0.36m.

Fig 92 No 93 (ST11) Context: I.4.F18  
Fragment of a lower quernstone in coarse Triassic pink sandstone conglomerate; diameter uncertain.

Fig 92 No 94 (ST27) Context: III.C.350  
Damaged half of a lower quernstone in close-grained pink crystalline sandstone; diameter c 0.43m.

Fig 92 No 95 (ST28) Context: III.10/11/12.357  
Segment of an upper quernstone in coarse Triassic pink sandstone conglomerate; diameter c 0.44m.

Fig 92 No 96 (ST68) Context: IV.22/384.1  
Complete upper quernstone in medium-grained pink-grey Devonian or Carboniferous Pennant grit; diameter c 0.38m.

14.6.2c Stone mauls

The recovery of two stone mauls or pounders from the site is most likely to reflect the on-site dressing of local building stone, employed in the construction of the temples and other buildings at Henley Wood. Both were characteristically worn and finely pitted from heavy use, and are listed and illustrated below (cf MF14.3.1–2).

Fig 92 No 97 (ST50) Context: V.18/20.L2  
Large, sub-rectangular pebble or block of fine pink ferruginous sandstone with recesses to facilitate holding in use; the heaviest wear concentrated at each end.

Fig 92 No 98 (ST61) Context: III/IV.21.350  
Well rounded, roughly spherical pebble or block of pink quartz; heavy wear on most surfaces.

14.6.2d Spindlewhorls

For an ostensibly non-domestic site, the quantity of spindlewhorls recovered may seem somewhat surprising. With one exception in shale, all the remaining twelve were adapted from potsherds of varying fabric, pierced and shaped for use. No obvious alternative function than that for which they were originally conceived, religious or otherwise, suggests itself; they may represent casual loss during use by visitors to Henley Wood or reflect ancillary activities within the temenos.

A representative selection are illustrated here, the full catalogue appearing in MF14.3.1.

Fig 93 No 99 (SHA1) Context: I.5.F15
Figure 92 Quernstones 92–96, and stone mauls 97–98
Complete, turned Kimmeridge shale spindlewhorl; diameter 38 mm.

**Fig 93 No 100 (POT397) Context: I.4.303**
Complete pottery spindlewhorl, reutilised A1 fabric potsherd; diameter 34 mm.

**Fig 93 No 101 (POT393 & POT446) Context: I.4.L10 and I.4.F18**
Complete pottery spindlewhorl in two pieces, reutilised A2 fabric potsherd; diameter 40 mm.

**Fig 93 No 102 (POT615) Context: I.5 Ext E.L11**
Damaged pottery spindlewhorl in two pieces, reutilised E2 samian fabric potsherd; diameter 28 mm.

**Fig 93 No 103 (POT617) Context: I.5 Ext E.L11**
Half of a small pottery spindlewhorl, reutilised A1 fabric potsherd; diameter c 30 mm.

**Fig 93 No 104 (MISC2) Context: V.18.L1**
Complete pottery spindlewhorl, reutilised A1 fabric potsherd; diameter c 35 mm.

**Fig 93 No 105 (MISC5) Context: V.18.F30, u/s**
Large damaged pottery spindlewhorl, reutilised B1 fabric potsherd; diameter c 48 mm.

14.6.2e Stylus

Of the ten stylus identified on this site, all but one copper alloy example were of iron. Stylus were writing instruments, the pointed end used to inscribe a softer medium such as wax or lead, while the blunt end could be employed as an eraser. No such inscribed sheets or tablets are known from Henley Wood, but the presence of stylus almost certainly reflect an important aspect of religious and ritual activity on the site. The inscribing of invocations or curses addressed by supplicants to the local deities worshipped at the temple probably accounts for this particular assemblage. Other groups of stylus at temple sites in Britain, notably in this region at Nettleton or West Hill, Uley, doubtless have a similar significance. Their employment was most probably in the hands of professional scribes or the temple priesthood rather than the supplicants themselves, and might imply the former as residents on the site while the temple at Henley Wood was in regular use (Henig 1984, 142–5). The following examples are illustrated, with the full catalogue appearing in MF14.3.1.

**Fig 93 No 106 (IR12) Context: I.4.F18**
Part of a corroded iron stylus, point missing.

**Fig 93 No 107 (IR41) Context: III.C.357**
Complete iron stylus.

**Fig 93 No 108 (IR56) Context: III.16.L1–L2**
Complete iron stylus.

**Fig 93 No 109 (BZ18) Context: IIA.1962/F17, Grave 62/7**
Complete copper alloy stylus, shaft bent.

14.6.2f Knives

A small group of iron knife blades from Henley Wood were all badly corroded, and no handles were recognised. Among a variety of tanged or socketed blades none were obviously attributable as weapons and all may have been employed either as personal possessions or in specific trades. Once again however the possibility arises of secondary employment in connection with ritual and religious activity on the site. Animal sacrifice is perhaps the most obvious context for the use of knives, some of which may well have been reserved specifically for such rituals. The presence of animal burials within the temple enclosure at Henley Wood is witness to this practice, which may have been an even more prominent feature of ritual (cf 14.12.4, also Sections 6 and 15). The accident of survival elsewhere sometimes provides more realistic glimpses of the scale of such practices on other temple sites, as at Uley where huge quantities of sheep and goat bones were recovered (Henig 1984, 13 and Woodward & Leach 1993). A selection of the better preserved examples are illustrated here, the full catalogue appearing in MF14.3.1.

**Fig 93 No 110 (IR22) Context: III/IV.B.L1**
Small pointed knife blade, tang broken off.

**Fig 93 No 111 (IR27) Context: V.C.Grave 14**
‘Spurred’ knife blade, tip missing, square-sectioned tang.

**Fig 93 No 112 (IR63) Context: V/VI.18.L1**
Straight-backed, tanged knife blade, tip missing.

**Fig 93 No 113 (IR66) Context: III.11.350**
Part of a socketed iron knife or cleaver blade, tip and blade edge missing.

**Fig 93 No 114 (IR77) Context: V.18.L2**
Part of a long straight-backed knife blade with a flat riveted tang.

14.6.2g Miscellaneous implements

Items placed within this group are for the most part not conveniently divisible into sub-species according to type or function. The majority appear to be identifiable implements or parts thereof, although several attributions are doubtful and for want of better identifications the objects should perhaps be catalogued under 14.13. Of the selection illustrated here, their identity and potential significance is given in each case. The objects perhaps used in weaving etc should be compared with 14.6.2d. The full catalogue is presented in MF14.3.1.

**Fig 93 No 115 (IR53) Context: III/VI.14.L1–L2**
Large, heavily corroded, socketed iron mounting, one rivet in the socket, and tapering to a blunt-ended spike, possibly broken off. Function uncertain.

**Fig 93 No 116 (IR60) Context: ?IV.21.L1**
Small, badly corroded socketed iron ‘spud’ blade, or alternatively part of a sickle blade.

**Fig 93 No 117 (IR64) Context: III.C.350**
Iron key with a suspension loop for a barrel padlock.

**Fig 93 No 118 (IR113) Context: VII.Ba at NE end of F30.L3**
Cylindrical, socketed iron mount, long tapering spike, terminal missing. Function uncertain. Both this object and No 115 (IR53, above) may be portions of mounts or standards which could have been associated with the temple or its ritual.

**Fig 93 No 119 (IR119) Context: III.19.350**
Heavy iron socketed pick head of rectangular cross section, blade tip missing (but also see 14.14, below re date).

**Fig 94 No 120 (BZ40) Context: III.16.L1–L2**
Plain copper alloy shaft with pointed ends, possibly a hair pin, skewer, or part of a needle.
Figure 93 Spindlewhorls 99–105, styli 106–109, knives 110–114, and miscellaneous implements 115–119
Figure 94 Miscellaneous implements 120–124, fittings and furnishings 125–139, glass beaker 140, and flesh hook 141
There are 477 coins from the site. The earliest, a Dobunnic Class C issue, was identified by the late Derek Allen; the remainder by Richard Reece. The latest coin is of Arcadius, of AD388–402. Full lists in chronological order and by site coin number are in MF14.6.3f and MF14.6.3g.

Also in MF14.6 are full discussions and tables concerning coarse site distribution, the site coin ‘finger print’, general chronological distribution, area details, and coins in graves. No significant differences were found in analyses of period distributions whether area coin totals were taken by themselves or as components of the site coin total. A summary of the conclusions follows here.

There are coins from all areas I–VII; only 1% were unstratified (for coin plots see MF Figs 111, 112, 113). The highest numbers are from Area I (215), Area V (83 and a further possible 3), and III (80), with much smaller totals in other areas. MF Table 62 assesses the significance of these numbers in relation to the size of each area of excavation.

The highest number of coins are for the period AD300–349 (40.8%), followed by AD250–299 (38.8%) outside these date ranges there are sharp drops to AD350–399 (11.1%) and to the pre-3rd century AD (5.0%); the smallest percentage is of AD200–249 (0.8%). The concentration of coins between AD250–299 (38.8%) and the low percentage of pre-3rd century AD coins both fit Reece’s pattern for Roman Britain (Reece 1972); he warns however that any attempt to form a ‘finger print’, general chronological distribution, area details, and coins in graves. No significant differences were found in analyses of period distributions whether area coin totals were taken by themselves or as components of the site coin total. A summary of the conclusions follows here.

There are coins from all areas I–VII; only 1% were unstratified (for coin plots see MF Figs 111, 112, 113). The highest numbers are from Area I (215), Area V (83 and a further possible 3), and III (80), with much smaller totals in other areas. MF Table 62 assesses the significance of these numbers in relation to the size of each area of excavation.

The highest number of coins are for the period AD300–349 (40.8%), followed by AD250–299 (38.8%) outside these date ranges there are sharp drops to AD350–399 (11.1%) and to the pre-3rd century AD (5.0%); the smallest percentage is of AD200–249 (0.8%). The concentration of coins between AD250–299 (38.8%) and the low percentage of pre-3rd century AD coins both fit Reece’s pattern for Roman Britain (Reece 1972); he warns however that the latter must not be taken at face value.

The date of coin concentration varied within the site. Areas I, II, IV and VI peaked in the period AD250–299, while the greatest numbers in Areas III, III/IV and V occurred between AD300–349.

Analysis of coins from graves suggest that they were residual in the ground disturbed to dig graves, and were not gravegoods (cf MF 13.3.3).

Richard Reece adds the following (written in the early 1980s):

“One major problem impedes the interpretation of the coins from Henley Wood: no one knows how properly to do it. One piece of work established the general pattern of coin finds in Britain, and, judged against that, Henley Wood falls into the expected pattern and this inevitably reduces the remarks that can be made (Reece 1972). That original work on 14 sites has now been broadened out to include some 140 sites, but that work is still in progress and no general conclusions have yet been reached. One course which is now open is to compare Henley Wood with the other 10 temple coin lists in that summary and some 54 town coin lists so that first basic comparisons may be drawn.

Table 56 shows the coins from Henley Wood divided up into the usual chronological periods. In the other columns, all expressed as coins per thousand found, are the values of Henley Wood, the mean values for the other 10 temple sites, and the mean values for a whole range of 54 town sites. The overall values for rural sites are not yet fully collected so that the temple sites will have to represent them for the moment; a further recent piece of work has found difficulty in distinguishing temple sites as a recognisable group of rural sites, different from other rural sites, so this imperfectness may not be too unfortunate.

It will be seen at once that Henley Wood follows the other temples in opposition to the towns by a poor spread of coins struck before AD259. The numbers are usually so small that there is little point in examining the periods at which our site leans one way or the other, especially since these coins all had long lives and may well have been lost a century after they were struck. After AD259, a time when all sites in Britain show a rise in coin loss, our site rises sharply above both the town means and the temple means. There are plenty of other sites in Britain with values like these, but not among the temples, and in the towns and the military sites they are balanced by more sites with lower values. Henley Wood is therefore relatively high in radiate coins and compares with towns and small settlements in the east of Britain, where coin lists die off later on, and with villas and rural settlements and forts which seem to decline in the 4th century.

When we move into the 4th century the site becomes more extreme in its value. From AD317 to 330 it is unusually high, from AD330 to 348 very much around the mean, and from AD348 onwards unusually low even judged against the larger towns of Roman Britain which are, as a group, low in coinage at this time. This is particularly unfortunate since the one point that John Davies has noted (1986), is that what may distinguish temple sites in general is a higher than normal representation of coins of AD364–378. As the mean values from the temples show, the number of coins from AD364–378 can often approach that of the usually best represented period, AD330–348, but, at this site, such values are low.

All that has been done so far is to point out similarities and differences which are obvious from a table of figures and which might reasonably be termed facts. As always in archaeology, statements of the obvious (facts) are reliable while any attempt...
Table 56 Coins from Henley Wood compared with those from temples and towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Henley Wood Numbers</th>
<th>Temples Mean %</th>
<th>Henley Wood %</th>
<th>Towns Mean %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to AD41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudius</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nero</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trajan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadrian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Pius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Aurelius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Severus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222–238</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238–259</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259–275</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275–296</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296–317</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317–330</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330–348</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348–364</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364–378</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378–388</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388–402</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To interpret the 'facts' immediately moves the argument on to a totally different level of reliability or uncertainty. This preamble is an attempt to separate out the material in this discussion which it might be hoped would be repeated to a fair degree of similarity by any other worker, and so may be hoped to be reliable, from the purely interpretative suggestions which follow; each reader has to judge these against his or her inner picture of Roman Britain.

Henley Wood is an unusual temple by its coin finds when they are set against a pitifully small group of other temple coins, which unfortunately form a reasonable group of the evidence available. The overall impression is that the site has a period of major coin loss from about AD260 to about 340 and then the coin loss declines. This is in opposition to almost every other known temple site where coin loss holds up until later in the 4th century. This pattern is similar to some of the major towns - London for example - to military sites where garrisons seem to be withdrawn - such as Lympne - and to villas which might even be deserted - such as Dickets Mead (Herts). But coin loss does not cease after AD348, and the interesting question is whether this suggests a link to thriving centres of Romanization in decline, such as the towns, or simply failure. Failure of a site has to be judged from the archaeology in total and here there does not seem to be material failure; structures, like moderate coin loss, continue (cf 5.5).

This leaves one further division: the site could be interpreted as something belonging to the early period of Roman Britain, like the capital, London, fast becoming irrelevant; or it could be interpreted as a temple up to around AD348 and something else thereafter, While the writers of the archaeological report must comment on these possibilities (cf Section 15.5.15–7), it can be noted that there is nothing in the coin list at any date which suggests a religious deposition of coins in numbers above the generally expected.'

14.7 Fittings and furnishings (cf MF 14.3.1)

Items classified within this category can include the components or furnishings of containers, furniture, building elements such as doors or windows; and the fittings associated with vehicles, animal husbandry and decoration, such as harnesses and similar accoutrements. This may appear to be a somewhat broadly defined group, accommodating a miscellany
of items, and covering a wide range of functions. This is partly justified by the difficulties of precise attribution and the opportunities for alternative functional interpretation. The broad functional classification of a fitting or furnishing should however cover most of the material, whatever its precise original context.

Some attempt to suggest function and context is made for all those examples illustrated here. It is probably reasonable to assume that most of the objects are connected in some way with the religious buildings or with their contents at Henley Wood. The full catalogue is in MF 14.3.1.

**14.8.1 Introduction**

Utensils and other household equipment are normally distinguished by their association with food and drink, its storage, preparation and eating; or with other aspects of domestic life such as heating or lighting. While there may be a degree of overlap between certain items assigned to this category and other groups such as Tools and Weapons, or Fittings and Furnishings, most of the Henley Wood material is clearly identifiable. By far the largest group of material, outweighing all others, is pottery; dealt with in 14.8.3b below, with its own series of illustrations. The remaining subsections deal with two further classes of material, glass vessels and miscellaneous utensils. In the context of Henley Wood, alternative functions for all these groups must be considered, and are discussed where appropriate.

**14.8.2 Miscellaneous utensils**

**14.8.2a Stone lids**

None of these are illustrated, but occur as roughly shaped, flat stone discs varying between c 45 and 80mm in diameter. With one exception (of limestone) these had been fashioned out of Pennant sandstone, a relatively local material used extensively in this region for roofing tile on Romano-British buildings. Direct on-site evidence for the function of these lids was not forthcoming; they could indeed have been used equally well as plinths or stands. From their size and shape, coverings for the mouths of pottery vessels seems a likely use.

**14.8.2b Flesh Hook**

Although clearly identifiable as a flesh hook, and therefore a domestic utensil, this item could alternatively have been classified with 14.6 – Tools and Weapons. Its presence on the site may have had some connection with the ritual slaughter and sacrifice of animals.

**14.8.3 Containers**

**14.8.3a Glass vessels**

A small group of vessel glass fragments from the site were seen by the late Dorothy Charlesworth and briefly identified. With one or two modern exceptions (see 14.14), all represented Roman vessels. The majority are not closely identifiable although beerers are certainly present, one of which is illustrated. A full list of the extant material is provided in MF14.3.1.

Assuming that these fragments represent vessels actually present on site, their role, with or without liquid contents, in religious and ritual observances at Henley Wood, can only be a matter for speculation.

**Fig 94 No 140 (GL1) Context: I.5.L1**

Part of the base of a clear glass beaker with a footing, but of undetermined shape, 2nd–3rd century AD.
14.8.3b The Roman pottery

14.8.3b–1 Introduction

Pottery comprises by far the largest category of portable finds recorded and collected at Henley Wood. The great majority arises from the excavations of Ernest Greenfield, although small groups collected by other workers on the site have also been included in this analysis. The character of Greenfield’s excavated assemblage was influenced by a discriminatory collection and recording policy. Thus the pottery available was apparently retained upon the basis of the following criteria: ‘diagnostic’ form; special fabric or decoration; important sealed contexts; mortaria; and samian. In practice this has resulted in an assemblage comprising most if not all the rim sherds, a small but unknown proportion of base and body sherds, and all the recognised mortaria and samian pottery.

With these qualifications in mind this report has been structured towards the presentation of an illustrated pottery fabric and form series; their quantified spatial and chronological site representation; support for an events sequence at Henley Wood as defined through principles of archaeological stratigraphy; and to illustrate any social, economic or cultural patterning within the assemblage. The material available for study comprised over 3,000 sherds representing a minimum of 231 individual vessels. All those retained were serially numbered within the Henley Wood finds recording sequence HW1 – HW3835; samian and mortaria receiving an additional sequential catalogue number prefixed S1 – S302 and M1 – M30 respectively. The provenance of the majority were originally expressed as bag numbers, in which form they were stored. This has subsequently been translated into defined archaeological contexts whenever possible. A full catalogue of the identified and provenanced pottery is to be found in the archive to this report (ARC 3.2 and 3.6).

With the exception of a handful of prehistoric and medieval sherds, all the pottery dealt with here is of Roman or Romano-British type. The prehistoric and the medieval pottery identified is referred to separately in 14.4.3 and 14.14. Among the assemblage were also recognised several items whose secondary characteristics acquired through reuse justify their relocation and discussion elsewhere in this report. Principal among these were pottery discs or counters and spindlewhorls (cf 14.6.2d and 14.5.6).

14.8.3b–2 Methodology

In modern Roman pottery studies the definition of a type fabric and form series is an essential prerequisite (Peacock ed 1977). At Henley Wood the former was established through macroscopic examination of pottery matrices and their definition by principal inclusions, textural attributes, and the characteristics of colour or firing. The definition of form series based upon and secondary to each of the pottery fabric types, was achieved relative to the range of vessel forms, finish, and decorative elements recognised. To emphasise the significance of the individual fabric types, these have been grouped into six collective sub-sections, defined below. Thus for example are distinguished a series of Romano-British reduced coarsewares – Group A: fabrics A1 – A6; or Roman imports – Group E: fabrics E1 - E3 (below). The variety of forms specific to each fabric type and group have also been classified within a more generally applicable range of basic generic forms (see below). Thus eg jars are defined with the prefix 1 and their variations numerically 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, etc. Whenever possible these pottery fabric and form types are correlated with other published groups, some of which have been subjected to definitive study and classification (cf Oxfordshire pottery – Young 1977; New Forest Pottery – Fulford 1975). Two fabric types within this series are the subject of additional specialist reports – the samian (terra sigillata) and the mortaria – and appear in MF14.8.3b–4.

The illustrated series published with this report (Figs 95–104) has been selected to present a maximum range of the pottery types and their form variations at Henley Wood. This very full presentation is justified by the special importance of the site and its potential relationship with the post-Roman reoccupation of nearby Cadbury Congresbury (cf Section 4 and now CADREX 1992, 147–54); and also by the scarcity as yet of comparably published local pottery assemblages. Quantification of the assemblage was achieved by a minimum vessel estimation (MVE) based upon the measurement and proportion of rim diameters present (Orton 1975). In the circumstances of a selective collection and recording policy by the excavator, sherd counting and weighing were clearly unrepresentative and inappropriate. The apparent retention of all rim sherds favours minimum vessel estimation, a method of quantification regarded in any case as more statistically valid than counting or weighing. Presentation of the material according to well stratified phased groups was not considered worthwhile here. Such contexts are few and far between at Henley Wood, where the degree of disturbance and thus residuality appears to be high. A reordering of the material, published and unpublished, is of course possible with reference to the site stratigraphy (where established) and a concordance of the illustrated pottery from Area I is in microfiche (MF Table 69).

14.8.3b–3 The form series

A basic generic form series is classified as follows:
- Jars: Forms 1.1 – 1.6;
- Bowls: Forms 2.1 – 2.7;
- Beakers/Cups: Forms 3.1 – 3.3;
- Mugs: Form 4.1;
- Flagons/Bottles: Forms 5.1 – 5.4;
- Lids: Form 6.1.

This form series is justified and defined more fully in MF14.8.313–3.
14.8.3b–4 The type fabric (TF) series

Definition of the following is based primarily upon macroscopic examination of fabric types, supplemented by form and decorative characteristics, and with reference to identifiable parallels.

**Group A**
- Roman coarsewares; reduced greywates (A1–A6)
- Roman coarsewares, reduced black burnished wares (B1–B2)
- Roman colour coated wares (C1–C6)
- Roman coarsewares; oxidised wares (D1–D2)
- Roman imports; including samian and amphora wares (E1–E3)
- Miscellaneous Roman wares – mortaria (F1–F6)

**Type Fabric A1** (Figs 95–96, Nos 1–56)

*Fabric:* Coarse, medium-fired, reduced mid-grey sandy fabric; somewhat variable in colour, firing and texture. Moderately tempered with visible quartz sand and some iron. Sometimes with a lighter fired core between darker outer skins.

*Form:* A wide range of moderately thick-walled and wheel-made or finished vessels; Form type: 1.1, 1.2/4, 1.3, 1.5; 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4/5, 2.6; 3.1, 3.2, 3.3; 4.1; 5.1 and 6.1. Surfaces wiped or sometimes burnished, and occasionally decorated with hatched or linear-tooled bands.

**Dating and Parallels:** The most commonly recorded fabric at Henley Wood comprising over 30% of the total assemblage. Almost certainly a product of the nearby Congresbury Kilns, along with Fabrics A2 and A3.

No detailed study of these kilns or their products exists and the Henley Wood assemblage probably comprises one of the best published groups to date of the material. Its predominance among late-3rd and 4th-century contexts excavated at Henley Wood, and such evidence as was obtained from the kiln sites themselves, points towards a later Romano-British product. The Congresbury kilns were certainly producing large quantities of upright jars with cavetto rims (Fig 95, Nos 1–18), and narrow-necked jars with double beaded rims (Fig 95, No 24 and Fig 96, No 54). Should further discoveries of or work be undertaken on the Congresbury kilns and their products, the Henley Wood assemblage will provide valuable comparanda (Usher & Lilley, 1964).

The influence of contemporary products of the Dorset Black Burnished industry is apparent in the Congresbury repertoire at Henley Wood (eg Nos 1–15, 25, 29–32, and in Fabrics A2 and A3); and largely supports the suggestion of 3rd and 4th-century manufacture. A few pieces appear to imitate earlier forms (eg Nos 39–41, 43, 48 and 53); perhaps indicating 2nd-century origins for the Congresbury industry. Some of these demonstrate the influence of another major pottery manufacturing tradition in the region, that of the Severn Valley (eg Nos ?16, 39–40 and 53). It might indeed be argued that Congresbury pottery is a later offshoot of that tradition, although the classic oxidised wares do not appear to have been produced here (Webster 1976).


**Type Fabric A2** (Fig 97, Nos 57–85)

*Fabric:* Moderately smooth, medium-fired, reduced light-mid grey fabric; lightly tempered with scatters of small visible iron, grog, sand and mica flakes. Bodies generally fired evenly grey or with a lighter core between darker grey outer skins.

*Form:* Occurs in a wide range of wheel-made or wheel-finished kitchen and tableware forms including Form Types 1.1, 1.2/4, 1.5; 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3; and 5.1. Occasional linear-tooled surface decoration.

**Dating and Parallels:** This type comprised over 9% of the Henley Wood assemblage and appears to be a product of the Congresbury potteries in a somewhat finer fabric than A1. Whether or not this represents a different kiln source or is simply a slight variation in the raw material used, the form range closely resembles those of fabrics A1 and A3. Once again the forms appear to be of predominantly 3rd and 4th-century manufacture, and subject to similar influences and traditions as suggested for A1 (above). Where available the on-site associations support this date range. Local parallels for this fabric are suggested at Cadbury Congresbury by Group 5 (op cit); at Butcombe among Fabrics 8, 9 & 12 (op cit); and at Gatcombe possible by Fabric 2 (op cit); and in the Chew Valley by Fabric E (op cit).

**Type Fabric A3** (Figs 98–99, Nos 86–127)

*Fabric:* Smooth or slightly rough, hard and well-fired reduced mid-grey fabric, lightly tempered with occasional small iron and quartz sand inclusions. Bodies generally evenly fired, sometimes to a semi-stoneware and with a striped darker grey or buff-grey core.

*Form:* Occurs in a wide range of wheel-made or finished table and kitchen ware forms, including 1.1, 1.2/4 1.3, 1.5; 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6; 3.1, 3.2, 3.3; 4.2, 5.1; and 6.1. Surfaces smoothed, sometimes burnished; and some vessels decorated with grooved hatched and linear bands.

**Dating and Parallels:** This type comprised over 21% of the total Henley Wood assemblage, appearing as another variant product of the Congresbury potteries. It is chiefly distinguished from A1 and A2 by the degree of firing, the fabric being closest to A1. The range of forms represented closely resemble those of A1 and A2, among which 3rd and 4th century types again predominate. The influence of the Dorset
Black Burnished industry and to a lesser extent the Severn Valley industries is again apparent. The real distinction between this type and the A1 fabric lies in the degree of firing, the range of forms being virtually interchangeable. Whether this was a deliberate effect or arose through accidental firing variation, is difficult to determine from the evidence at Henley Wood.

The local parallels for this fabric appear to be at Cadbury Congresbury: Group 7 (op cit); Gatcombe; type Fabric 4 (op cit); and Chew Valley; Fabrics ?A and C (op cit).

**Type Fabric A4** (Fig 99, Nos 128–131)
*Fabric:* A coarse, moderately rough and medium-fired reduced mid-grey fabric well tempered with a mixture of sand, iron and angular calcite or chalk inclusions. A distinctive pale grey body speckled with inclusions, and often a darker buff-grey exterior skin.

*Form:* At Henley Wood the vessels identified in this fabric, comprised a limited range of wheel-made or wheel-finished jar or bowl forms; *ie* 1.2, 1.5 and 2.1. No decoration or other surface treatments were recorded.

**Dating and Parallels:** On site all recorded associations for this fabric, comprising a little over 1% of the assemblage, are 4th century; a suggested date of manufacture not contradicted by the available vessel forms. Other parallels for this type are not available among local published assemblages, even at the adjacent Cadbury Congresbury site. The distinctive fabric and its low representation among the Henley Wood pottery assemblage suggest a more distant import rather than a variant product of the local kilns, although probably originating somewhere in the Severn/Avon region.

**Type Fabric A5** (Figs 99–100, Nos 132–35)
*Fabric:* A coarse, moderately hard and rough reduced grey fabric; generally well-fired, and heavily tempered with a mixture of sand chert/flint, iron and grog inclusions. Bodies may be variably fired with a mid-grey or buff core buff-grey and orange-brown surfaces, and distinctly speckled with large inclusions.

*Form:* Among the Henley Wood assemblage this ware occurred exclusively as thick-walled, coarse storage vessels; jar type 1.6. These hand-made, sometimes wheel-finished jars have thick rolled-over or applied rims, which are sometimes decorated with slash or thumbed decoration.

**Dating and Parallels:** Storage jars of this type, comprising a little over 1% of the total Henley Wood assemblage generally occur as a small component of late Romano-British site ceramic assemblages. Their sources are various, and in view of their bulk likely to be fairly local. In this instance the Congresbury kilns would be an obvious source although this is not yet verified. An identical fabric – Group 44 – is found at Cadbury Congresbury (op cit), and possibly at Gatcombe: TF 28 (op cit); Butcombe: TF 14 (op cit), and Chew Valley Fig 100, Nos 58–60, no TF (op cit).

**Type Fabric A6** (none illustrated)
*Fabric:* A coarse, moderately soft medium-fired reduced grey fabric, heavily tempered with large grey-white fossil shell and calcite inclusions. Bodies usually mid-dark grey and characteristically speckled with light temper; surfaces sometimes mottled lighter grey or buff-brown.

*Form:* A handful of sherds representing moderately thick-walled bowl or jar forms were detected among the Henley Wood pottery assemblage. None were considered worthy of illustration. A shallow rilled exterior surface decoration is characteristic.

**Dating and Parallels:** Although barely represented at Henley Wood, this very distinctive shell-tempered coarseware is a well known late Roman pottery fabric in southern Britain. From a suspected 3rd-century origin in the south or east Midlands, this fabric does not appear in the south west until later in the 4th century, and then only in very small quantities. Its late occurrence at *eg* Ilchester: TF ST (op cit), Gatcombe: TF 57 (op cit), or West Hill, Uley TF 9 (op cit), should provide the chronological context for its appearance at Henley Wood.

**Group B**

**Type Fabric B1** (Figs 100–101, Nos 136–173)
*Fabric:* A coarse, moderately hard, medium-fired reduced sandy fabric, well tempered with quartz sand, some iron and occasionally other minerals. Bodies generally dark grey or black but sometimes variably fired light grey, buff or red-brown, and characteristically tempered with abundant sand inclusions.

*Form:* Among the Henley Wood assemblage this fabric was represented in a variety of jar and bowl forms: 1.1, 1.2/4, 1.5; 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6; and occasional cups and lids: 4.1 and 6.1. The majority of vessels are handmade and wheel-finished. A black burnished surface finish is characteristic, of both surfaces on tableware; and bands of hatched or linear-tooled decoration are common.

**Dating and Parallels:** Over 17% of the Henley Wood pottery assemblage was of this fabric. Readily identifiable as a product of the Dorset Black Burnished pottery industry, this fabric type is ubiquitous on almost every Roman-British site in southern and south western Britain (Williams 1977). The bowl, dish and jar forms are typically, although not exclusively, 3rd and 4th century types as is borne out by their on-site occurrence at Henley Wood. Its local equivalents have been defined at Cadbury Congresbury: Group 40 (op cit); Butcombe: TF 16 (op cit); TF 10 and TF 36 (op cit); Chew Valley: TF D (op cit); and more widely on many other sites.
It has been suggested (TF A1 above) that the appearance of these wares in the region, from at least the early 2nd century AD, influenced the form repertoire of the local Congresbury industry. 2nd-century forms seem to be present among the Henley Wood assemblage (eg Nos 167, 169–170, 147–8), although the bulk are later 3rd and 4th century when the Congresbury industry would have been in direct local competition with Dorset products.

**Type Fabrics B2 (Figs 101–103, Nos 174–208)**

_Fabric:_ A coarse, medium-hard, reduced sandy fabric, moderately fired, and tempered with quartz sand, iron and occasional shell or calcite. Bodies normally mid-dark grey or buff-brown with black exteriors; moderately tempered, and sometimes laminated.

_Form:_ Occurs in a wide range of forms, ie Jars 1.1, 1.2/4, 1.3, 1.5; Bowls 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.6, 2.7; Beakers 3.1; Mugs 4.1; Flagons 5.1; and Lids: 6.1. The vessels are hand-made and wheel-finished, with characteristically burnished black surfaces inside and out on table-wares. Decoration includes lattice and linear tooling on exteriors. Both the decoration and black burnished surface finish appear to be in conscious imitation of Dorset Black Burnished industry products.

_Dating and Parallels:_ Although this type is an obvious imitation of and competitor with Dorset Black Burnished wares in both form and decoration, the influence of 2nd-century Severn Valley products is also apparent (eg Nos 201, 203–4). Relatively few vessels were obtained from phased contexts at Henley Wood although the fabric comprises over 10% of the total assemblage, but the forms suggest production ranging from the later 2nd century into the 4th century. No source for this material can yet be suggested, its only other documented occurrence in the region being at Gatcombe: TF 5 (op cit). A relatively local source must be suspected, although there is no evidence that this fabric was a product of the Congresbury kilns, with which it would otherwise have also been in some competition. Thin sectioning by Dr D F Williams (HBMC Ceramic Petrology Project, University of Southampton) confirms that this is not a Dorset Black Burnished product, but sheds no more light upon its origin (report in ARC 3.6).

**Group C**

**Type Fabric C1 (Fig 103, Nos 209–222)**

_Fabric:_ A fine, soft or medium slightly sandy oxidised fabric, well tempered with small mica flakes and some sparse scattered grog and iron. Generally well fired to an even orange-buff or pink-red body, sometimes with a lighter grey-buff core.

_Form:_ At Henley Wood this distinctive red colour coated fabric was present principally as the bowl forms 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7; and occasionally as enclosed beakers, form 3.2. All vessels are wheel-made and coated with a characteristic red slip which is lustrous when fresh and unweathered. The enclosed vessels were coated with a darker red-brown slip, usually on the exterior only. Traces of white paint or rouletted decoration on a few bowl sherds. Mortaria sherds of identical fabric are considered below as part of Group F (F2).

_Dating and Parallels:_ This fabric comprising a little over 1% of the Henley Wood ceramic assemblage, is readily identifiable as a product of the late Roman Oxfordshire pottery industry; whose imports were probably reaching this area from the later 3rd century, and continued during much of the 4th century. The industry and its products have been the subject of a recent definitive study, and this fabric undoubtedly belongs to the class of Oxidised Colour Coat Wares manufactured in the Oxford region (Young 1977, Type C, 123–184). In most instances the vessels recovered can be classified with reference to the Oxford corpus (see Fig 103, Nos 209–222). All were types in production during the 4th century. Parallel examples of this fabric are to be found on virtually every later Roman site in the region, eg Cadbury Congresbury: Groups 81–3, (op cit); Gatcombe: TFs 24 & 56 (op cit); Butcombe: TF 30 (op cit); and Chew Valley TF F (op cit).

**Type Fabric C2 (Fig 103, Nos 223–4)**

_Fabric:_ A fine-grained, hard and well-fired reduced fabric, sparsely tempered with some visible iron. High temperature firing sometimes results in a grey semi-stoneware body, which can vary in some vessels to a softer buff or cream.

_Form:_ At Henley Wood this fabric category was represented by enclosed vessel forms; beakers/cups: 3.2; and flagons/bottles: 5/3 & 5.4. These were wheel-made and colour-coated buff-brown, or dark red-black. The most highly fired examples were characterised by a lustrous dark red/purple surface slip.

_Dating and Parallels:_ A product of the New Forest pottery industry, exporting enclosed vessels of these types widely through southern England during the later 3rd and 4th centuries AD. A recent definitive study of this industry and its products permits the identification of this type at Henley Wood as colour coat Fabric Ia, and its representatives with reference to the New Forest corpus (Fulford 1975, 24–5 & 43-62). Their appearance at Henley Wood as less than 1% of the total assemblage, is most likely to coincide with activity late in the 3rd century or during the first half of the 4th. Elsewhere in the immediate region this fabric is identified at Butcombe among TF 32 (op cit); at Gatcombe: TF ?25 & 33 (op cit) and at Chew Valley: TF ?Z (op cit).

**Type Fabric C3 (Fig 103, Nos 225–6)**

_Fabric:_ A fine-grained, medium hard and moderately fired, partly reduced fabric, sparsely tempered with visible iron inclusions. Bodies generally fired somewhat variably to a buff-grey or cream.

_Form:_ Only a handful of sherds representing this
type were recovered, from wheel-made bowls or cups (Forms 2.1 & 2.4/5) with a buff-brown-red colour coat and sometimes a burnished or lustrous finish. The latter is particularly characteristic and with the range of open vessel forms, distinguishes this otherwise identical fabric type from C2 above.

Dating and Parallels: A product of the New Forest pottery industry which is distinguished from fabric C2 by its characteristic red slip, generally lower firing temperature, and a repertoir of exclusively open vessel forms. Defined by Fulford as Fabric lb (op cit, 25, 32–3, & Figs 19–22), this was an equivalent but commercially less successful competitor with Oxfordshire red slipped ware (Fabric C1 above). Its production and distribution to Henley Wood is thought to have been confined mainly to the first half of the 4th century. It has also been recognised locally in small quantities at Cadbury Congresbury: ?Group 84 (op cit); Butcombe: in TF 32 (op cit); Gatcombe: ?TF 33 (op cit); and Chew Valley TF ?Z (op cit).

Type Fabric C4 Fig 103, Nos 227–9
Fabric: A fine, smooth, medium-soft and moderately well fired oxidised fabric, tempered with some fine sand mica and iron. Body somewhat variable buff-brown to orange-pink, and often with a darker buff-brown or grey core.

Form: Occurs in a range of thin-walled wheel-made, enclosed vessels; beakers: 3.2, and flagons: 5.1 and 5.3. Characterised by red-brown colour coats, which may be glossy; and decorative motifs including rouletted bands or barbotine and white paint designs.

Dating and Parallels: An oxidised colour coat ware whose products appear to be widely distributed in the Severn/Avon region although no production centres have yet been located. At Henley Wood this type forms a little over 1% of the total ceramic assemblage and does not seem to occur in contexts earlier than the 4th century AD. Similar fabrics and forms are defined locally at Cadbury Congresbury Group 83 (op cit); and Gatcombe: ?TF 30 (op cit); and further afield at eg West Hill, Uley: TF 17 (op cit); and Ilchester: TF CCiiv (op cit). Originating possibly in the late 2nd century from an unknown source, this type was evidently current during the 3rd century on some sites, and perhaps continues in competition with Oxford and New Forest wares into the 4th century.

Type Fabric C5 (None illustrated)
Fabric: A fine, smooth or slightly sandy, medium hard and moderately-fired, oxidised fabric, lightly tempered with some large grog and small iron inclusions. Body well-fired, pale pink-buff with a cream-white surface stain.

Form: Only a handful of sherds were recognised, apparently deriving from thin-walled, wheel-made enclosed vessels; probably beakers or flagons. Exterior surfaces are colour-coated dark brown-grey/black and may be decorated with rouletted bands.

Dating and Parallels: No good parallels can yet be quoted for this type, despite its fairly distinctive fabric. Its sparse representation at Henley Wood might signify a more distant source. Alternatively it is related to Type Fabric C4 whose forms and style it appears to echo. Other than its occurrence in 4th-century contexts on this site, little more can usefully be said of its chronology.

Type Fabric C6 (Fig 103, Nos 230–35)

Form: At Henley Wood this fabric type was represented by a small group of enclosed vessels; mainly Flagons; forms 5.1 and 5.4 and beakers form 3.3. No decoration was noted but exterior surfaces have a characteristic cream-white colour coat.

Dating and Parallels: Few pieces were recovered from well phased contexts at Henley Wood where this type comprised barely 1% of the total assemblage, although associations with other artefacts, notably coins, indicate its 4th-century currency. Elsewhere this is a widely identified fabric type in central south and south western Britain although of uncertain origin. Local parallels included Cadbury Congresbury: group 9ii (op cit); Chew Valley; TF ?Q (op cit); Gatcombe: TF 20 (op cit), West Hill, Uley: TF 13 (op cit); Ilchester: TF CCiv & Mi (op cit). What may be a variation of this fabric type occurs in the form of mortaria on many of these other sites. One example could be present at Henley Wood (Fig 104, No 246), see under mortaria fabric F5 in group F below. An Upper Thames/South Cotswold source for the mortaria at least, is suspected (Hartley below).

Group D

Type Fabric D1 Fig 103, Nos 236–38

Form: Less than 1% of the Henley Wood pottery assemblage was defined as of this type, the few identifiable forms comprising bowls: form 2.2; and lids form 6.1, Vessels were wheel-made, with wiped surfaces and occasional bands of linear-tooled decoration.

Dating and Parallels: Apart from some of the colour coat fabrics in Group C, oxidised Romano-British wares were restricted to the two representatives of this small group. The origins of either are uncertain, although they appear to belong to the Severn Valley industry. The fabric D1 possibly originated at the Shepton Mallet kilns, although the products and fabrics of this industry have yet to be defined. A similar fabric among the mortaria in Group F (F6) is also thought to have originated at Shepton Mallet (Hartley, below). The products of this industry seem
to have been in circulation mainly during the 2nd century AD, and thus may relate primarily to an earlier and largely inferred phase at Henley Wood. Its closest local equivalents appear to be at Cadbury Congresbury: Group 62 (op cit); TF 3 (op cit); Chew Valley: TF K & ?L (op cit); and at Ilchester: TF CBii (op cit).

**Type Fabric D2** (Fig 103, Nos 239–241)

**Fabric:** A fine, medium-hard sandy oxidised fabric, well tempered with quartz sand and some iron. Body generally well fired but somewhat variably, buff-red-brown with a darker grey-buff or occasionally black core.

**Form:** The few sherds in this fabric represent a small group of jar and bowl forms, wheel-made, with smoothed or lightly burnished surfaces, and occasional linear-tooled decorative grooves or bands.

**Dating and Parallels:** As for fabric D1 the origin of this type is uncertain and not easily paralleled in the region. The equivalent fabric at Cadbury Congresbury was apparently Group 61 (op cit); while further afield the closest equivalent may be TF CBi at Ilchester (op cit). A Severn Valley product seems most likely, possibly in production and circulation somewhat earlier than its occurrence in ?4th century contexts at Henley Wood would suggest.

**Group E**

**Type Fabric E1** (Figs 103–104, Nos 242–3 & Pl 35)

**Fabric:** A very fine and hard, well-fired oxidised fabric, with no visible inclusions. An even pink-red or red-orange body with a pale grey core.

**Form:** Fine, thin-walled, moulded or wheel-made enclosed vessels, represented by a handful of beaker sherds; Form type 3.2. Surfaces are coated with a dark red-brown or black lustrous slip and may be decorated with roulette-stamped bands, barbotine or occasionally moulded figures (No 248).

**Dating and Parallels:** A distinctive later Roman import from factories in central and east Gaul, or the Rhineland, and sometimes referred to collectively as Rhenish colour coat ware (Greene 1978, 15–30). It makes its appearance in small quantities on many sites in Britain from the later 2nd century AD, and continues through much of the 3rd century. Its occurrence elsewhere in this region can be cited at eg Gatcombe, TF 35 (op cit); Butcombe; in TF 32 (op cit); Ilchester: TF CC vi (op cit) or West Hill Uley: TF 19 (op cit).

Pl 35 (HW No 1223, from context V.C. Graves 20/21) is a body sherd from a Form Dech 74 vessel, a beaker (Dechelette 1904); decorated with an applied plaque moulded in the form of a triton wielding a club. Decorated vessels of this type are rare in Britain, originating in Central Gaul, probably Lezoux, around the middle of the second century (Simpson 1957). An almost identical piece was found with other 2nd-century Antonine samian at Lechlade, Gloucestershire (Simpson 1973), 42–51).

**Type Fabric E2:** samian ware (none illustrated)

This distinctive fabric type, collectively the product of several manufactories in Gaul from the later 1st to the early 3rd century AD, makes some appearance on almost every Roman-British site. At Henley Wood it was by far the largest single fineware group, comprising 3.5% of the total ceramic assemblage. In contrast to most of the assemblage each piece was identified by the excavator in a numbered series S1–S302. The whole group was separately examined and identified by Brenda Dickinson, who provides the following report.

**The samian ware, by Brenda Dickinson**

Very little samian was found at Henley Wood that is dated before the later half of the 2nd century.

There are only three South Gaulish vessels, all of late 1st or early 2nd date; one of these has an unwork footing. Trajanic ware from Les Matres-de-Veyre is completely absent. There is a little Hadrianic or early Antonine material, but the bulk of the samian will not have reached the site before c AD 160, at the earliest. There is a high proportion of forms such as 31R and the type of form 31 which occurs in the Wroxeter Gutter. Most of the material is Central Gaulish, but there is a fair quantity of East Gaulish ware, and some of this will almost certainly be 3rd century.

There is an unusually low proportion of decorated to plain forms in this assemblage and several of the vessels have been mended, or prepared for mending. This may or may not be significant of the prosperity of the site. The catalogue of samian is in MF 14.8.3b–4.

**Fabric E3 – amphorae (none illustrated)**

**Fabric:** Hard, moderately coarse and generally sandy, oxidised fabric, tempered with quartz sand and variable quantities of grog, iron and other mineral or stone fragments. Well-fired to a range of even colours, normally pink-buff or orange-buff-cream, sometimes with grey core.

**Form:** Only two sherds of this fabric were recognised at Henley Wood, both from a large thick-walled vessel identified as an amphora. In these circumstances further specialist examination or analysis was not thought worthwhile.

**Dating and Parallels:** Both sherds originated from at least one wine amphora of south Spanish type, and probably of 2nd-century manufacture (Callendar 1965). Small quantities of Mediterranean amphorae are frequently present on Romano-British sites; the majority of later 1st or 2nd-century manufacture. Their durability and re-use value accounts for a common occurrence as highly residual pieces in later Roman contexts and assemblages.

**MF 14.8.3b–9 Mortaria (Fabrics F1–F6)** (Fig 104, Nos 244–247)

The Type Fabrics assigned to this group are linked through their common occurrence in a particular
form type – mortaria. In many instances their definition as distinct fabric types is fully justified, although some mortaria are almost indistinguishable in fabric from a wider repertoire of vessel forms. Reference is made to parallel fabrics where appropriate. Mortaria were distinguished on site by the excavator in an individually numbered series M1–M30, although one or two additional pieces were subsequently recognised among the rest of the pottery assemblage.

All the numbered mortaria were examined by Kay Hartley, who provides the following report; her catalogue is in MF 14.8.3b–4.

The mortaria,
by Kay Hartley

Fragments from at least 16 mortaria were examined, dating from the first half of the 2nd century to a date in the 4th century. Four, probably all of the period AD110–160, are from relatively local workshops including those at Caerleon and Shepton Mallet, and a fifth (AD250–400) is also from a source in SW England. The remaining eleven vessels are from the important potteries in the Oxford region: all date to the period AD240–400. The proportion of mortaria from Oxford to those from other sources (11 to 1) for the period AD250–400, indicates the extent to which local production had foundered and the Oxford potteries had taken over the markets in the south and SW England. One might have expected the odd sherd from the New Forest potteries in a larger sample.

Mortarium Fabrics

Fabric 1 (F1) Oxford region; Young 1977, Type M
Slightly sandy, off-white fabric, occasionally with a pink core: the distinctive trituration grit consists entirely of mixed pink, brown and transparent quartz (Fig 104 No 244)

Fabric 2 (F2) Oxford region; Young 1977, Type C
Fine textured, slightly micaceous red-brown fabric, sometimes with a grey core: the trituration grit is identical with that of Fabric 1. This fabric is indistinguishable from TF C1, group C (above). These mortaria were sometimes used with a white slip, and sometimes with a red-brown samian-like slip. The slip does not survive on all the Henley Wood fragments, but all except Nos M22 and M28 would certainly have had the red-brown slip, and they may also have had it (Fig 104 to 220).

Fabric 3 (F3) SW England, perhaps a local workshop. Hard, fine-textured, orange-brown fabric with a blue-grey core virtually to the surface: few, small translucent quartz inclusions only translucent quartz trituration grits surviving. Self coloured.

Fabric 4 (F40) Caerleon c AD110–180
Fine-textured, slightly micaceous orange-brown fabric with no visible tempering at x10 magnification – white angular quartz trituration grits. These mortaria always have a red-brown, samian-like slip which often does not survive acid soil conditions. The fabric is often softish but some hard specimens surviving may indicate the original texture. None of the kilns have been found but the heaviest distribution is at Caerleon and Caerwent. It was formerly considered to be legionary ware, but this is far from certain (Hartley 1966; Boon 1966).

M3 (Fig 104 No 245) A burnt rim sherd with part of a weathered potter's stamp. The fragmentary stamp is unidentifiable but the mortarium can be attributed to the pottery at Caerleon; the stamp is likely to be from a die not represented among the published stamps from Caerleon. The pottery was active within the period AD 110–180 and this rim profile would fit a mid 2nd century date.

Fabric 5 (F5) Probably a local workshop (see below). Softish orange-brown fabric with dark grey core and traces of thin white slip; abundant, ill-sorted inclusions, mainly quartz, some of it pinkish, with occasional opaque red-brown and black fragments.

The single vessel in Fabric 5 (M21 Fig 104 No 246) is in the tradition of a well-attested regional pottery, probably situated in the SE Gloucestershire/north Wiltshire area, for which Cirencester was the biggest single market. The fabric of M21 is of this same basic type and it is possible that it was made there, but the fabric of M21 is softer and of a more vivid orange than is usual with these products, and it may therefore be the work of a potter trained in that pottery but working locally. See also TF C6, Group C above.

Fabric 6 (F6) Shepton Mallet or a kiln in the SW working closely in that tradition.
Orange-brown fabric with a drab greenish-grey core; fine textured and slightly micaceous with some temper barely visible (x10); occasional red clay pellets (7mm) present. Surviving trituration grits consist of translucent and opaque quartz. The fabric is fired to a pale orange at the surface. An equivalent fabric, possibly from the same source, appears to be TF D1, Group D, above (Fig 104 No 247).
14.8.3b–5  The Roman coarse pottery: an illustrated type series by fabric and form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric Group A : Type A1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Generic Form : Jar (Fig 95)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>I.3.L2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>I.4.F18</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>I.4.F18</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>I.5.304</td>
<td>?3or4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>I.5.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>2656</td>
<td>V.18.L1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>2742</td>
<td>V.18L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.10</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>I.4.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.11</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>I.4.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.12</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.13</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>I.5.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.14</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>I.5.L10</td>
<td>?1–3</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.15</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>I.Ba3/4.L8a</td>
<td>3i</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>Lattice decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.16</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>I.2.L2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.17</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.18</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.19</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.20</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.21</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.22</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>I.5.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.23</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>I.Ba 4/5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.24</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>I.1.1962/F5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Generic Form : Bowl/Dish (Figs 95 &amp; 96)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.25</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>u/s</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Internal &amp; external decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.26</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>I.4. L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.27</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.28</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.29</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.30</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.31</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.32</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>I.Ba4/5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.33</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>III/V/VI.C.L1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.34</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.35</td>
<td>2713</td>
<td>V.18.L1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.36</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>I.4.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.37</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.38</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>III.A.Grave 3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 95 Roman pottery 1–27
Figure 96 Roman pottery 28–56
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96.39</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>2.4/5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.40</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>I.5.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4/5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.41</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>I.Ba4/5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>2.4/5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.42</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>III/VI. 10.L1–L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.4/5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.43</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.44</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.45</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>I.6.L3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.46</td>
<td>1144</td>
<td>V.C.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.47</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>III/VI. 14.L1–L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.48</td>
<td>2879</td>
<td>V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generic Form: Beaker/Cup/Tankard (Fig 96)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96.49</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.50</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>V.?C.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.51</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.52</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.53</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>I.Ba5/6.L11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generic Form: Jug/Flagon (Fig 96)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96.54</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>5.1(or 1.5)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generic Form: Lid (Fig 96)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96.55</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.56</td>
<td>1732</td>
<td>V.14.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabric: Type A2**

**Generic Form: Jar (Fig 97)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97.57</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.58</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>I.Ba1/2.L7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.59</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>II.Z.1962/F7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.60</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>II/VI.B. Grave 17</td>
<td>?5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.61</td>
<td>2858</td>
<td>V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.62</td>
<td>2940</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.63</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.64</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>I.1.1962/F9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.65</td>
<td>2737</td>
<td>V.18.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.66</td>
<td>2856</td>
<td>V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.67</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>I.3.L9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.68</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>I.?1 and/or?4. 1962/F13</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.69</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>II.A.1962/ F17,Grave 62/7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.70</td>
<td>2732</td>
<td>V.18.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generic Form: Bowl/Dish (Fig 97)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97.71</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>I.2.L2–L3</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.72</td>
<td>2564</td>
<td>V.17.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.73</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>I.Ba2/3.L9</td>
<td>?2–3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.74</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>V.18.L1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.75</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>I.2.L2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 97 Roman pottery 57–85
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97.76</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>III/V.B. Grave 16</td>
<td>?5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.77</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>I.Ba1/2.L7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.78</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>V.14.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generic Form: Beaker/Cup/Tankard (Fig 97)**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97.79</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.80</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.81</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1.3.L2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.82</td>
<td>2845</td>
<td>V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.2 (or 1.5)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.83</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>I.6.L3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.84</td>
<td>2941</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generic Form: Jug/Bottle (Fig 97)**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97.85</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>I.1.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabric Type A3**

**Generic Form: Jar (Fig 98)**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93.86</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>I.4.L3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.87</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>V.?C.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.88</td>
<td>2744</td>
<td>V.18.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.89</td>
<td>2794</td>
<td>V.18/20.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.90</td>
<td>2796</td>
<td>V.18/20.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.91</td>
<td>2939</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.92</td>
<td>3022</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Linear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.93</td>
<td>3083</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Lattice decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.94</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3 or earlier</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.95</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>I/II/III.–.1962/F1, Grave 62/1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.96</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>V.C.Grade 13</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.97</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>III/V.B. Grave 16</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.98</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>III.11.L1–L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.99</td>
<td>2862</td>
<td>V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.100</td>
<td>3084</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>Lattice &amp; curvilinear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.101</td>
<td>3092</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.102</td>
<td>3095</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>Curvilinear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.103</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Lattice decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.104</td>
<td>3139</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Lattice decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.105</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>I.5.L5</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.106</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>I.5.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.107</td>
<td>2680</td>
<td>V.18.L1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.108</td>
<td>2844</td>
<td>V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.109</td>
<td>3137</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generic Form: Bowl/Dish (Fig 99)**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99.110</td>
<td>2773</td>
<td>V.18.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.111</td>
<td>2909</td>
<td>V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 98 Roman pottery 86–109
Figure 99 Roman pottery 110–132
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99.112</td>
<td>3019</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.113</td>
<td>3024</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.114</td>
<td>3031</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.115</td>
<td>3112</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.116</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>V.B–C.F32</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.117</td>
<td>3013</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.118</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>III.16.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Lattice decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.119</td>
<td>2943</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Lattice decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.120</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>I.3.L2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.121</td>
<td>2727</td>
<td>V.18.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Colander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.122</td>
<td>3020</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generic Form: Beaker/Cup (Fig 99)**

| 99.123      | 2938   | V.18.L4         | –            | 3.3  | –                             |
| 99.124      | 3080   | V.18.L5         | –            | 3.3  | –                             |
| 99.125      | 3081   | V.18.L5         | –            | 4.2  | –                             |

**Generic Form: Flagon/Jug (Fig 99)**

| 99.126      | 582    | I.5 Ext E.L1    | 6            | 5.1  | –                             |

**Generic Form: Lid (Fig 99)**

| 99.127      | 3151   | V.18.L5         | –            | 6.1  | –                             |

**Fabric Type A4**

**Generic Form: Bowl (Fig 99)**

| 99.128      | 455    | I.5.L3          | 4            | 2.1  | –                             |
| 99.129      | 630    | I.5 Ext E.L11   | 3            | 2.1  | –                             |

**Generic Form: Jar (Fig 99)**

| 99.130      | 921    | II.A.1962/F18, Grave 62/8 – | 1.2 | – |
| 99.131      | 2969   | V.18.L4         | –            | 1.5  | –                             |

**Fabric Type A5**

**Generic Form: Jar (Figs 99–100)**

| 99.132      | 369    | I.4.L5          | ?3           | 1.6  | Thumbed rim                  |
| 100.133     | 821    | III.VI.B.L1     | –            | 1.6  | –                             |
| 100.134     | 1097   | III/VI. BaC/D.L2 | –        | 1.6  | –                             |
| 100.135     | 2762   | V.18.L2         | –            | 1.6  | –                             |

**Fabric Group B: Type B1**

**Generic Form: Jar (Fig 100)**

| 100.136     | 281    | I.3.L3          | 4            | 1.1  | –                             |
| 100.137     | 453    | I.5.304         | ?3 or 4      | 1.1  | –                             |
| 100.138     | 520    | I.5.L5          | ?3           | 1.1  | –                             |
| 100.139     | 765    | I.Ba4/5.F18     | ?3           | 1.1  | –                             |
| 100.140     | 792    | II/III.VI. A.L1 | –            | 1.1  | Hatched decoration           |
| 100.141     | 1175   | V.?C.L3         | –            | 1.1  | Lattice decoration, incised 'X' |
| 100.142     | 580    | I.5 Ext E.L1    | 6            | 1.2/4| –                             |
| 100.143     | 1695   | V.A,B,C.F30, u/s | –        | 1.2/4| –                             |
| 100.144     | 2631   | V.17.?L3        | –            | 1.5  | –                             |
Figure 100 Roman pottery 133–153
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No, Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic Form: Bowl/Dish (Figs 100–101)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.145</td>
<td>335 I.3.L8a–L10</td>
<td>?1–3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.146</td>
<td>339 I.3.L8a</td>
<td>3i</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Linear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.147</td>
<td>580 I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.148</td>
<td>746 I.Ba3/6.F14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.149</td>
<td>3027 V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.150</td>
<td>3111 V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Linear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.151</td>
<td>580 I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.152</td>
<td>643 I.5 Ext E.L11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.153</td>
<td>678 I.6.L3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.154</td>
<td>679 I.6.L3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.155</td>
<td>2778 V.18.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Curvilinear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.156</td>
<td>2908 V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.157</td>
<td>294 I.2.L2–L3</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.158</td>
<td>301 I.2.L8</td>
<td>3i</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Curvilinear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.159</td>
<td>580 I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.160</td>
<td>2899 V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Curvilinear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.161</td>
<td>2894 V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.162</td>
<td>2895 V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.163</td>
<td>3043 V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Curvilinear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.164</td>
<td>379 I.4.L6</td>
<td>3ii</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.165</td>
<td>439 I.4.F18</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Curvilinear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.166</td>
<td>732 I.Ba3/4.L8a</td>
<td>3i</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Curvilinear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.167</td>
<td>835 III.A.Grave 2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.168</td>
<td>1052 III.C.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Curvilinear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.169</td>
<td>3708 VII.Ba at NE end of F30.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Curvilinear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.170</td>
<td>579 I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.171</td>
<td>3082 V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Curvilinear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic Form: Beaker/Cup (Fig 101)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.172</td>
<td>1022 VI.A,B,C.L1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>One handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic Form: Lid (Fig 101)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.173</td>
<td>1340 V.D.Grave 23</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fabric Type: B2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generic Form: Jar (Figs 101–102)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.174</td>
<td>293 I.2.L2–L3</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.175</td>
<td>709 I.Ba1/2.L10</td>
<td>?1-3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.176</td>
<td>2754 V.18.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.177</td>
<td>2870 V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.178</td>
<td>2889 V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.179</td>
<td>3053 V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.180</td>
<td>881 I.1.1962/F5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.181</td>
<td>2981 V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.2/4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 101 Roman pottery 154–182
Figure 102 Roman pottery 183–205
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101.182</td>
<td>2970</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.183</td>
<td>3146</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.184</td>
<td>2854</td>
<td>V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.185</td>
<td>2979</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Generic Form: Bowl/Dish (Fig 102)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102.186</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>u/s</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.187</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>I.4.F18</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.188</td>
<td>2910</td>
<td>V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.189</td>
<td>2912</td>
<td>V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.190</td>
<td>3037</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.191</td>
<td>3110</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.192</td>
<td>2709</td>
<td>V.18.L1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.193</td>
<td>3124</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.194</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>III.C.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.195</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>III.Ba12/13 L1–L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.196</td>
<td>2882</td>
<td>V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Curvilinear decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.197</td>
<td>3049</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.198</td>
<td>3150</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.199</td>
<td>1775</td>
<td>V.14.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>?Mortaria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Generic Form: Beaker/Cup/Tankard (Fig 102)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102.200</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>III.A.Grave 2</td>
<td>?5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.201</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>I.Ba4/5.F18</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Lattice decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.202</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>I.2.L2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>One handle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.203</td>
<td>2946</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Lattice decoration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.204</td>
<td>3078</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Lattice decoration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Generic Form: Flagon/Bottle (Fig 102)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>102.205</td>
<td>2726</td>
<td>V.18.L2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Generic Form: Lid (Fig 103)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.206</td>
<td>1696</td>
<td>V.A.B.C. F30,u/s</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.207</td>
<td>2883</td>
<td>V.18.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.208</td>
<td>3050</td>
<td>V.18.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fabric Group C: Type C1*

*Generic Form: Bowl/Dish (Fig 103)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.209</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>I.4.F18</td>
<td>?3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Young Type C 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.210</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Young Type C 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.211</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Young Type C 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.212</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Young Type C 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.213</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Young Type C 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.214</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Young Type C 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.215</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Young Type C759–64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.216</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Young Type C759–64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.217</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>I.3.L2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Young Type C 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.218</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>II.Z.1962/F8, Grave 62/5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Young Type C 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 103 Roman pottery 206–243
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.219</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>III/V/VI.C.L1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Young Type C 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.220</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>I.5.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Young Type C 97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generic Form: Beaker/Cup (Fig 103)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.222</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>I.3.L2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Young Type C22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.222</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>I.6.L3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Young Type C22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabric Type: C2**

**Generic Form: Beaker/Cup (Fig 103)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.223</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>I.6.L6</td>
<td>3ii</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Fulford Type 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generic Form: Flagon/Bottle (Fig 103)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.224</td>
<td>2723</td>
<td>V.18.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Fulford Type 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabric Type: C3**

**Generic Form: Bowl/Dish (Fig 103)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.225</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>III.16.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Fulford Type 66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabric Type: C4**

**Generic Form: Flagon/Bottle (Fig 103)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.227</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>V.C.Grave 19</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabric Type: C6**

**Generic Form: Beaker/Cup (Fig 103)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.230</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>III.16.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabric Group D: Type D1**

**Generic Form: Bowl/Dish (Fig 103)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.236</td>
<td>3073</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generic Form: Lid (Fig 103)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.237</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>III.16.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.238</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>V.14.Grave 38A</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabric Type D2**

**Generic Form: Jar (Fig 103)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.239</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>V/VLI4. Grave 37</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Generic Form: Bowl/Dish (Fig 103)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustration</th>
<th>HW No.</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.240</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>II/VI.17.L1–L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.241</td>
<td>2725</td>
<td>V.18.L2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illustration HW No. Context | Temple phase | Form | Other detail
--- | --- | --- | ---

**Fabric Group E: Type E1**

*Generic Form: Beaker/Cup (Fig 103)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HW No</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103.242</td>
<td>III.16.L3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.243</td>
<td>V.18.L5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl 35</td>
<td>V.C.Grave 20/21, u/s</td>
<td>?5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Moulded triton decoration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabric Group F: Type F1**

*Generic Form: Mortaria (Fig 104)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HW No</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104.244</td>
<td>III/VI.B.L1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabric Group F4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HW No</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104.245</td>
<td>I.5 Ext E.L1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Potter's stamp; M3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabric Type F5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HW No</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104.246</td>
<td>IV.Ba16/19.350</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>M21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fabric Type F6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HW No</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Temple phase</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Other detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104.247</td>
<td>IV.21/22.L1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>M27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB** The bulk of the Mortaria were originally numbered in a separately identified category M1–M30 (MF14.8.3b–9)

14.8.3b–6 Discussion

14.8.3b–6,i General comments An overall assessment of the Henley Wood pottery assemblage is conditioned by the limitations and difficulties encountered in establishing a full chronological sequence of events for the site. Spatial distributions are better documented, and the sample size is quite adequate for analytical purposes. It should be emphasised that the latter, calculated by means of whole vessel equivalents, is only a minimum estimation, as represented (primarily) by rim sherds and other distinctive types retained by the excavator; the possible number of vessels present may be considerably higher.

It is difficult to make a chronological comparison of type, fabric occurrence and frequency at Henley Wood. Only the buildings sequence of Area I was susceptible to any reasonably reliable ordering, and even here some contexts are open to reinterpretation or cannot always be exclusively associated with specific groups of pottery. The sample from this area (Fig 107) is less than 18% of the total Henley Wood assemblage and over one third of this was obtained from post-use contexts, ie those representing de-

*Figure 104 Roman pottery 244–247*
struction or desertion of the temple's site. Given these qualifications, any statistical evaluation of pre-4th-century pottery assemblages and thus changes in the Henley Wood corpus through time, will be difficult. For example all the assigned pre-4th-century contexts are represented by barely five vessel equivalents (MF Fig 124 and MF Table 70). It may therefore be most instructive to consider briefly the general character of the whole assemblage, its fabric and form representation origins, site distribution, and comparison with other local groups.

14.8.3b–6,ii Type fabric representation The overall corpus of pottery from Henley Wood is represented on Fig 105, quantified minimally as vessel equivalents. From this it is immediately apparent that the coarsewares of Groups A and B are overwhelmingly predominant. The local Congresbury wares account for over 60% (TFs A1, A2 and A3), while at least another 10% (TF B2) is also suspected to have been a relatively local product. The Dorset Black Burnished industry contributed over 17.4% of the remaining coarsewares (TF B1), while of the
remainder less than 10% were finer wares, mainly imported from further afield (Fig 106).

The predominance of Congresbury products (Group A) causes little surprise in view of the proximity of their source. The presence of earlier forms, eg Fig 96. Nos 39–41, 43, 48 & 53, and in some instances their recovery from pre-4th-century contexts in Area I suggest some Congresbury type wares in production by the 2nd century. The bulk however should be 4th-century products, corresponding with the probable floruit of the industry. Cooking and storage vessels predominate in these fabrics, although tablewares also feature; principally the bowls and dishes.

Dorset Black Burnished Industry products (B1) probably appeared in this area during the 2nd century and will have been a competitor to any local industry from that time. Cooking and storage vessels and the open tableware forms are once again the principal types, but proportionately the latter (bowls and dishes) are better represented (MF Pigs 125–6). Possibly this is a reflection of marketing patterns; Dorset Black Burnished tablewares being favoured above cooking/storage wares, and to some extent above the Congresbury tableware products. In even more direct competition were the products of a local imitative black burnished industry (B2). The latter's products closely mirror those from Dorset, although

a wider range of forms was available (Figs 101–3. Nos 174–208), and their quality is generally poorer. The presence of several earlier forms, eg Fig 102. Nos 201, 203 & 204, suggest that this industry also began in the 2nd century, probably stimulated by the appearance of the Dorset industry's wares.

The small group of finer wares at Henley Wood was almost exclusively tableware, although the Dorset and Congresbury industries together still supplied the majority, even of enclosed vessels (MF Table 71). Many of the finer wares represent importation of pottery from a considerable distance (Fig 106). Apart from a few sherds of Spanish amphorae, the Central and East Gaulish samian and other colour coat wares (E1 & E2) are the most distant imports and form the largest single group. Among the remainder products of both the Oxfordshire and New Forest industries are present; the former (C1) dominating the latter (C2) quantitatively, although each complementing the other's range of forms (enclosed vessels from the New Forest, principally bowls and mortaria from Oxfordshire).

14.8.3b–6,iii Function and distribution Given the primarily ritual and religious function of the site, the presence of pottery is likely to have a significance beyond straightforward domestic requirements. To examine the spatial characteristics of the assem-
blage the ceramic component of four distinct areas was analysed (Fig 107). The other areas were excluded by virtue of uncertain context attribution and generally smaller sample size. Superficially these areas show no great contrasts; an increased emphasis upon table wares in Areas III and IV for example may reflect nothing more than the much smaller samples available there. Since all available pottery is used, irrespective of phasing, this may also blur the picture. A simple functional breakdown of forms into three major categories – food preparation, storage and tableware – indicates roughly equal proportions of each category present in both Area I (temples) and Area V (temenos ditch). Areas III and IV show a trend towards a higher proportion of tablewares. The general similarity between the pottery spectrums of Areas I and V echoes that found within the full corpus of finds from these two areas (cf 10.6.3), and lends further support to the suggestion of the temenos ditch receiving much of the material associated with the temples at the time of desertion and ultimately their destruction, also from Structure 4 (cf 9.3 and 15.5).

The presence and character of the pottery assemblage from individual areas should be conditioned to some extent by original site function. Without a far more exhaustive examination of the material it is impossible to assess fully the post-discord mobility of ceramics on site. Joining sherds from distinctive vessels or fabric types have occasionally been identified (cf MF Table 60), but are too few to give any impression of coherent patterns of movement. Other than wholesale movements, such as that suggested between the temples area, Structure 4 and the temenos ditch, once broken most of the pottery probably remained close to its locality of use, particularly once the whole site was abandoned. Disturbance in the course of subsequent excavations for graves in the cemetery is likely to have been only local in effect.

Assuming that most of the pottery from Area I is associated with the sequence of religious buildings there and their functions, what may be deduced from the assemblage? Well over 70% of the vessels represented, principally jar and bowl forms, were associated functionally with either the preparation or storage of food, in roughly equal proportions; no more than 25% were identifiable as tablewares. Archaeological evidence for the activities so represented was sparse, and perhaps not to be anticipated at all in this context, although the rituals associated with the slaughter and sacrifice of animals attested on this site would explain the presence of all these categories here. Secondary religious functions or connotations for other classes of material from Henley Wood are referred to elsewhere (cf 14.2), and should be anticipated equally for pottery. The predominance of both storage and cooking vessels, principally jars, could in part be explained by their use as containers within the temple buildings, possibly for offerings or libations.

The similarity between the Area I ceramic spectrum and that from the temenos ditch (Area V) may already have been explained (above), although some additional deliberate deposition with a religious/ritual purpose could also have occurred prior to clearance of the temple contents and their suggested relocation.

The introduction of material from other sources and localities, during or prior to the final infilling of this ditch, could also be contributory. The likelihood that the enigmatic building in Area IV differed in function from the Area I structures may find some reflection in the ceramic spectrum. Unfortunately the sample is statistically too small for reliable comparison with Areas I or V, although the increase in tablewares in Areas III and IV hint at a greater emphasis upon food consumption and perhaps more domestic functions in this direction. No other more conventionally domestic structures or localities were excavated at Henley Wood, although their existence, ancillary to the religious site and thus potentially contributing to the pottery assemblage actually recovered, should not be discounted.

14.8.3b–6, iv Comparison with other assemblages
There are still too few published contemporary sites where analyses of the pottery corpus based upon type fabric and form characterisation has been undertaken. Of those few available two are chosen to represent on the one hand a closely adjacent site, Gatcombe, and on the other a site of similar function, West Hill Uley.

Gatcombe (Branigan 1977), the site of a large defended villa estate, lies less than 10km NE of Henley Wood. Although of quite different character, most of the buildings and contexts excavated (mainly working quarters) were of 4th-century date, and the bulk of the pottery corpus should therefore be directly contemporary with that from Henley Wood. It is apparent that the range of type fabrics present at Gatcombe is somewhat larger than at Henley Wood. This may in part be accounted for by the virtual absence of pre-4th-century pottery assemblages at the latter, but could also be some reflection of the relative scale and status of Henley Wood. Virtually all the Henley Wood fabrics can be paralleled at Gatcombe (MF14.8.3b–4), with Congresbury and black burnished ware fabrics dominating both assemblages. The greatest contrast lies in the relative proportions of these groups at each site. The ascendance of Congresbury wares over Dorset black burnished products at Henley Wood (60.3% to 17.4%) is largely reversed at Gatcombe (29.2% to 49.8%); a significant indicator of the relatively local importance of the Congresbury wares. Further insight into the relative importance and market impact of these products is provided by a third assemblage at Butcombe, SE and somewhat closer to Henley Wood and Congresbury (Fowler 1968a). Here the Congresbury products also dominated those of Dorset, but to a lesser extent (41.2% to 27%).

The occurrence of another suspected local product, a black burnished imitation (B2 at Henley Wood, TF5
Table 57 Pottery type fabric representation (with Fig 107)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Area I MVEs</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Area V MVEs</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>16.148</td>
<td>(39.3%)</td>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>13.589</td>
<td>(13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>2.498</td>
<td>(6.1%)</td>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>6.294</td>
<td>(6.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>3.683</td>
<td>(9.0%)</td>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>26.134</td>
<td>(26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
<td>A.4</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>(0.9%)</td>
<td>A.5</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>3.257</td>
<td>(7.9%)</td>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>8.993</td>
<td>(9.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>(2.4%)</td>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>5.955</td>
<td>(6.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.1</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.2</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>3.229</td>
<td>(7.9%)</td>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>4.942</td>
<td>(5.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>(0.8%)</td>
<td>A.2</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>(0.2%)</td>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>4.256</td>
<td>(4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>(0.2%)</td>
<td>A.4</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>2.531</td>
<td>(6.2%)</td>
<td>A.5</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>8.626</td>
<td>(8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>7.631</td>
<td>(7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
<td>D.1</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td>(0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.2</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>2.539</td>
<td>(2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Beakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>(7.9%)</td>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
<td>C.3</td>
<td>0.155</td>
<td>(0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.4</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.6</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td>(0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>(0.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flagons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>(1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>(2.4%)</td>
<td>A.3</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B.2</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.2</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D.1</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vessel Equivalents</td>
<td>41.061</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Vessel Equivalents</td>
<td>98.160</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MVE = minimum vessel equivalent)
125

Figure 107 Occurrence of Roman pottery finds in selected areas

at Gatcombe) is also worthy of comment. Their relative proportions, over 10% of the Henley Wood assemblage as against just over 2% at Gatcombe, strengthens the suggestion that this type was more local to Henley Wood, possibly another Congresbury product.

Comparisons between the fine ware products from both sites (specifically the colour coats) reveal some interesting variations, although overall the proportions do not vary too greatly (10.6% at Gatcombe to 8.0% at Henley Wood). This contrasts markedly with the much lower representation at Butcombe (2.2%), interpreted as a much lower status site than either Gatcombe or probably Henley Wood. The variation in relative proportions of samian present are perhaps most surprising between Gatcombe and Henley Wood in the 4th century. The high survival (3.6%) of samian at Henley Wood contrasts with a more
expected proportion at Gatcombe (1.7%) in this period. The role of Oxfordshire red colour coat ware as some replacement for samian is emphasised here (5.0%, at Gatcombe). In contrast the proportion of this import at Henley Wood is much lower (1.2%), the samian wares apparently remaining longer in currency and requiring less replacement. In view of the rarity of pre-4th-century contexts encountered at either site and their rather different character, a difference in the degree of use or function seems the most likely explanation for this discrepancy. A very high proportion of the Henley Wood samian was late, Central and East Gaulish products of the late 2nd and early 3rd centuries. This seems to contrast with the Gatcombe material which had none South Gaulish ware, although no details are available in publication. The very small group recovered at Cadbury Congresbury also appear rather different from the Henley Wood samian with the emphasis once again on earlier material (Burrow 1981, 121).

Finally, it is worth comparing the functional characteristics of the two assemblages. Breaking these down into just three basic attribute types the contrast is quite marked. At Henley Wood pottery whose prime function was for storage, and for cooking and food preparation, each comprised around 35% of the whole assemblage. Tablewares at about 30% formed a slightly smaller proportion. At Gatcombe over 65% of the vessels represent cooking or food preparation. 22.5% were for storage, while only just over 12% were identified as tablewares. To what extent this representation was biased by the character of the localities excavated at Gatcombe is unclear, but factors which may influence the Henley Wood corpus have already been suggested (above).

West Hill, Uley, Gloucestershire (Ellison 1980 and Woodward and Leach 1993) is a religious hilltop complex which includes a sequence of Romano-Celtic shrines overlooking the Severn Estuary, and is sited approximately 50km NE of Henley Wood. In this instance ceramic comparisons between the sites are best restricted to the 4th century when, like Henley Wood, West Hill appears to have been most active and flourishing. More specifically the comparison is restricted to pottery from the Romano-Celtic temple structures of this period and later, and to ?equivalent deposits of material thought to have been cleared out of those buildings, on both sites.

Overall, the quantity of pottery recovered at West Hill was considerably higher than at Henley Wood, by virtue of more extensive excavation and a greater structural complexity, both spatial and chronological. Quantification by minimum vessel equivalents gave a somewhat larger representation at Henley Wood in the contexts compared, although this may only reflect differences in the degree to which the temples areas were cleared and the extent to which the clearance deposits were excavated on each site. The relative proportions of vessels between the two localities on each site, 2:1 in favour of the dumped material at Henley Wood as against 3:1 at West Hill, suggests a more thorough clearance of the temple buildings at the latter. This suggestion is supported by subsequent phases of use for the West Hill temples site, for which there was little evidence (except burials) at Henley Wood.

The range of type fabrics current at West Hill, even during the 4th century, was evidently greater than at Henley Wood. This may reflect the greater structural complexity, cultural assemblage, and perhaps therefore, range of contacts and success enjoyed by the former site. The proportion of ?local greyware fabrics to imported Dorset black burnished ware at West Hill (50.6% to 15.7%) is similar to that at Henley Wood, ie better than 3:1 in favour of the former. On the Henley Wood model this would argue in favour of the alternative local coarseware source located quite close to West Hill, although the greywares here are a less homogenous group than the Congresbury products. Later in the 4th century the appearance of imported shell-tempered coarseware (7.6%), barely present at Henley Wood, was an additional factor as a potential rival to both the Dorset and more local coarsewares at West Hill.

The contrast between Henley Wood and West Hill in the representation of fine wares, some imported from a considerable distance, may argue further in favour of the latter’s superior status. Overall the proportion of fine wares at West Hill (24.2%) far exceeds that at Henley Wood (7.3%) in these comparable localities. As at Gatcombe (above) residual samian pottery formed a very small proportion of the West Hill assemblage (less than 1%) by this period. This is in marked contrast to Henley Wood where it comprises by far the largest single fine ware group (3.3%). The representation of Oxfordshire red colour coat ware is also relevant here; at West Hill overwhelmingly the dominant fine ware (15.5%), but comprising less than 2% of the Henley Wood corpus. As a plausible late Roman functional substitute for samian, this colour coat was evidently required for that purpose in considerably greater quantity and proportion at West Hill, A much closer correspondence exists between the character of the samian assemblages, both of which were well weathered, comprised predominantly later 2nd and early 3rd-century types, and were generally undistinguished.

It is not possible to make an exact prime functional comparison between the two assemblages although it is clear that tablewares formed a somewhat higher proportion of the West Hill group, while storage vessels were in a minority. Some explanations for the function of pottery within a religious shrine and precinct have already been advanced (above). At West Hill and in contrast to Henley Wood (cf 14.12.4. below), the recovery of enormous quantities of animal bone (principally goat/sheep) from the temple’s clearance deposits indicate a major role for both animal sacrifice and perhaps the consumption of its products, in the religious observances at that site. Such differences of emphasis in ritual between two functionally similar sites also demonstrates the potential of such factors to influence the character and representation within a pottery corpus.
14.9 Building/services (cf MF14.3.1)

14.9.1 Introduction

Buildings and structures identified by their remains on archaeological sites are as much artefacts as items within any of the categories so far considered. Although rarely if ever removed as an entity from their primary contexts (unless through destruction), the components of buildings will frequently be present and available as a sample of the original. At Henley Wood the bulk of this sample was obtained from successive phases of the temple buildings – Temples 2 and 3. Samples of the principal inorganic components were kept (organic materials not surviving), along with other accessories. These may be subdivided here into components of the structure, eg the stones, mortar, roof tiles, plaster, etc; and accessories such as nails and staples, many of which are reflectors of the perished organic components.

A selection of items representing these subdivisions is illustrated and described here, the full catalogue appearing in MF14.3.1.

14.9.2 Building components

These can be subdivided into several categories according to material and function. As referred to above, the majority derive from the temple structures, some to a particular phase. A larger sample however is unspecified or even of uncertain origin. At least one other building stood for a time at Henley Wood – Structure 4 – and some building components almost certainly derive from it (cf 9.4) Where appropriate the significance of each species component is considered separately below.

14.9.2a Building stone

This is not the place for a full discussion of building morphology and attempted reconstructions, but a brief review of principal identified components will be useful here. That the buildings were substantially of stone can be assumed from the surviving remains as recorded. The local Carboniferous Limestone, of which Henley Wood and the neighbouring hill of Cadbury Congresbury are composed, is a durable and easily obtained raw material for building. The foundations of Temples 2 and 3 were almost exclusively of this stone, and two samples were taken from the cella walls of Temple 3. Of Temple 1 and Structure 4 there is less certainty, although the latter apparently had stone footings of predominantly Carboniferous Limestone. The use of at least one quernstone (ST68) within the fabric of Structure 4 suggests some reuse of stone for building, and possibly its derivation from redundant structures. To what extent timber was used, beyond such essential components as roof supports, door and window frames, and perhaps floors, is impossible to estimate with any precision. No earlier timber phase preceding Temples 2 and 3 was identified, despite the indications of pre-3rd century, and perhaps pre-Roman, religious activity provided by some of the finds. Temple 2 however may not have had a stone superstructure (cf 6.6.3b). Rebuilding in stone was widespread in later Roman Britain on both secular and religious sites, and there is every reason to assume that Henley Wood followed suit in this.

Carboniferous Limestone, although very durable, is not amenable to very precise shaping or cutting, and an oolitic limestone freestone was used for some detailing in the temple buildings, if not Structure 4. This stone, identified as Bathstone from the Jurassic Great Oolite series (by the late FW Anderson, for the AM Laboratory) may have been used for sculptural or decorative elements of the temple (Fig 108.144, ST18) and was certainly used upon the roof. Fragments of roof coping stones indicate its use for Temple 3 (cf 6.6.4e) while further fragments from the temenos ditch could derive from a similar arrangement for Structure 4 (Fig 108.142–3, ST12 & 13; and Fig 108.145–6, ST18 & 47). Of the roofs themselves, the only other evidence to survive are Pennant sandstone roof tiles scattered as fragments across the site, of which samples were kept (Fig 108.147–8, ST64 & 65). There was no evidence indicating the use of ceramic roof tiles, and evidence for any perishable roof materials such as thatch did not survive.

The following specimen pieces are illustrated:

Fig 108.142 (ST12) Context: I.5.L3 Segment of a roof coping stone in Bath freestone (section). Probably originating from either the cella or ambulatory roof of Temple 3.
Fig 108.143 (ST13) Context: I.5.L3 Part of a badly weathered cylindrical pointed stone finial in Bath freestone. This was probably located at the Temple 3 cella roof apex or possibly above a porch roof, either position accounting for its heavily weathered state (cf 6.6.4e).
Fig 108.144 (ST18) Context: I.Ba3/6.F14 Rectangular weathered fragment of Bath freestone, possibly belonging to an exterior frieze or panel built into an elevation of Temple 3.
Fig 108.145 & 146 (ST47 & 48) Context: V.18.L2 Two segments of Bath freestone roof-coping stones (differing profiles). These were recovered from the temenos ditch and may originate from Temples 2 and 3 or from Structure 4.
Fig 108.147 & 148 (ST64 & 65) Context: /s Two Pennant sandstone roofing tiles (one incomplete), both lozenge-shaped and pierced by nail-fixing holes.

14.9.2b Window glass

Only one fragment of window glass (blue-green) was recognised and identified by the late Dorothy Charlesworth, but is not illustrated here (GL9, from I.L8a). Its location raises the possibility that Temple 3 had glazed windows, perhaps in the upper storey of the cella (cf 6.6.4d).
Figure 108 Building stone 142–148
14.9.2c Wall plaster

Two principal groups of wall plaster were recovered, along with a few additional scattered pieces. None are illustrated here, but detailed descriptions are given in MF Tables 2 and 5. The largest group is associated with the temple buildings, from I.L9, interpreted as destruction material from Temple 2; and from I.L8+L8a, make-up within the cella area of Temple 3 (cf 6.6.3–4). From the wall plaster in I.L9, (WP4, WP5 and WP8) it may be postulated that both rooms of that building were decorated with painted plaster (cf 6.6.3b). From the fragments recovered and by analogy with better preserved examples, the original design was probably a series of predominantly cream/white panels painted with imitation green marbling or perhaps foliage, and set within red ochre borders (Davey & Ling 1982, 30–7). This apparently simple white ground scheme is more characteristic of post-2nd-century AD wall painting, which would accord with other evidence for the date of Temple 2 at Henley Wood.

Similarly decorated fragments from I.L8+L8a suggest that Temple 3 was plastered and decorated in a very comparable style (cf 6.6.4e). Such panel schemes could have a long life (cf Davey and Ling 1982, 30–1).

The second, smaller, group of wall plaster, including WP14, was recovered mainly from the north end of the temenos ditch (MF Fig 118). A cream-white ground with pink or red ochre borders and panels appears once again to have been the basic design. Similar fragments associated with Structure 4 (WP18) suggest the source of the temenos ditch material, and it may therefore be legitimate to postulate Structure 4 as having at least one enclosed room with decorated walls (cf 9.3).

With one or two exceptions all the wall plaster was backed by a common mortar type (Type i) as defined below. The flat surfaces to the back of the wall plaster suggests that it was applied to stone.

14.9.2d Mortar

In addition to the mortar backing for the wall plaster fragments several additional samples of mortar were collected from the site. By far the majority was of fairly uniform composition, in appearance a pale buff-pink sandy matrix speckled with moderate quantities of white lime or chalk, grey angular limestone fragments and smaller amounts of red-brown iron stone (Type i). This was presumably a locally mixed matrix, varying only slightly in texture and proportions of components, and was used both as the mortar bonding for stone buildings, certainly in Area I, and as a base for plastered walls and painted walls at Henley Wood. A variation, characterised by its cream-white sandy matrix incorporating quartz sand and limestone fragments (Type ii), was occasionally encountered. No particular correlation between this second type, and any particular building or structural phase, or type of wall plaster, could be detected in so small a group.

None is illustrated here, further details and the full corpus being reserved for MF14.3.1 and the archive index, ARC 3.6.

In only one instance is a sample (of Type ii mortar) known to have been obtained directly from an in situ structure, ie MO1 from the steps I.238 between the east ambulatory and cella of the Period 3ii temple building. The poor preservation of mortar prevented different building phases or structures at Henley Wood being identified through any variations in mortar types.

14.9.2e Fired clay

Two fragments of decorated ceramic box flue tile from the Temple 3ii ambulatory (I.5.L6) and from temple destruction levels (I.5.L3) should really be classed among building accessories and services (below). Their presence here as a reflection of their original function may be misleading relative to this building. The possibility of a heating system in a building on or near the excavated site should not be discounted, but some other and unknown secondary purpose is more likely to account for their presence. See 14.8.3b–6 for a discussion of possible motives behind the import of a range of ceramics to the site.

More direct structural evidence is provided by fragments of fired clay daub, some with wattle impressions (only BC1, from 1.5Ext E.L1, clearly). A sparse scatter of such material suggests no particular grouping or association with a known structure. Their presence is most likely to be explicable either as the degraded superstructure of Temple 2 (cf 6.6.3b) or the remains of some subsidiary building or annex to the religious buildings on the site, or perhaps as a trace of Structure 1 or some unknown predecessor.

None of this material is illustrated but is fully catalogued in MF14.3.1 and described in more detail in the archive index, ARC 3.6.

14.9.3 Building accessories/services

The material considered under this subsection is perhaps best defined as that secondary to the prime structural building components. In this instance items which are for the most part to be interpreted as accessories to building construction, principally the nails, studs and staples used in wooden structures. Within this group the reliability of certain attributions may sometimes be in doubt, while certain items considered elsewhere, eg under Fittings and Furnishings, might more correctly be classified here.

A selection of the nail types recovered are illustrated here, the full catalogue appearing in MF14.3.1. While groups of nails were certainly associated with excavated structures, they were also distributed widely across the site in no particular pattern (MF Fig 118).
Figure 109 Building accessories 149–158, and crucible 162

Nails, Fig 109

109.149 (IR10) Context: I.3.L8
Small dome-headed iron nail, square-sectioned shank.

Small flat-headed iron nail, square-sectioned shank.

109.151 (IR17) Context: I.5 EXT E.L1
Flat-headed iron nail or clamp, square-sectioned shank.

109.152 (IR21) Context: III/VI.B.L1
Dome-headed iron stud with a short square shank.

109.153 (IR34) Context: V.B–C.F31
Flat-headed iron nail or stud, short square-sectioned shank.

109.154 (IR70) Context: V/VII.20.377
Large flat-headed iron nail, square-sectioned shank.

109.155 (IR71) Context: V/VII.20.377
Dome-headed iron nail or stud, short square-sectioned shank.

109.156 (IR89) Context: IV.Ba16/19.350
Small T-shaped iron nail or staple, square-sectioned shank.

Dome-headed iron nail, square-sectioned shank.

One of two flat-headed iron nails with square-sectioned shank.

14.10 Religious/votive (cf MF14.3.1)

14.10.1 Introduction

The identity of Henley Wood as a primarily religious site rests largely upon comparanda of structures, layout and objects, from elsewhere in Roman Britain and the Western Empire. The remains of successive buildings, some of classic Romano-Celtic temple form and set within a ditched enclosure upon a hill top, provide the strongest clues to the site’s identity. An association of characteristic religious artefacts or evidence for devotional practices, strengthens this interpretation. Many of the finds categories or individual items within them, could, by implication of their presence at Henley Wood, have religious and ritual connotations. Some indeed may be very specific, as for example the suspected offerings of coins, brooches, and animal sacrifices, or the components of temple buildings, their fittings and furnishings (cf 15.6). Wherever appropriate the potential for such interpretations or associations are discussed under each category or sub-group.

Despite this, the fact remains that in almost every instance interpretation depends upon context rather than inherent religious identity. If applying that criteria, remarkably little material was recovered which qualifies for inclusion in this group. Virtually everything else is subject to some alternative functional interpretation.

The bronze nude female figurine (BZ66) is without doubt the most important and unequivocally ‘religious’ object found at Henley Wood (Fig 110.161 & Pls 30–33). Its likely identity as a fertility goddess, of early 1st-century AD date, and parallels are discussed by Martin Henig (below, 14.10.2a).

What its significance for Henley Wood may be is more problematic. Miniature figurines of deities, usually in copper alloy, are widespread as individual finds or as small groups on temple sites throughout Roman Britain. In most instances the deity will be identifiable, normally a member of the Roman Pantheon, and thus some clue afforded to the identity of the gods or goddesses venerated at a particular
site, at least in their Roman forms. The Henley Wood figurine may well provide such a clue at this site, but from her essentially Celtic representation no close identification is possible.

The outstanding interest of this figurine is its suggested pre-Roman date. Quite apart from its intrinsic importance, its presence probably signifies an earlier origin for the religious cult associated with the site than the evidence of structures alone can suggest. Such an object will probably have been venerated for many decades – perhaps centuries – at Henley Wood (cf Section 15). It was found beneath the surface of the temple precinct (cf Section 8). Whether or not it was sealed beneath that precinct cannot be ascertained, but a deliberate concealment implying continued respect and veneration even when the temple was abandoned or destroyed, is very likely (Henig 1984, 225). The careful burial of a limestone head belonging to Mercury, the principal deity at the West Hill temple site, Uley, Gloucestershire, implies a similar circumstance (Ellison 1980, 305–25).

14. 10.2 The bronze figurine

14.10.2a The bronze figurine, by Martin Henig

**Fig II.161, p1s 30–33 (BZ66) Context: III.10.350**

Standing female figure; height 75mm, maximum width 20mm, weight 60gm. She is nude, apart from a plaited band around the hair and a notched and grooved collar around the neck representing a twisted torque. The modelling of her body is much simplified – she holds her arms down by her sides but her hands are clasped before her belly; neither hands nor feet are clearly differentiated. Her breasts are pendulous but do not project sharply from her chest like those of the Aust figurine (see below). Her physiognomy is almost worn away – thus her nose is now scarcely apparent at all, but her ears, evidently large, are marked by depressions in the metal – and a slit-like mouth is still clearly visible. The most prominent features are two close-set and deep circular holes which mark the position of her eyes. These were probably of glass. Traces of infill survive in the left hand socket. Originally the figure appears to have been mounted on a stand, as is suggested by the circular socket or rivet hole between her feet. Excessive wear to her figure, and the face in particular, may indicate regular handling during rituals associated with the cult.

The closest parallel is a rather larger figurine from Aust by Severn, also in Avon (Ellis 1900; Cunliffe 1974, 147, Pl 22b). This is female, has arms straight down her sides, and smaller but projecting breasts. Her physiognomy is similar, above all in the recessed eye-sockets, one of which still contains a glass eye. The Aust figurine has long been claimed as an Iberian import of the 4th or 3rd century BC, but the comparison with true Iberian bronzes is unconvincing (AlvARES-Ossorio 1941) and it is better to see it too as a native Iron Age figurine, dating from not long before the Roman period. Indeed, in so far as it had any archaeological associations these too seem to be Roman, as samian pottery was also found in the cliff at Aust.

The use of glass eyes at the very beginning of the Roman period (c AD 43) is confirmed by their presence in a figurine portraying Mars from Sheepen, Colchester (inf David Clarke). The curious ‘Iberian’ head dress on the Aust figure may be compared with the head dress of a woman moulded on the body of a Roman black pottery vessel from Colliton Park, Dorchester (Drew and Collingwood 1987, 14 and Pl VIII,a). This curious applique has eyes made separately and luted into the face. It is tempting to see this as a representation of the same fertility goddess. More distantly related, but of bronze, and again almost certainly Roman, is the large breasted and kilted ‘Venus’ figurine from the Woodeaton temple near Oxford (Kirk 1949, 31 No 1, Pl IV, B).

The head of the Henley Wood figure has a general resemblance to those of other Iron Age heads of the 1st century BC and 1st century AD, including that on a linch pin terminal from Castle Gotha, St Austell, Cornwall (Saunders 1963, 49) – mounts on the Aylesford and Baldock buckets (Stead 1971); the head of a boar or pig from Duncton Hill, Dorset (Henig and Keene 1985); and the anthropomorphic terminal (perhaps from a whip) found at Chalton, Hants, which I now believe to be pre-Roman (see Henig in Cunliffe 1976, 62, there proposing a late Roman date). The line of the hair – though not developed into a band – makes an interesting point of comparison with the Henley Wood bronze.

The wearing of a torque, a Celtic symbol of power, is a feature to be seen on some figures from Gaul, probably pre-Roman in date (Boucher 1976, 36, 174, 220), such as those from Bouray and Neuvey-Pailloux. It is also paralleled on figurines of the Roman period – although here the torque is added in precious metal (eg Mercury, Britannia 3, 1972, 330 Pl XXV, B & C).

The outstanding importance of the figurines from Aust and Henley Wood is that they date to a period before Roman influence was widely established in Britain. They display a passing resemblance to Archaic Greek and Etruscan Korai and Koroi, and perhaps we should seek their derivation ultimately in the art of Liguria where Greek Massilia dominated its native hinterland – The Squatting Warriors from Roquepertuse come to mind (Megaw 1970, 135, No 212) – or even more in the art of Etruscan north Italy and Liguria. The stele of a standing man from Hirschlanden, a native work with manifestly Etruscan connections, has an exact similar placing of its arms (Megaw 1970, 47, No 12). However these are generally thought to be rather earlier in date, the Roquepertuse figures c 4th century BC and the Hirschlanden stele, 6th century. A number of early bronzes have been found in Gaul – none is very close to ours in style, but the lines of influence proposed are with North Italian bronzes (Boucher 1976, ch 1). Some such as the Neuvey-en-Sullias group may belong only shortly before the Roman conquest of Gaul.

The identity of the figure remains a mystery. It is
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clear that her nudity is significant; indeed Pliny writes of women in Britain appearing naked at festivals (Natural History XXII.2). Graham Webster (1986, 66), in noting that 'the Celts regarded [female nudity] as very powerful magic', cites this passage and mentions two Roman period 'Mother goddesses' carved in stone from Caerwent and Carrawburgh respectively. A wooden idol from Ballachulish, Argyllshire, figured by Miranda Green, is of uncertain date but perhaps contemporary with the Henley Wood bronze. 'It is naked with an emphasised pudenda which suggests its sexual/fertility symbolism' (Green 1986, 76 and Fig 5). There is a tendency to call all such female deities mother-goddesses, but while this is only inference, we must remember that the concept of fertility has a much wider context (Green 1986, 72–102; Webster 1986, 63–6). The Henley Wood figurine is a native counterpart to the more familiar Greek Aphrodite and Roman Venus and the very ideas this little image epitomises are, indeed, taken up in the Roman period in Gaul and Britain by mass-produced pipe-clay figurines depicting Venus – certainly as far as iconography is concerned however she was regarded and invoked by her humbler worshippers (Green 1986, 94–5).

14.10.3 Stone panel fragment

The most positive indicator of a Romano-British religious site is normally provided by epigraphic evidence. This may not only give the name or names of the presiding deities, but can sometimes give clues to some of the rituals or beliefs involved. Little however was recovered from excavation at Henley Wood to shed light upon such matters (but cf 15.6). The potential significance of styli from the site has been considered (14.6.2e above), but no writing tables etc were recovered.

The bronze octagonal ring (14.5.4c and Fig 89.36, BZ58) carries the only clear Inscription from the site and might therefore be legitimately included within this group of artefacts as a primarily ritual or votive object. Its meaning has not been yet deciphered and thus its true significance remains obscure.

No items of stone statuary or altars were recognised at Henley Wood, the closest such discovery being a fragment of an inscribed stone panel (ST1). This fragment, found in topsoil above the Temple 3 cella (6.6.7 above), appears to have been part of an inscription rather than an altar. Only one rather Indistinct letter 'M' can be deciphered, from which little may be surmised. It is possible that this fragment belonged to a dedicatory inscription set into the building, probably naming at least the principal deity at Henley Wood.

Fig 110.159 (ST1) Context: 1.3.L1
Bottom left corner fragment of a stone panel of Purbeck limestone. Face shows the bottom left corner of a raised border enclosing an inscription of at least two lines. An indistinctly inscribed letter 'M' begins the upper line; traces of other letters adjacent and below.

At least one further line of inscription above these two could be inferred, but it is difficult to estimate the original size and arrangement of the panel.

14.10.4 Bronze leaf

Fig 110.160 (BZ3) Context: 1.3.L2
Leaf-shaped copper alloy plaque, with lightly incised chevron ornamentation representing veining or feathering on its convex face. This appears to be a crudely-executed example of a leaf plaque, a specific class of votive found widely on Romano-Celtic temple sites in Britain (Toynbee 1978).

14.11 Industrial (cf MF14.3.1-2)

14.11.1 General comments

No direct evidence of industrial processes or activity was recognised at Henley Wood, although some waste products were recovered (SL1–SL5). These are identified by Justine Bayley (MF 14.11.2). Perhaps the most significant of these was the fragment of a crucible (Fig 109.162, SL5), found in topsoil, with residues from copper alloy smelt adhering. The on-site production of certain items associated with the religious cult at Henley Wood could provide the context for this item. Evidence at other temple sites suggests the same practice. At West Hill, Uley, for example, hearths and ovens associated with lead and copper alloy waste within a separate building, may have been engaged in the production of the lead 'curse' tablets and other classes of copper alloy votive objects present so abundantly on that site (Ellison 1980, 305–25).

What, if any, were the products at Henley Wood? Cheap votive trinkets were probably available to devotees and worshipers at the shrine, either for deposition within the temple building or elsewhere within the precinct. It would not therefore be surprising if some of these were actually manufactured on or near the site. The other fragments of vitrified clay (SL1–SL3) could have originated as a by-product of smelting processes; but all were found in contexts overlying the temples. One fragment of iron slag (SL4), from Area IV, would indicate rather more substantial processes, although this may be a stray piece, perhaps even associated with the evidence for later iron mining which destroyed part of the site to the NE.

Several pieces of waste lead melt, possibly casting fragments, were found, scattered across the site. Few other identifiable lead artefacts were recovered, and all the waste could easily derive from accidental destruction. Some lead may well have been employed in buildings, as for example lead roof flashing.

With the exception of the crucible fragment, none of this industrial material is illustrated. The full catalogue and index appears in MF14.3.1.

Fig 109.162 (SL5) Context: III/IV/V.19.L1
Part of a shallow, handmade crucible, probably of A1 pottery fabric. Slag with traces of copper and zinc adhering to the exterior surface.
14.12 Environmental (cf MF 14.3.1–2)

14.12.1 Introduction

Two groups of material qualify in this category, geological samples and faunal remains. The former were collected quite extensively from the site and subdivided into samples of local geological formations, and a series of beach pebbles. The locally derived material includes samples of the Carboniferous Limestone formations upon which Henley Wood is sited, and of the nearby Triassic sandstone and conglomerate. Within the limestone occur iron ores of haematite and limonite, also sampled, and probably the subject of quarrying to the north and east of the site. The beach pebbles, although wholly natural in origin, do not occur as constituents of a natural deposit on the hill. For this reason they are grouped separately in a miscellaneous category in 14.13 (below) as possible artefacts. As will be demonstrated, many of the faunal remains have connotations more pertinent to the religious use than to the environment or human economy of Henley Wood.

14.12.2 Geological samples

As stated above, samples of local stone were collected from the site, presumably to provide a representative selection of such material. None is illustrated here but the full assemblage is listed in MF14.3.1–2. A report (unnumbered) by the late F W Anderson for the Ancient Monuments Laboratory (HBMC) identified these samples among the complete assemblage of stone (including artefacts) recovered from the site, and is lodged in the site archive (ARC 3.6). These include samples of the local grey Carboniferous Limestone (ST5, I.1,2,Bal/2.?228; ST26, III/IV/V. 19.L1), local siltstone (ST25, V.14.L3) and a grey-green fine Triassic sandstone (ST9, I.3.L9). Samples of natural haematite iron ore, the object of recent mining, were also identified (ST2, I.–.u/s; ST20, I.5 Ext E.L11).

14.12.3 Fauna and flora

One sample of carbonised oakwood (Quercus spp, identified by Susan Limbrey, was taken from the site (CH1, Context: I.Ba2/3.F19). The calcareous free-draining environment of Henley Wood was inimical to the preservation of organic remains and no such material, nor any suitable localised environments were encountered during the excavation.

14.12.4 Animal bones

In the primarily calcareous environment of Henley Wood skeletal remains were generally well preserved, although conditions were locally variable. To what extent the animal remains recovered were representative of assemblages formerly present on the site is impossible to say. No information is available as to any sampling strategy which may have been employed in collecting the material. Quantitatively the sample is in any case insufficient for reliable statistical analysis of species populations or their character. The species list (Table 58 below) identifies at least fifteen varieties of domestic and wild mammals, birds, and fish, represented by a collection of a little over 200 individual bones. These are listed in MF14.3.1–2 and identified with some additional detail in an archive report (AM Lab Report 83/75) by Roger Jones from the Ancient Monuments Laboratory (HBMC) (ARC 3.6) (also cf MF Table 72).

Despite the limitations of this assemblage several aspects merit further discussion (see Table 59). The discovery of at least six animal burials, all within or adjacent to the temple buildings, provides one of the principal indicators of religious ritual at Henley Wood. In reality all but one of these burials comprised the incomplete remains of more than one animal. Parts of at least ten sheep/goats were present; some individuals could have been divided between more than one deposit and so some of these could have been contemporary. The presence of ox (1 instance) and pig (3 instances) remains respectively in several animal burials provides evidence of further species and individuals so used. All these animals, in the context of a Romano-Celtic temple site, can be presumed to represent sacrificial victims. Their partial dismemberment probably reflects aspects of

<p>| Table 58 Animal bone, quantified species list |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>No of bones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheep/goat</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic fowl</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird (wild species)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red deer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallow deer</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hare</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water vole</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shellfish</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB Quantification by numbers of identifiable bones; further unidentified fragments not included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of precinct</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description of deposit</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>PT reference</th>
<th>MF and ARC references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?Temple 2</td>
<td>I.L9</td>
<td>Within building. Location within I.L9 not known</td>
<td>BO5 – sheep, BO7 – sheep, pig, (also a human infant rib bone)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.3a</td>
<td>MF 6.6.3a, MF Table 9, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Temple 2 or 3</td>
<td>I.F18</td>
<td>Feature in area of Temple 3 ambulatory, SE corner (Fig 10)</td>
<td>BO11 – sheep (including foetal), Pig</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.3a</td>
<td>MF 6.6.3a, MF Table 9, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Temple 2 or 3</td>
<td>I.F20</td>
<td>Against wall L.216, N wall of Temple 3 cella (within cella) (Fig 10)</td>
<td>BO16 – sheep (parts of at least three animals and foetal bones)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.3a</td>
<td>MF 6.6.3a, MF Table 9, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple 3</td>
<td>I.1962/F9</td>
<td>Alongside inner face of wall 1962/T2, S ambulatory wall (Fig 10)</td>
<td>HW62.9 – sheep, pig goat</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.4b</td>
<td>MF 6.6.4b-5, MF Table 9, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple 3</td>
<td>I.1962/F11</td>
<td>Within W ambulatory (not against wall) (Fig 10)</td>
<td>HW62.11 – sheep (parts of at least three animals)</td>
<td>Recorded as two groups of bones, at either end of a depression</td>
<td>6.6.4b</td>
<td>MF 6.6.4b-5, MF Table 9, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple 3</td>
<td>I.F15</td>
<td>Alongside inner face of wall I.246, in SE corner of ambulatory (Fig 10)</td>
<td>BO12 – sheep (parts of two animals), ox (including foetal)</td>
<td>Recorded as two burials</td>
<td>6.6.4b</td>
<td>MF 6.6.4b-5, MF Table 9, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple 3</td>
<td>I.F16</td>
<td>Alongside inner face of wall I.246, E ambulatory wall (Fig 10)</td>
<td>BO14 – pig</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.4b</td>
<td>MF 6.6.4b-5, MF Table 9, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple 3</td>
<td>I.281</td>
<td>Within W ambulatory (not against wall) (Fig 10)</td>
<td>Described on excavation as 'sheep foundation burial' of a young animal but no formal identification</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.4b</td>
<td>MF 6.6.4b-5, MF Table 9, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Temple 3</td>
<td>I.276</td>
<td>Within cella</td>
<td>Described on excavation as 'dubious animal burial, covered by a very large stone'. May be the same as BO15, a smashed sheep palate</td>
<td>Probably casual intrusion into I.L8a, rather than a ritual deposit</td>
<td>6.6.4b</td>
<td>MF 6.6.4b-5, cf MF 6.6.4d, MF Table 9, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple 3ii</td>
<td>I.L2</td>
<td>Within cella</td>
<td>BO2 – red deer antler fr</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.4d</td>
<td>MF 6.6.4d, MF Table 9, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?Derived from temple deposits</td>
<td>I.L1</td>
<td>Within cella or cella or ambulatory</td>
<td>BO13, BO18 – 2 red deer antler frs</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.7</td>
<td>MF 6.6.7, MF Table 9, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos ditch</td>
<td>V.L6</td>
<td>On base of V.F30, Cutting 18 (cf Fig 21)</td>
<td>BO44 – sheep</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5.2</td>
<td>MF 10.5.2, MF Table 17, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos ditch</td>
<td>V.L5</td>
<td>Cutting 18 (cf Fig 21)</td>
<td>BO41 – sheep, pig, BO42 – sheep, ox (including new born)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5.2</td>
<td>MF 10.5.2, MF 10.6.3c-2, MF Table 17, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont)
Table 59 (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of precinct</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description of deposit*</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>PT reference</th>
<th>MF and ARC references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temenos ditch</td>
<td>V.L4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>BO21 – rabbit, BO39-40 – sheep (parts of at least two animals), pig, ox</td>
<td>V.L4 is known from either end of V.F30 – MF 10.3</td>
<td>10.5.2</td>
<td>MF 10.5.2, MF Table 17, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos ditch</td>
<td>V.L3</td>
<td>Cutting 18 (cf Fig 21)</td>
<td>BO37-38 – pig, ox, fish</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5.2</td>
<td>MF 10.5.2, MF Table 17, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos ditch</td>
<td>V.L2–L3</td>
<td>Baulk 13/14 (cf Fig 21), Cutting D (cf Fig 21), Cutting 14 (cf Fig 21), Cutting 14 (cf Fig 21)</td>
<td>BO25 – corvid</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5.2</td>
<td>MF 10.5.2, MF Table 17, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos ditch</td>
<td>V.L2</td>
<td>Cutting 14 (cf Fig 21), Cutting 14 (cf Fig 21), Cutting 18 (cf Fig 21), Cutting 14 (cf Fig 21)</td>
<td>BO22 – fish</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5.2</td>
<td>MF 10.5.2, MF Table 17, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos ditch</td>
<td>V.L1-2</td>
<td>Cutting 19 (cf Fig 21)</td>
<td>BO47 – pig</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5.2</td>
<td>MF Table 17, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos ditch</td>
<td>V.L1</td>
<td>Cutting 17 (cf Fig 21), Cutting 18 (cf Fig 21)</td>
<td>BO33 – hare</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5.2</td>
<td>MF 10.5.2, MF Table 17, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temenos ditch</td>
<td>V –</td>
<td>Cutting 18 (cf Fig 21)</td>
<td>BO46 – sheep, pig, rabbit</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.5.2</td>
<td>MF Table 17, ARC 3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Note that the composition of these deposits has not yet been analysed in terms of the parts of the animals represented, or of sex. Also that the BO numbers in some cases represent only one bone.

ritual associated with animal sacrifice and deposition of the remains. For example it may be surmised that portions of sacrificial victims were consumed on the site (Henig 1984, 33–4). Sheep or goats are commonly represented among such deposits, and on occasion their use may be an indicator of the deity worshipped. At West Hill, Uley, the overwhelming predominance of sheep/goat remains was almost certainly a reflection of one of the main cult animals associated with Mercury, the principal deity there to whom they were dedicated (Ellison 1980, 312). Among the remaining assemblage collected at Henley Wood, sheep/goat remains also predominate. Their presence is most likely to be accounted for as a further reflection of ritual; while the more occasional remains of domestic pig or cattle echo the other species represented among the sacrificial animal burials.

Since little or nothing is known of any complementary domestic component to this essentially religious site, it is impossible to determine whether or not the animal remains (excluding the burials) simply reflect a domestic economy (Burrow 1981, 91–110). Among the other species identified the domestic range is extended by the presence of dog, cat and domestic fowl. Of these, domestic fowl is potentially the most significant, as another possible representative of sacrificial ritual. West Hill, Uley, once again provides a convenient parallel (Ellison 1980, 312).

The remaining individuals, represented for the most part by a handful of bones, comprise wild species of mammals, birds and fish. With the exception of the latter, all could be accounted for as casual visitors to the site, although the rabbit (B021 & B046), and possibly the others, will not be contemporary with the Romano-British and post-Roman use; but religious contexts should not be discounted (cf 15.2 and 15.6). The fish remains and a handful of limpet and oyster shells are undoubtedly present through human agency, presumably the residue of food consumed on or close to the site. One group, the red deer antler remains found among the temple buildings (6.6.4d, 6.6.7, 10.5.2 and Table 59), do however stand out as potential representatives...
once again of the religious and ritual aspects of Henley Wood (cf 15.6). Changes through time in the animal bone assemblage are considered in 10.6.3 and 15.6.

14.13 Miscellaneous (cf MF14.3.1-2)

In classifying the Henley Wood finds assemblage it has proved possible to provide an appropriate thematic allocation for virtually every item. In some instances such allocations are at best open to alternative interpretations, while others might more legitimately have been placed within this final group. Nevertheless, only one group of material has in the event been designated in this way, a collection of water-worn ?beach pebbles, in origin foreign to Henley Wood. But for their apparent origin these pebbles might otherwise be classed among the geological samples of the foregoing category section.

Neither the character nor the site distribution and associations of these pebbles give much clue to their use. Assuming their importation to the site by man, functions such as weights, rubbers, slingstones, or even the requirements of religious ritual, can be suggested. Whatever their purpose, none are illustrated, but are fully listed in MF14.3.1-2. Their geological identity was verified by the late FW Anderson in a report (unnumbered) from the Ancient Monuments Laboratory (HBMC) to be found in ARC 3.6.

14.14 Medieval and post-medieval (cf MF14.3.1-2)

Artefactual evidence for any human activity or occupation at Henley Wood post-dating the latest cemetery inhumations is negligible. A few fragments of modern vessel glass (GL15-17 & 19; MF14.3.1) are probably the result of breakage and loss by casual visitors (cf CADREX 1992, 251). A similar explanation probably accounts for two base sherds of a 13th–14th-century green-glazed jug (HW288 & HW3352, from 1.2.L1 and III/IV/VI.19.L1 respectively). Among the other finds from the site, none can be positively identified as belonging to any phase beyond the end of the Roman period. To what extent Roman and Romano-British artefacts are residual to, or deposited contemporaneously within, post-Roman contexts at Henley Wood, is considered elsewhere in relation to the cemetery and the contents of graves (Section 13, especially MF).

There are in addition several items or groups of material which are intrinsically almost undatable, beyond any associations with more diagnostic artefacts, and thus have some potential for consideration in this section. Much of the iron falls into this category although it is difficult to single out individual items. Medieval or later surface iron mining which destroyed part of the site to the NE might account for the pottery (above), but may also have introduced other artefacts to the site. The iron pick head (IR119, Fig 93.119, 14.6.2g above) found close to the mined area is a possible example.
15 Synthesis and discussion

15.1 Introduction

Specific aspects of the archaeological evidence, especially the sequence of the temples and the characteristics of the cemetery, have been considered above in relation to individual areas of excavation; here discussion is directed towards a broader site synthesis as well as towards more speculative issues.

The sequence of events in each area remains independent, with few stratigraphic or other links, but a broad correlative framework can be attempted; this is summarised in Tables 75 and 76. A full discussion of the theoretical and other considerations that determine such a sequence is in MF 15.1.

15.2 Location and resources

The characteristics of location that made Henley Wood attractive as a sacred site were dependent on contemporary perceptions (religious and otherwise) and the specifics of land use, especially, it is suggested, related to the adjacent hillfort area (cf 4.1–2). Significant attributes may have included being marginal land (cf Fowler 1975, 129), possibly close to a boundary (cf Lewis 1966, 130; Bullough 1983, 184), and on a hilltop that was additionally distinguished by effectively forming a low promontory (Fig 3) and possibly further identifiable by being wooded (4.3). Ancillary functions such as being the setting for markets, fairs, and/or religious activities (cf Lewis 1966, 130) could have developed in combination with such natural characteristics. The site's local setting should also be considered in relation to tribal areas and political units, routeways and the possibility of the importance of intervisibility between sites of the same status (cf Leech 1980, 331). The importance of hilltop settings to religious activity in Somerset during the first millennium AD has been discussed by Burrow (1981, eg 160–6).

The same general reasons for the location of the temple complex may also have applied to the cemetery. More specifically, ideological associations, stemming from the Roman temples or possibly from earlier sacred connotations, may have provided the immediate impetus for burial, either of which could imply continuity of a population who made such links; indeed the temples and cemetery may have been used by successive generations of the same communities.

Of the local resources identified by excavation, geological samples (14.12.2), stone artefacts (14.6.2 and 14.10.3) and building stone (14.9.2a) indicate the range of lithic resources used on the site (for potential local sources, see Dawson 1987, 3–9); amongst these was iron ore, local to the site, although there is no evidence for working of it during the Roman period (cf 3.2 and 4.1). In the earlier phases, buildings were possibly at least partly of wood and other organic materials (cf 6.6.3b and 6.6.4e).

Animal bones were numerous (14.12.4). Fifteen varieties of domestic and wild mammals, birds and fish were represented (Table 58). Fish bones and the few limpet and oyster shells reflect local freshwater and marine resources, but it is uncertain whether their presence was primarily associated with routine consumption or with ritual (see 15.6 below). This applies to both domestic and wild species.

15.3 The prehistoric–protohistoric evidence

Prehistoric material from the site includes flints, of middle-late Neolithic date (14.4.2), which occurred in residual contexts, extending to the extreme NE of the site in Area VII (cf MF14.4.2–3). Beaker sherds were also reported (3.2). Neolithic material, including polished axe fragments, and Bronze Age finds are well represented at Cadbury Congresbury. Although the flints may only reflect frequentation of the area, Darvill (1987, 15) has drawn attention to the possibility of a middle Neolithic settlement in the vicinity. The Beaker sherds may have been derived from a grave, either flat or topped by a round barrow. Darvill’s maps show that Neolithic/Beaker material is otherwise scarce in this area (Darvill 1987).

From the Iron Age there are a small number of sherds (14.4.3); these are again comparable with the large amounts from Cadbury Congresbury. There is also at least one brooch which should be pre-Roman (14.5.2a–2, Fig 87.7). The most important find of this date, probably of the pre-Roman first century AD and certainly from a pre-Roman milieu, is the remarkable bronze figurine (14.10.1–2, Fig 110.161 and Pls 30–33). Martin Henig has stressed its importance in relation to potential activity of this date at Henley Wood (14.10.2a). Its very worn condition may point to continual handling, until ultimate deposition in the late Roman period (8.3). The single Dobunnic coin from the site was also found in a late Roman context, in the top of the temenos ditch (10.5.2 and 14.6.3). Cunliffe’s mapping of the distribution of Dobunnic coins and other material shows Henley Wood to lie on the north-western edge of the area of known finds (Cunliffe 1982, Fig 7.5).

The only Iron Age material which may have been stratified in situ was below Structure 4, an area where there was other Iron Age pottery as well as
### Table 75  Area sequences - fixed points and chronological indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Means of dating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?Temple 1 (6.6.2)</td>
<td>Pre-Temple 2 (6.6.2c)</td>
<td>=Temple Phase 1 (Section 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple 2 (6.6.3)</td>
<td>Post-?Temple 1, pre-Temple 3; destruction level suggests C3 <em>floruit</em>; NB lack of Constantinian coins (6.6.3c)</td>
<td>= Temple Phase 2. It is an interpretation that <em>TPQ</em> is derived from destruction level (1.1.9) (6.6.3b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple 3i (6.6.4)</td>
<td>Post-Temple 2, pre-Temple 3ii; destruction level of Temple 2 (above) provide <em>TPQ</em> of AD270–90 (6.6.4f)</td>
<td>= Temple Phase 3i. An alternative interpretation of the stratigraphic evidence is possible so that a later TPQ of AD367–75 is possible, with Temple 3ii being correspondingly later (6.6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure 4</td>
<td><em>TPQ</em> of either AD293–96 or AD337–41 (9.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Structure 4</td>
<td>Metalling over surface associated with Structure 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple 3ii (6.6.4)</td>
<td>Post-Temple 2, pre-Temple 3ii; destruction level of Temple 2 (above) provide <em>TPQ</em> of AD270–90 (6.6.4f)</td>
<td>= Temple Phase 3i. An alternative interpretation of the stratigraphic evidence is possible so that a later TPQ of AD367–75 is possible, with Temple 3ii being correspondingly later (6.6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure 4</td>
<td><em>TPQ</em> of either AD293–96 or AD337–41 (9.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Structure 4</td>
<td>Metalling over surface associated with Structure 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Post L3 (S4). Latest coin AD350–53 (10.5.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Post-causeway (10.4.2), pre-L2 (S4). Latest coin AD337–41 (10.5.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Post-bridge abutment, pre-L3 (10.4.2). Latest coin AD330–45 (10.6.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Post L3 (S4). Latest coin AD350–53 (10.5.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Post-causeway (10.4.2), pre-L2 (S4). Latest coin AD337–41 (10.5.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Post-bridge abutment, pre-L3 (10.4.2). Latest coin AD330–45 (10.6.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Temenos* ditch as a negative feature (10.2, 10.6.1, 10.6.4)

Pre-filling – C4 material on bottom (10.5.2)

Association not certain, but should hold (MF10.6.2). Not certain whether associated with primary layout of F30 (MF10.6.2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Means of dating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Means of dating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Means of dating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temple 3ii (6.6.4)</td>
<td>Post-Temple 3i, ?pre-all graves; coins in what is interpreted as make-up for this phase give TPQ of AD367–75 (6.6.4f)</td>
<td>= Temple Phase 3ii cf above (6.6.4f)</td>
<td>Graves</td>
<td>?Cut from top of L2 (10.3)</td>
<td>This is not reliable enough to use latest datable find from L2 as TPQ for graves; relation of L2, graves and L1 not certain (cf Fig 73 and MF13.4.2e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grave 6</td>
<td>?Post-construction of Temple 3ii – pre-complete removal of S ambulatory wall</td>
<td>= Temple Phase 5 (6.6.6c)</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Latest coin AD364–78 (10.5.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other graves</td>
<td>Post- at least partial demolition of Temple 3ii (?partial/total)</td>
<td>= Temple Phase 5 (6.6.6c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilapidation and/or robbing of Temple 3ii</td>
<td>Post-Temple 3ii, both before and after individual graves; calibrated C14 determination (at 95% probability level) TAQ before AD600 for at least part of demolition (Table 51)</td>
<td>= Temple Phase 4 (6.6.5c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 76 Suggested correlation of site sequence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broad chronology</th>
<th>(Temples ?1–3)</th>
<th>Area IV (Structure 4)</th>
<th>Area V F30, \textit{temenos} ditch</th>
<th>Comments and favoured interpretations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age and/or earlier</td>
<td>?Temple 1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?Origin in secular and/or religious context for F30; ?sole or main feature of complex. ?Crossing S end or ?Temple 1, although Iron Age/Celtic in milieu rather than Roman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st–?2nd century AD</td>
<td>?Temple 1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?Origin of \textit{temenos} ditch; ?southern crossing and/or unknown predecessor to bridge abutment but S end │ Cf 15.4. Later 2nd century origin favoured for ?Temple 1, although Iron Age/Celtic in milieu rather than Roman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd–?3rd century AD</td>
<td>Temple 2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?Origin of \textit{temenos} ditch; ?southern crossing and/or unknown predecessor to bridge abutment but S end │ Cf 15.4. and 15.5.3rd century origin favoured for Temple 2 together with \textit{temenos} ditch and ?bank. If so, planned layout with lines of sight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 3rd–earlier 4th centuries AD</td>
<td>Temple 3i origin</td>
<td>Structure 4 origin</td>
<td>Bridge abutment ?</td>
<td>Cf 15.5. Favoured sequence is that Temple 3i predates Structure 4, but that the two subsequently coexisted. But NB possibility of Structure 4 pre-dating origin of Temple 3i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early/mid 4th century AD</td>
<td>Temple 3i \textit{floruit}</td>
<td>Structure 4 \textit{floruit}</td>
<td>Causeway</td>
<td>Cf 15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later 4th century AD and later</td>
<td>Temple 3ii origin</td>
<td>?Demolished and area metalled over</td>
<td>Upper fill of ditch</td>
<td>Cf 15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?Temple 3ii \textit{floruit}</td>
<td>?with Grave 6 At least partial demolition of Temple 3ii pre-600</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Cf 15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To 8th century AD at latest, centring on 5th–7th, and more closely probably on 5th–6th centuries</td>
<td>Graves</td>
<td>Graves</td>
<td>Graves</td>
<td>Cf 15.7–8. Correlation of graves across site uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-all cemetery</td>
<td>?Robbing continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cf 15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neolithic flints in residual contexts (cf 9.3–4 and 14.4.3); given the relative concentration of both Neolithic and Iron Age material here, this may have been an early activity area, but the extent and nature of the evidence is vestigial.

One structural feature which could theoretically be of Iron Age origin is the \textit{temenos} ditch. The only dating for the ditch, at an unknown number of removes, is the material in its filling. If it did have pre-Roman origins, it could be interpreted either as a religious, delimiting, boundary, or improbably in a secular, defensive, context (cf 10.6.–5), cutting off the small promontory (4.1) on which the temples subsequently stood, the ditch being either main-
tained throughout or specifically cleaned out when it was later reused as a religious boundary.

Burrow has noted the close proximity of local hillforts, which could suggest that Cadbury Congresbury and Henley Wood be viewed as either complementary earthworks on either side of a slight col or, less likely given the relative weakness of the latter, as rivals; Henley Wood would also fit into the arc of ‘open or weakly defended sites’ he maps to the NE of Cadbury Congresbury (Burrow 1987, 45, 47 and Fig 4.2).

The early part of the sequence is thus most positively represented not by structures but by artefacts. The figurine, and the subsequent use of the hilltop as a religious setting, may tip interpretation in favour of a religious explanation for the activity, with or without the temenos ditch (also see ?Temple 1 in 15.4 below). In the immediately pre-Roman period, this may have echoed possible Neolithic/Beaker religious use (?still visible in the form of a barrow; cf Ross 1974, 84 re mounds); or it may have been an independent development. Religion in an Iron Age (‘Celtic’) setting did not necessitate buildings (cf Drury 1980, 55; Henig 1984, 21); open spaces, woods and prominent locations (cf 4.3; Ross 1974, eg 61, 84; Drury 1980, 57 and Henig 1984, 17), perhaps defined by a boundary such as the temenos ditch (Henig 1984, 21), were at least as important (cf Wilson 1975, 14). This of course would offer a major explanation for the location of the later Roman temples. Certainly many parallels exist for pre-Roman religious sites preceding similar Roman usage (eg Lewis 1966, 50 and Drury 1980, 59). Lewis even went as far as to assert that most rural temples were associated with pre-existing holy places (Lewis 1966, 50); similarly Rodwell, an advocate of continuity unless proved otherwise, ‘. . . there is plausible evidence for religious continuity extending over millennia . . . ’ (Rodwell 1980, 236). Any structural elements would have been unlikely to have survived subsequent disturbance, although the possibility of testing this in Area I was not taken (MF6.7.2).

Such a pre-Roman religious site must be considered in relation to the pre-Roman phases at Cadbury Congresbury (CADREX 1992, 226–7), which includes evidence of religious activity in the form of human skull fragments and possibly some other finds.

**15.4 The 1st–3rd centuries AD**

There are many finds of the 1st and 2nd centuries AD which, like the prehistoric material, were residual in later contexts (MF14.3.3–4) – and these probably represent a minimum: those that can be dated. They include 23 coins (3 of Claudius I) (Table 56 + the Dobunnic coin), the majority of the brooches (14.5.2a), a silver mount from a military dress (14.5.3, Fig 89.34), a melon bead (14.5.4e, Fig 90.64), and much of the samian ware (MF14.8.3b–4). As there has been no previous chronological discussion of the finds, these must be discussed in some detail.

This early assemblage shows considerable variety in type and distribution. 1st and 1st to 2nd century artefacts are confined to Areas I, III and V (in the latter area, they have been argued to be residual, cleared from elsewhere in the immediate vicinity) (10.6.3 and Section 14). Besides the figurine, the most striking of the 1st and 2nd century objects are the brooches, by virtue of their numbers, 24/71% of the site total (with 41% being 1st century, probably on both sides of the Conquest [cf 15.6]). Their variable distribution may reflect possible differing chronological functions of these areas, or, what seems more likely, already well-defined functional zones, for purchase and display; the temenos ditch subsequently providing both a convenient and also perhaps a venerable place in which to dispose of redundant gifts.

2nd century material is more plentiful, exhibiting greater variety but within the same range of thematic categories as for the 1st century. The samian is mostly of the later 2nd century (or even early 3rd); the rarity of 1st or earlier 2nd century (pre-c AD160) samian is in contrast to the definite 1st century finds noted above (14.8.3b–4); and also in contrast to the small samian assemblage from post-Roman contexts at Cadbury Congresbury, which is mainly early (CADREX 1992, 150–1).

There are far more 3rd-century artefacts, these concentrated in Area I, perhaps because they were not so thoroughly cleared from where they were originally used. Brooches appear to have been replaced by finger rings in this century (rings, including the three octagonal ones, 11/100% of the site total; brooches 0 – cf MF14.3.3).

The character of this assemblage can most easily be paralleled on religious sites. The brooches especially, and perhaps some of the undated items including pins and beads, are found on other temples sites (locally eg Leech 1980, 332–6 and cf Section 14). ?Temple 1, the first identifiable structural element of an important sequence, was ill-defined. If stone-based, it was more likely to have been of Roman than Iron Age date. ?Temple 1 could plausibly belong to the 1st century, but given the greater number of 2nd-century finds, it may be easier to envisage construction during this period, with or without the temenos ditch. Culturally its affinities nevertheless may have been Iron Age/Celtic as much as Roman; this perhaps marked a transitional phase in the history of the site or area, reflecting that ‘the crux of the matter was that, to approach any god, the local cult title and the established ritual were essential’ (Henig 1984, 66).

The chronology of ?Temples 1 and 2 is however still very much open (cf 6.6.2–3). It is not until the later 3rd century that stratified finds allow any close dating, and this only for what is interpreted as the floruit (rather than destruction) of Temple 2, not for its origin; as coinage from the period before AD260 is generally scarce, the floruit for Period 2 may have
been more extended than the immediate evidence suggests. The origin of Temple 2 could be in the earlier 3rd century (note the volume of 3rd century finds, MF14.3.3–4), or even the 2nd. The further back it can be pushed conceptually, the more feasible it is to assign Temple 1 to earlier in the 2nd century, or before.

On balance, a later 2nd century date is favoured for Temple 1, with possible extensive earlier cult use; and a 3rd century date for Temple 2 – both in origin and *floruit* – together with the *temenos* ditch and ?bank. There are of course major constructional continuities between Temple 1 and Temples 2 and 3 (6.6 and Fig 19); these may argue for continuity of cult practice without any hiatus.

### 15.5 The 3rd–4th/th centuries AD

In the later Roman period, the chronology is on firmer ground. It is activity of this period that is primarily represented in the structural record, reflected also for example in the period of major coin loss from c AD260 to c AD340 (14.6.3).

It is argued that Temple 3i can be securely dated to later than AD270–90; also that it followed directly on the disuse and partial demolition of Temple 2. There are however alternatives to this interpretation (6.6.40; the possibility remains of a hiatus in the earlier 4th century, not in the religious activity on the site, but in the continuity between Temples 2 and 3i, with the Constantian period instead being represented solely by the scant remains of Structure 4, a possible octagonal shrine or mausoleum (9.4): a scenario illustrated in Table 77.

The favoured hypothesis however is that Temple 3i followed on immediately from Temple 2, with Structure 4 forming an additional element of the Constantinian complex, as in Table 78.

Whatever the precise relationship of the buildings in Area I and Area IV, they demonstrate the existence of more than one focus within the precinct – this was a *complex* for religious activity, not just a single centre.

At the beginning of this period too it is argued that a crossing of the *temenos* ditch opposite these structures was in use, firstly by a bridge, presumably of timber, which left the ditch as a continuous physical and symbolic boundary; and secondly (after AD330–45), by a dumped causeway of massive size (10.6.2). This and/or the later filling of the ditch may have been derived in part from the postulated bank (10.6.1). A southern crossing may also have been in operation (Section 7). There are indications of a planned *temenos* enclosure (*cf* 6.6.3b).

Such major activity in the late 3rd–early 4th century in a religious context is paralleled at several local sites, notably at nearby Pagans Hill and many other western temples (Rahtz and Watts 1979, 187; Rahtz and Watts 1991). It is indeed the demonstrated existence of earlier religious phases at Henley Wood that is unusual in relation to Somerset temples, although this is well established at Nettleton and Uley, further north in the Cotswolds (Wedlake 1982 and Woodward and Leach 1993).

In the later 4th century at Henley Wood there was a major refurbishment, marked by the substantial changes to Temple 3i that comprise Temple 3ii (6.6.4c and 6.6.4f), probably together with the removal of and metalling over of Structure 4 (*cf* 9.4). This is also a familiar pattern from other western temples, including Pagans Hill and notably at Maiden Castle, where a new temple was built in this period; both, like Temple 3ii, post-AD367–75 (6.6.4f; Rahtz 1951, 117; Rahtz and Watts 1979, 190).

Whether religious observance was both continuous and of a similar character up to and through the middle of the 4th century is uncertain. In general, the assumption is that it was, in as far as Temple 3ii was only a modification of an existing structure and it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 77 Relationship between temples and Structure 4: scenario 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temple 2 (C3 <em>floruit</em>)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still standing (so could provide continuity of plan with Temple 3i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temple 2 demolished</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temple 3i (post-AD270–90 or post-AD367–75)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temple 3ii (post-AD367–75)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure 4 still standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure 4 demolished (and metalling extended over it)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 78 Relationship between temples and Structure 4: scenario 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temple 2 (C3 <em>floruit</em>)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temple 2 demolished</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temple 3i (post-AD270–90)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temple 3ii (post-AD367–75)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure 4 (post-AD293–96 or 337–41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure 4 demolished (and metalling extended over it)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
may even have perpetuated an internal focal point in a similar position to that of Temple 2 (6.6.4e); but there are also indications of change.

At Pagans Hill various alterations during this period have now been delineated more fully, focused on the changing status of the temple well, from arguably ritual cleanliness, to the presence of debris in it, finally with a return to maintained conditions. These physical differences, it is proposed, may be indicative of more general changing circumstances, as might be expected from the known history of the period, in which Christianity has to be considered (cf Rahtz and Watts 1991; also Boon 1989). At Henley Wood, an analogous shift may be provided by the extent of dumping in the temenos ditch after the 330s (10.6.3), when the causeway had itself partially blocked it, perhaps also reflecting changing needs. The change in character in the animal bone assemblage in the upper part of this ditch (10.5.2 and 15.6 below) may also witness this, before burial began, Reece independently suggests, on the basis of the coin corpus, a change of emphasis at Henley Wood after the mid 4th century (14.6.3). Another indication of such a shift might be the deposition of the figurine, although how long after the mid-4th century it was lost or buried cannot be determined (cf 15.3 above). Analogies with the proposed deliberate destruction of former iconographic symbols may be appropriate (cf 14.10.1).

These considerations are especially pertinent to Temple 3ii. Its ground plan remained very much the same as for Temple 3i, but so for example did the known architectural manifestations of the diverging pagan and Christian cults (cf Thomas 1981, 155ff). Structure IV should also be noted in this context (cf 9.4 and 10.6.3). The most definite change in the religious use of the site is however marked by the advent of burial at a date discussed below (15.7–8).

Turning from activities to chronology, coins associated with Temple 3 extend to the end of the 4th century (6.6.4f). The latest coin from the site is of Arcadius (AD388–402, 13.4.3 and MF 14.6.3f). The number of Valentinian or Theodosian coins on the site is relatively small (31 out of 477, 6.5% – cf Table 56). Although interpretation of the coin assemblage is difficult (14.6.3), there are not enough late coins to argue for a major floruit in this latest Roman period of the kind evidenced at Maiden Castle, or especially at Lydney, almost in sight of Henley Wood on the other side of the Bristol Channel (cf 14.6.3 and Rahtz and Watts 1979, 190).

The latest coins do nevertheless allow activity to be postulated at Henley Wood as late as coinage was available and pottery can be dated. As always it is the 5th century which is problematical, when dating evidence for ultimate Roman Britain disappears, and all ‘Roman’ material effectively becomes residual. Indeed it has been asserted that ‘most of the artefacts on dark-age sites in Somerset are Roman, residual . . . any site with Roman material now has to be argued from other evidence to be Roman rather than dark age’ (Rahtz 1982a, 182). Radiocarbon determination for the graves do however extend through this and later centuries (cf 15.7–8 below).

Before considering the relationship of the temples and cemetery further, the religious aspects of the temple complex will be summarised.

15.6 Religious activity at Henley Wood

The discussion of the temples themselves, of Structure 4 and of the enclosure within which these buildings lay has related their various features to comparative evidence for cult activity as known from other sources and from other sites. To in situ features must be added the major evidence of portable artefacts although, as found, these were not in the main associated with the structures (Section 14 and 15.4–5 above). The objects that have been separated as religious/votive in 14.10 are few – the enduring figurine, the stone panel with its fragmentary inscription and the votive leaf – but not unusually so (cf ApSimon 1964–5, 220). As already argued, on a religious site, however, the function of the other thematic categories may blur into this specific group (Section 14). The majority of the finds may therefore be either directly of votive significance or may be derived from activities directly related to cult, as well as from the other more ‘secular’ activities associated with temple complexes, such as fairs, markets, pilgrimage, and especially the food preparation and consumption that is conspicuous in the pottery assemblage (14.8.3b–6, iii), to name only the most obvious (Lewis 1966, 130; Henig 1984, 157); in Peter Brown’s words, the area of life covered by ‘religious practice’ was ‘immeasurably wider and more intimately felt by ancient man than by their modern counterparts’ (Brown 1981, 19).

As with many other temples, the name of the deity or deities associated with Henley Wood is not provided by a major inscription, representation or clear ritual practice. Instead, deductions about the character of the deity(ies) must be made from the ambiguous, mainly non-organic, remnants of cult practice.

The most direct evidence of cult at Henley Wood is the nude female figurine. Taken at face value, this should relate to the earlier part of the sequence, but to judge from the context in which it was found (8.3 and 15.3) and the excessive wear, to the later part also. Figurines were certainly appropriate as offerings in a Roman context (Henig 1984, 148), so that its continued used would not be anomalous. It is suggested by Henig to be associated with fertility, the native counterpoint iconographically of the Roman Venus, although fertility has, Henig reminds us, wider connotations than that of procreation (14.10.2a).

Other reflections of cult practice include the animal bone, especially that found in deliberate burials within and around the temples. Ross has suggested that many if not most animals could assume ritual meaning (Ross 1974, especially Ch 7). At Henley
Wood, in the animal bone assemblage – both from the vicinity of the temples in Area I (including specific individual deposits) (6.7.3) and from the temenos ditch - there is a strong presence of sheep and goat, and to a lesser extent ox and pig (14.12.4). The presence of both animal foetal material and of the multiplicity apparent in the deposits around Temples 2–3 may be associated with fertility. The red deer antler may have had more significance than its slight presence suggests (cf 6.6.4d, 14.12.4). It occurs at other western temples, where it is argued to have had ritual significance in relation to the cult of Cernunnos (cf Ross 1974, 186–7; Leech 1980, 334–5) and to fertility (cf Boon 1987, 426). In Area I it was associated with Phase 3ii (or later). Other late changes in the animal bone assemblage are suggested by the greater variety found in the upper filling of the temenos ditch, where the additional species include fish (10.5.2).

Of the objects found, the large number of brooches may also be linked with a female cult (cf 14.5.2a–10 and Henig 1984, 22). The potential cult significance of rings is emphasized by the presence of an inscription on one (14.5.4b and Pl 34). In general, the personal nature of many of the finds may have been associated with individual petitioning (cf 14.5.1, Lewis 1966, 47), perhaps an important aspect of the cult. Martin Henig implies that many of the individuals thus suggested to be supplicating the gods were from a largely ‘artisan’, ‘lower class’ clientele, using cheap rings and the like (14.5.4b) (more valuable items may not of course have remained on site).

The figurine, aspects of the animal bones, the brooches and perhaps the rings, and the infant burial (6.6.2a and 6.6.3a) could all be associated with fertility in one way or another, specifically perhaps with reproduction and more generally with fecundity of both humans and animals. Another factor that may reflect a cult associated with the feminine and/or fertility is the very form of the site, an enclosed complex in contrast to an open site (Henig 1984, 21). The underlying importance of fertility to Roman temples (cf Henig 1984, 26–32) and earlier (cf Ross 1974, 265) is obvious, and would be suitable to a small rural temple.

Fertility can thus be identified as a significant aspect of the cult at Henley Wood, but it was not necessarily the sole one. Any cult figure may not have remained constant throughout the long life of the temples; indeed there may not have been one dominating figure at any stage, as the variety of different deities represented for example at Lamyatt Beacon warns (Leech 1986, eg 277). In addition, fusions between Celtic and Roman deities were not always on a one to one basis (cf Henig 1984, 50). At Henley Wood, in addition to the obvious comparisons to be drawn between Venus and the figurine, any equation between a horned god could arguably have been made between any or all of several deities: Mars (cf above re the temenos ditch); Mercury (in his role of protector of herds and flocks – cf Ross 1974, 205; also cf the major animal burials and the character of the local economy, cf Burrow 1981, 166–8; Leech and Leach 1982, 68–91); or Apollo (in a silvan context) (cf 4.3 and Boon 1989). The octagonal form of the rings (14.5.4b) and possibly of Structure 4 (Section 9) also may be relevant to dedication. The octagonal form of the ring is paralleled locally in buildings at both Nettleton, where an inscribed altar provides a dedication to Apollo in one of his many guises, and Pagans Hill (Rahtz and Watts 1991; also Boon 1989, although he discounts any facile association of plan with a particular deity – account has to be taken of the most frequently occurring dedications).

As a small rural temple, Henley Wood was unlikely to have attracted a far-flung populace regularly, unless it was associated with pilgrimage (cf Henig 1984, 157). Much of the pottery is indeed local, and in the 4th century for example there was a smaller range of it than at the more sophisticated Uley (14.8.3b–6, i, iv). It could have been the centre of a private or restricted cult, or simply an estate temple, the equivalent of a later proprietary church; alternatively, it could have been a/the cult centre serving a probably scattered population (cf Rodwell 1980, 232–3; Rahtz 1982a, 180).

At the end of the sequence at Henley Wood, religious activity was transmuted, finally being manifest in burials, as discussed in subsequent sections.

15.7 Temple precinct and cemetery

The relationship between temple precinct and burial remains ambiguous. Although the cemetery does in the main represent the latest activity on the site, it is argued (6.6.6) that Grave 6 was inserted when at least the south ambulatory wall of Temple 3ii was still apparent. The precise condition of this wall is uncertain, but the possibility must be considered that part of the last temple still served a religious function. By the time the remainder of the ambulatory graves were dug, in contrast, the south ambulatory was more than delapidated: its outer wall had been deliberately robbed.

The occasion(s) for the deliberate robbing of the south ambulatory of Temple 3ii remains ill-defined. The disrespect implied by the truncation of the burial in Grave 6 contrasts with the general lack of disturbance of graves in the cemetery proper, outside to the east. Activity at Cadbury Congresbury may provide a context for robbing, with utilisation there of the resulting stone.

Burial is assumed not to have been a primary function of Temple 3ii because of the usual strict regulation on the location of Roman burials (cf Liversidge 1973, 468); and also because burial is not amongst the defining characteristics of Roman temples (cf Wilson 1980), although there are exceptions (Lewis 1966, 6, 135; Henig 1984, 196–7). Chronologically, therefore, the cemetery is assumed to post-date AD367–75, the date after which Temple 3ii was constructed. Thus although terminus post quems for some of the graves in the temenos ditch would allow
burial to have begun in the 4th century or even earlier, a 4th century beginning to burial seems unlikely. The radiocarbon determinations from the ambulatory area suggest that its south wall was obliterated by AD600 (cf Tables 46 and 76).

Matters of chronological overlap apart, it can be suggested that the location of the cemetery, most obviously in the case of the burials within the ambulatory area of Temple 3ii, was directly related to the existing building. More generally, the final or former existence of the temple complex and awareness of what it had represented in overall religious terms may have been the major or sole factor in initiating burial on the site. Alternative explanations are however possible which view the superimposition of a cemetery on a temple complex as the result of considerations associated with the place rather than the monument.

To summarise, it should not be assumed that Temple 3ii did not coexist with at least part of the cemetery; moreover, it is archaeologically possible that the ultimate phase of the structural use of Temple 3ii (better ‘Structure 3ii’ in this context) included burial as one of its functions. Indeed, perhaps Henley Wood had a much grander focal building than did Cannington, (Rahtz, Hirst & Wright in prep), which was only fully robbed after burial ceased.

Beyond the specific site context, Henley Wood must clearly be considered in the context of the wider-spread phenomenon of Roman temples that were associated with subsequent cemeteries, in terms of both similarities and dissimilarities (cf Rahtz and Fowler 1972; Rahtz and Watts 1979; Burrow 1981, 162, 186, fn’t 42; Leech and Leach 1982, 75; Rahtz 1987, 77).

15.8 The cemetery

The Henley Wood cemetery has been described in Section 13, where its distinguishing characteristics are also summarised (13.6), but the analysis presented there could be much extended. Little attempt for example has been made to consider what ‘community beliefs’ might be encoded in the cemetery. If the religious affiliations of the people using this cemetery could be distinguished on the present archaeological criteria, this would be of the greatest historical interest, given the background of both 4th century paganism in this area (eg Thomas 1981, 265–6; also cf 4.4) and the prominent role of cemeteries in recent discussions of insular Christianity in the period AD400–700 (cf Thomas 1981 and Morris 1983). During the late-post-Roman period, the location of many cemeteries and details of burial undoubtedly did change and Christianity did make headway. Any simple correlation however between burial rite and religious or social context is unlikely and simple contrasts between pagan and Christian may not reflect contemporary practice (cf below and Morris 1983, 25). Anthropological studies stress, in contrast, both the continuing importance of the family in the context of death and the stability of associated customs (cf Brown 1981, 24).

This should not imply that attempts to identify known religious cults are unfruitful, but that such analyses must be approached clearly: what is meant for example by Christianity at this time must be clearly defined; it is then a separate operation to test whether any archaeologically-defined criteria correlation with this. For the former, such commentaries as Brown’s classic historical studies, although drawn from a Mediterranean context, must alert us to the importance of both ‘the very special dead’ and the associated placing of bodies close to saints and other revered figures; also to the role of both space and of large buildings in cemeteries that were usually peripheral to existing settlements, but which themselves attracted settlement (Brown 1981).

Archaeologically, there is at present no unequivocal evidence from this type of cemetery for Christianity, although certain features of, for example, Cannington could be (and have been) interpreted in this way (cf Thomas 1971, Ch 3). In such a context at Henley Wood, a viable model, especially for the graves in the ambulatory area is that Temple 3ii became the equivalent of the Christian ad sanctos, providing a favoured spot to be near (cf James 1980, 43; Brown 1981, 27) (also cf 6.6.6c).

Definition of burial rites is also important in this context. Although their significance in arbitrating between pagan and Christian has been questioned (Bullough 1983, eg 192 and cf above), they remain the most likely means by which the place of Henley Wood within the sequential development that is now discernible in early medieval burial will be established (this extends from late Roman cemeteries to graveyards which chronologically and locationally should be Christian) (cf Bullough 1983 and Morris 1983, 51). The principal attributes of burial at Henley Wood (13.6) are not specifically Christian, although they are amongst characteristics of later Christian churchyards.

Whatever the religious affiliations of the living population of the Henley Wood cemetery, this individual profile will be thrown into further relief by comparison with other local, broadly-contemporary cemeteries (cf 4.5). Superficial comparison with Cannington for example draws attention to differences in size and in the lack at Henley Wood of unmistakable focal graves, circular structures, imported Mediterranean pottery of 5th–6th century date, indigenous post-Roman fabrics, type-G penannular brooches and of 7th–8th century artefacts (cf Rahtz 1982a, 183 and Fig 4). Whether such contrasts are due to differences of chronology, social spectra, belief systems (individual and/or collective), or other cultural factors will be addressed in the Cannington report (Rahtz, Hirst and Wright in prep).

Dating, both for Henley Wood and for the class as a whole, will remain imprecise, certainly in comparison with that expected in a fully Romanised situation. Calibrated radiocarbon determinations (the main potential for more precise dating) suggest
that the cemetery centred on the 5th–7th centuries AD, and more probably on the 5th–6th centuries. At the end of the sequence, they place the outside limits for the demise of the cemetery, at two sigma, in the later 8th century and, at one sigma, in the mid-later 7th century. They are important in confirming that the cemetery is neither of late Saxon date nor the burial ground of some ‘lost’ medieval chapel. Chronological comparison with Cannington may ultimately favour a chronological distinction between the two, with Henley Wood probably ending earlier.

Where the dead of Henley Wood lived is still uncertain. The significance of the physical proximity of the Henley Wood cemetery to Cadbury Congresbury remains ill-defined because of the lack of sufficient precision in either chronology; also because of inadequate knowledge of the surrounding area – the question of whether there were any other sites in the immediate neighbourhood in use contemporaneously with either or both cannot at present be answered negatively with confidence. This uncertainty also applies to the possible contemporary use of other cemeteries.

In the context of present knowledge, an association between the two sites nevertheless remains the most obvious model. Cadbury Congresbury is the nearest known site that may be contemporary to Henley Wood, possibly as an early monastery, although a complex, multi-faceted function that defies modern categorisation seems more likely (cf Rahtz 1982b, 104 and Fig 10.7; CADREX 1992, 247–51). As a close neighbour, it therefore provides a ‘least-effort’ context for the cemetery (cf Bullough 1983, 193). Further models could see Cadbury Congresbury, in a Christian context, as the settlement attracted to an existing cemetery; or as the settlement to which the cemetery was extramural, perhaps imitating Roman practice; or, instead of or as well as, in an attempt to associate new traditions with the former religious focus. Religious functions may indeed have been split between Cadbury Congresbury and Henley Wood: one suggestion is that Structure II and perhaps Structure I also at the former may have superseded the religious function of Temple 3ii at the latter (cf Burrow 1981, 178 and Fig 32).

Burrow suggests a population of c 150–200 for Cadbury Congresbury (Burrow 1981, 174). If this is correct, and if the Henley Wood cemetery was designated for this population, then it is clear that either only a small proportion of this group was buried here over two or three generations or that the cemetery was confined to a very short period.

The relationship between Henley Wood and Cadbury Congresbury may not however have been so simple. To take but one aspect, the present parish boundary which runs between the two sites may reflect an ancient division (cf Fig 2 and Fowler 1975, 129), separating rather than uniting the two, although of course it could represent a later division of the land unit postulated by Burrow (cf Fig 4). Furthermore, Cadbury Congresbury may have been only one of several settlements – or groups – burying at a cemetery that was perhaps situated at a focal point between them. Future work identifying all contemporary settlements and cemeteries could further this discussion, but it may be easier as well as more decisive to establish by further excavation whether the community of Cadbury Congresbury had its own cemetery on the hillfort, (cf Fowler, Gardner and Rahtz 1970, 9). A very few human bones are present there, but in residual contexts, and not in graves (CADREX 1992, 185).

A historically-derived model for the relationship of the two sites has been proposed by Rahtz (pers comm): that the disuse of Temple 3ii correlates with the disruption at the end of Roman Britain variously documented elsewhere in the archaeological record, while the development of the post-Roman site at Cadbury Congresbury, some or all of whose inhabitants may or may not have been buried at Henley Wood, represents the consolidation of an alternative hierarchy one or two generations later. One general hypothesis about the post-Roman reoccupation of the hillfort is that it represents a reversion to pre-Roman ways and beliefs (cf Rahtz 1982a; CADREX 1992, 249–9), of which the combination of burial and sanctity at neighbouring Henley Wood may be an aspect (cf Lewis 1966, 6).

The cessation of both sites may have been connected with changing settlement patterns in the early medieval period and, to continue the historical model, with the extension of English influence within the area (cf Morris 1983, 62; and locally Fowler 1975, 129); or, in the case of the cemetery, but possibly Cadbury Congresbury also, it may have been a matter of shifting religious significance, although the interaction of the growth of an institutional church with other aspects of the contemporary social and economic fabric again blurs clear-cut distinctions (cf Morris 1983). Ultimately, the immediate relationship – or lack of it – between Henley Wood, Cadbury Congresbury, settlement and graveyard burial in the Congresbury/Yatton area (the former possibly with a non-English name still remembered in the 9th century), the monastery at Congresbury documented by the 9th century, its royal connection (for the last three, Keynes and Lapidge 1983, 97 and 264, ft’nt 192) and its minster church (Costen 1987, 88–9) remain to be explored.

Meanwhile, detailed information like that from Henley Wood will enable Rahtz’s models for these post-Roman cemeteries to be consolidated. This type of cemetery clearly will soon no longer need to be defined by the negative attributes of its initial definition but will be positively characterised by the internal cemetery structure in terms of orientation, rows and other details of spatial layout; by the specific forms of mortuary behaviour as evidenced by body position, grave forms and the like; perhaps by structures, as well as by their wider relation to settlements and other components of the contemporary landscape. Such data will also enable the potential of cemetery studies to be extended, not only in relation to Christianity, but to questions of British
survival (Rahtz 1982a, 187) and dark age studies in general (Rahtz 1982b, 103).

15.9 Conclusion

Henley Wood exhibits various facets of explicit religious use, including mortuary functions, extending over 500 years and potentially considerably longer. The principal structures and finds are of the Roman period, but pass from this into the difficulties of the post-Roman centuries; difficult archaeologically because of the dearth of distinctive cultural material and a concomitant lack of dating evidence, and historically because of inadequate data, and again an inadequate chronology.

All that has been discussed in this report is the result of a long presentation and analysis of a very diverse and difficult body of data, recovered under far from ideal conditions, and not conforming to the expectations of the 1990s. It is to be hoped however that the sequence of events and the present hypotheses concerning them, despite the many doubts and uncertainties, will promote continuing interest in Henley Wood and its locality.
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Plate 1 General view across temples, looking west. Temple Phase 3 east ambulatory wall is in the foreground, with the site dropping away in the background (HWN 40).

Plate 2 General view across temples, looking SE. Temple Phase 3 north cella wall is in the foreground (HWN 24).

Plate 3 General view across temples, looking NE. The levelled temple Phase 3 west ambulatory wall is in the foreground (HWN 23).
Plate 12 Structure 4, looking east along surviving fragment of south wall and across entrance and flooring (HWN 170).

Plate 13 Structure 4, looking west across entrance; on the right is interior flooring (HWN 181).
Plate 15 General view of the partly-excavated temenos ditch, looking NE from the southern end of Area V (HWN 113).

Plate 16 Cf Pl 15, but fully excavated (HWN 157).
Plate 17 Abutment V.382, looking west across the emptied temenos ditch (HWN 187).

Plate 18 Detail of abutment, looking SW along top of wall V.382.2 and with filling of posthole V.383 in the foreground (HWN 191).
Plate 20  General view of graves in top of temenos ditch opposite temples (Graves 29–40), looking SW (HWN 116).

Plate 21  General view of graves in top of southern part of temenos ditch (Graves 13–16, 19–21, 23, 25), looking SW (HWN 86).

Plate 22  Double grave, Graves 5A (right) and 5B (left) (HWN 47).

Plate 23  Grave 13 (HWN 61).
Plate 24 Grave 17 (HWN 68).

Plate 25 Grave 19 (HWN 71).

Plate 26 Double grave, Graves 38A (right) and 38B (left) (HWN 108).

Plate 27 Graves 43 (left) and 44 (right) (HWN 163).
Plate 30 Figurine, BZ66 (cf Fig 110.161), front view (HWN 209).

Plate 31 Ibid, back view (HWN 207).

Plate 32 Ibid, right side (HWN 210).

Plate 33 Ibid, left side (HWN 211).
Plate 34 Inscribed finger ring, BZ58 (cf Fig 89. 36) (HWN 213).

Plate 35 'Triton' sherd (HWN 218).