CHAPTER 13

CEMETERIES AND HUMAN REMAINS

INTRODUCTION

The discovery in 1577 of the tombstone of Flavia Victorina is one of the earliest reported finds from Silchester (RIB 87). It generated so much interest that it was rapidly transported to Queen Elizabeth's Chancellor, Lord Burghley, in London for study, in whose possession it was observed by William Camden. Late Elizabethan England was the time when Camden and others founded an early forerunner to the Society of Antiquaries; amongst its membership was a former pupil of his, Sir Robert Cotton, first Baron of Connington. The two became firm friends and in 1600 toured Hadrian's Wall and the North, acquiring on their way inscriptions and Roman coins to add to Cotton's collection, which already included the richest private library of manuscripts of the nation's past. So it is probably not surprising that the Silchester tombstone passed into Cotton's possession and was moved up to his estate in Conington in Huntingdonshire. The inscriptions were passed by a descendant to Trinity College Cambridge around 1750, and from there to the University's Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology in 1969; curiously Trinity also have a record of the Revd John Paris passing title to the stone to the college, his alma mater, in the early eighteenth century (Camden 1610, 272; Horsley 1732, 332; Thomson 1924, 103–6; Davies 1997, 162–4; McKitterick 1997, 111–13). Yet despite the tombstone receiving peerless early attention, gaining an audience amongst the early antiquarians, the cemeteries of Silchester have remained virtually unstudied. The later Society of Antiquaries' ambition to explore the cemeteries was never realised as their campaign lost steam and attention moved to Old Sarum; otherwise Silchester might have seen the first large-scale Romano-British burial ground excavation, but it was not to be. Boon managed to stretch the meagre evidence on cemeteries to only two pages within his magisterial work on the town (Boon 1974, 185–6); not unreasonably so, as the evidence was limited to this solitary tombstone, a sarcophagus from the north of the town and evidence for cremations being turned up by the plough in a number of areas and from the Outer Earthwork. This lacuna in our knowledge has meant that since the mid-1990s developing a sense of the mortuary landscape around the town, and then sampling cremations and late antique inhumations, has been stated as a high priority (Fulford 1996, 31; Fulford and Allen 2010).

In this chapter we will review all the evidence, combining antiquarian and excavation finds with fieldwalking and geophysical survey results, and attempt to reconstruct the mortuary landscape in and around the town (fig. 13.8). While much evidence is based on the triangulation of multiple sources, some argument will rely solely upon the interpretation of geophysics without any other evidence to corroborate it, and appropriate notes of caution will be aired. Alas, many surveys of Roman towns have not ventured outside the town limits to provide comparative images of what the response from an urban cemetery might look like (e.g. White et al. 2013). While some of the conclusions will remain hypothetical until ground-truthing can test and sample what is there, others raise questions which can be tested against the datasets of geophysical surveys from around other Roman towns, particularly in searching for funerary pyre areas. The chapter first surveys the excavated material from within the town, and then examines evidence for burial enclosures, cremations and inhumations largely, but not entirely, outside the town. In each case expectations of what we might reason to find based on other sites in the South-East is contrasted with the actual evidence.
REMAINS FROM WITHIN THE TOWN

EXPECTATIONS

Classical convention would have it that, with the exception of infant remains, no burials should be expected within the confines of a Roman town. However, the boundary of the town changed over time: the area between the Inner Earthwork and the eastern Town Wall was once ‘outside’, so early burial may have taken place here. Also, since Silchester had pre-Roman origins, we might expect a hang-over from the Middle to Late Iron Age heritage of the area. This could include excarnations, with selected bones deposited within settlements, particularly boundaries, and the occasional body in a pit. The deposition of partial human remains on Roman sites in Hampshire certainly lessened, but never quite disappeared (Pearce 1999, 93–5; 2013, 87; 2015, 148).

INFANT BURIALS

The occurrence of premature, neo-natal and infant burials within pits, wells and post-holes on Roman sites is now a well-recognised phenomenon (Scott 1991; Moore 2009). There seems to be a broad shift from them appearing in partly-filled ditches in the Iron Age, as at Gussage All Saints and Owslebury (Whimster 1981, 28; Collis 1977, 26–8), to being found more commonly in the foundation trenches of buildings or under floors. Usually they come from private houses, but occasionally they are discovered in public buildings, such as the one buried beneath the floor in the Baths-Basilica at Wroxeter (Kenyon 1940, 188). Occasionally some were buried in larger official cemeteries (e.g. Poundbury: Farwell and Molleson 1993), though they could also be placed into smaller discrete cemeteries of their own. Examples of the latter in the vicinity include the villas at Barton Court Farm (Oxon.) and Hambleden (Bucks.) (Cocks 1921, 150); or in an urban context at Alcester (Philpott 1991, 97; Mahany 1994, 145–7); Southwark (Ridgeway et al. 2013, 10) and Dorchester (Dorset) (Trevathan 2008, 38).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insula</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>two infant skeletons were found in 1890, one from an unspecified pit containing a child about a year old, the other a little to the west of the detached square building south of House I.2, placed in a small urn (Fox and St John Hope 1890, 743–4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Joyce found infant bones at the entrance to the Forum (Balderston 2002, 8); fragments of a newborn were also found in 1892 in a pit to the north of the Forum (Fox and St John Hope 1893a, 572).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>the early material has yet to be reported on. However, six finds of infant remains from the mid-Roman layers are reported on by Lewis: two fragments and a neonatal burial from Period 3 and three fragments from Period 4 (Fulford and Clarke 2011a, 241–3). From the later Roman layers Snelling identified: a near-complete skeleton of a pre-natal infant from Pit (3251); seven long bones from at least two pre-natal infants from Pit (3235); a skull fragment and long bones of a pre-natal infant from Pit (1707); a long bone of a pre-natal infant from Well (1682); and a neonatal fragment from the foundation of Building 1 (1422) (Fulford et al. 2006, 201–2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXIII</td>
<td>several skull bones of very small babies were found in 1903–4 in the latrine pit of the Public Baths (St John Hope and Fox 1905a, 369).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From either Insula XX-VIII (west) or XXXV</td>
<td>parts of two very young (neonatal) babies were found in 1907, identified by Newton (St John Hope 1908, 213–14), though on re-examination by Balderston (2002) three infants are represented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the final years of Langshaw’s excavations</td>
<td>infant remains were found in a jar covered by a ‘saucer of dark clay’ and displayed by Dr Woodhouse in London, but no further details are known and it was not referred to in Hilton Price’s publication of Langshaw’s work (Anon. 1883).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At Silchester, over a dozen have been found during excavations, half coming from the recent work in Insula IX, which more implies a failure to identify them in earlier excavations than suggesting Insula IX was particularly exceptional. There is no obvious patterning in the distribution of remains found by the Antiquaries, so little advance can be made beyond Eckardt’s discussion of the specific contexts of the finds within Insula IX (Fulford et al. 2006, 225–6). Many of the earlier remains have recently been re-analysed by Balderston (2002).

INHUMATIONS AND CREMATIONS

Four inhumations and one cremation have been excavated from inside the town.

The earliest burial came from the Basilica excavation, where a young adult male inhumation was discovered in a large pit to the south-east of Lane 3; it was found in an extended supine position with bronze-working mould fragments (F1297: Period 2–3; 15 B.C. to A.D. 50/60). Fulford wondered if the pre-Basilica remains of this burial together with other skeletal fragments might be ‘outsiders’, victims of war, slaves or other groups, though there was no distinguishing pathology on the complete skeleton other than showing the individual had been engaged in hard physical labour (Fulford and Timby 2000, 548). This line of argument echoed that once used for burials in Iron Age pits in southern British hillforts, that these must represent criminals or other people marginalised from society; nowadays more ritualistic interpretations are considered (Hill 1995; Lally 2008, 124; Madgwick 2008, 101).

Another body was found in the Mansio bathhouse in the 1830s, and this evoked an even more fanciful interpretation at the time. It was imagined to be a Briton killed by a Saxon as they tried to hide a coin hoard which was found nearby. It is, however, a rare example of a British context for a Late Roman burial within the settlement area as the structure of the town fragmented (for a parallel in London, see Perring 2015, 38; Pearce 2015, 145; or for Late Roman burials in the hypocausts of the Wroxeter Public Baths, see Ellis 2000, 369).

The only cremation discovered in the town was found on its own in the south-west corner of Insula XIX, close to Block XIX.II. The Antiquaries made little of this building, but Boon thought it could be a small mithraeum (Boon 1973, 112; 1974, 159; 1976, 397), though it lacked any of the common internal features, and the idea has not been picked up by others.

**Table 13.2. Inhumations within the town walls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insula IV Basilica</th>
<th>– one complete (Period 2) and one partial (Period 3) inhumation were reported on by Janet Firth (Fulford and Timby 2000, 501–5).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insula IV Basilica</td>
<td>– a fragmentary inhumation was found high up in the stratigraphic sequence, so possibly Late or sub-Roman (Joyce’s Journal, 16 May 1867).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insula VI</td>
<td>– an adult inhumation with worn teeth was found in 1905, in a shallow grave in House VI.1 Room 17 (St John Hope 1906, 159, 164–5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insula VIII</td>
<td>– an inhumation was found in the Mansio bathhouse by the Revd J. Coles (Kempe 1833, 125).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insula XIX</td>
<td>– a cremation was found in 1898 in the south-west corner of Insula XIX in a large black vessel (St John Hope and Fox 1899a, 237).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FRAGMENTARY REMAINS: SKULLS AND MISCELLANEOUS FRAGMENTS

**Skulls**

Human remains, particularly skull fragments, were found outside the North and West Gates. The idea that they came from disturbed burials cut through by the ditch was considered by Fulford and Firth, but rejected. Only skulls and long bones were found and there were no signs of truncated graves. Since the Gates and Town Rampart were erected c. A.D. 180–200, any earlier disturbed burials would have been likely to have been cremations; however, no calcined bone
was recorded in the excavations. The conclusion that they represent the display of victim’s heads upon the gates is tempting and is discussed by Fulford (2000a). The other location where a number of skulls were found was around the Forum, which again makes public display not implausible. Redfern and Bonney (2014) pointed to a similar group from the Walbrook Valley in London which they also thought had been on display.

Other human skeletal fragments

Fragmentary human remains have been found in a variety of locations. As stated above, this phenomenon was common on Iron Age sites, and many of these remains probably come from the Iron Age phases of the town. Those from beneath the Basilica are unambiguously stratified in early contexts (Fulford et al. 1997, 131); but they can be complemented by several finds from the Inner Earthwork ditch: first, the skull fragments from Boon’s Trench B and secondly, a long bone found in a deposit just outside the ‘Sluice Gate’ which happens to be where the Town Wall crosses the filled-in Inner Earthwork. Other early finds include the skull fragment from the North Gate which had a radiocarbon date of 550–200 B.C. (1σ, OXA 8732), suggesting the presence of early material. The North Gate is also located in an area where the Town Wall Ditch would have cut through the earlier defences. In conclusion, the deposition of disarticulated remains certainly
TABLE 13.3. SKULLS FROM SILCHESTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insula</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>a skull fragment was found in the south of the insula in 1890 (Fox and St John Hope 1890, 743–4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>fragments of a human skull were found near the south-east angle of the Forum area in 1892, and the Antiquaries also reported Joyce having previously found parts of two or three skulls broken into fragments from the Forum (Fox and St John Hope 1893a, 572).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>two joining adult skull fragments came from a Period 3 context, identified by Lewis (Fulford and Clarke 2011a, 241–3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII/XXIIa</td>
<td>three small fragments of human cranium came from Boon's excavation of the Inner Earthwork (Trench B) (Boon 1969, 52).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII (west) or XXXV</td>
<td>an adult jaw from 1907 was identified by Newton (St John Hope 1908, 213–14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Gate</td>
<td>‘fragments of human skull’ were found in 1890 (Fox and St John Hope 1890, 757).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Gate</td>
<td>a crushed skull was found buried three feet down under a stone in the counterscarp of the ditch (St John Hope and Stephenson 1910, 323). Further fragments came from five locations in 1991, two in a deposit sealed by a gravel layer with a terminus post quem of A.D. 295, with the rest from later or unsealed contexts reported on by Firth (Fulford et al. 1997, 129). One fragment was dated to A.D. 420–540 1σ (OXA 8733) (Fulford 2000a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued after the foundation of the oppidum, but stratigraphically it is unclear for how long. This all appears to show a degree of continuity with Iron Age burial practices, even amongst a community using in other respects significantly Romanised assemblages of material culture. It will be interesting to see if such evidence continues to be found in the early levels of the Insula IX excavations.

TABLE 13.4. OTHER HUMAN REMAINS FROM WITHIN THE TOWN WALLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insula</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV, pre-Basilica</td>
<td>bones from three individuals, and some nail-clippings which had been cut with a knife (from the Period 1 well), reported on by Firth (Fulford and Timby 2000, 501–5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>part of a 12–14-year-old human skull and arm-bones from a wood-lined well in north-west quarter (St John Hope 1906, 161, 165). Note, this was not from Insula IV as stated by Snelling (Fulford et al. 2006, 204).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
<td>a pit produced various long bones from a ‘man’ of small stature in 1899, identified by Garson (St John Hope and Fox 1900, 111).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East Gate</td>
<td>a femur was found in the Town Ditch just outside the ‘Sluice Gate’ in 1892 (Fox and St John Hope 1893a, 572).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Gate</td>
<td>various long bones and a rib were discovered in 1991, including a femur with cut marks on it, identified by Firth (Fulford et al. 1997, 129); the latter fragment was dated to 550–200 B.C. 1σ (OXA 8732) (Fulford 2000a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AYLESFORD-TYPE BURIALS AND ROMAN CREMATIONS

EXPECTATIONS

By the late second century B.C. contact with Gaul saw the development of new burial rites in South-East Britain, with the earliest examples coming from Baldock’s ‘The Tene’ (Herts.) and Westhampnett (W Sussex) (Stead and Rigby 1986; Fitzpatrick 1997; for an overview see
Fitzpatrick 2007). These rites are characterised by urned cremations accompanied by a few intact grave-goods, such as brooches, and are commonly termed Aylesford-type burials after the eponymous cemetery excavated by Evans (1890). In North-East Gaul these cemeteries have a discontinuous distribution. Their primary focus is on the Rhine, but there are other clusters to the west in Champagne and elsewhere. So too, in Britain the focus is in Hertfordshire, Kent and Essex, while there are plenty of outliers, such as at Westhampnett in West Sussex and Owslebury in Hampshire (Collis 1977; Fitzpatrick 1997, 228). Many of our Late Iron Age excavated examples come from small groups on rural sites, rather than from defined cemetery areas; sites like Owslebury being the exception. Where we do find cremations within oppida they often appear to be in multiple groups, such as at Baldock. These clusters are often associated with dyke systems, such as at King Harry Lane, Verulamium and the Lexden cemetery at Colchester.

Given the start date of Calleva in the mid to late first century B.C., it would be highly likely that there should be one or more Later Iron Age cremation clusters in the area.

The kind of morphological features we might expect would not only be the cremation burials themselves, but also traces of the funeral pyres. At Westhampnett 11 of these were identified, characterised by X-, Y- or T-shaped channels cut into the ground to draw air to fuel the fires, generally no larger than 1.5 m in size. These might be too small to see in the geophysical data, but if used repeatedly then an elevated magnetic signature from the burning might be visible. Westhampnett also produced a series of small enclosures about 4–5 m in size, sometimes containing pyre debris within them, but not obviously pyre sites. Three of them produced fired daub suggesting they were structures, and two were thought to parallel the kind of shrines found at Danebury (Hants.) and Heathrow (Middlesex). This group of buildings was separated off to the east of the cremations (Fitzpatrick 1997, 15–32, 229–34). At Westhampnett the cremation pits were arranged in a pattern radiating out from a circular area; while at King Harry Lane cremations were focused around a series of rectangular enclosures, each of which appeared to have a ‘primary’ or ‘founder’s’ burial. Some sites, such as King Harry Lane, continued beyond the Claudian conquest, though in many places new cremation cemeteries can be found.

Moving on chronologically, Early Roman cremation cemeteries in the region include St Pancras, Chichester, which lasted from c. a.d. 70 to the third century (Down and Rule 1971, 53–126), and Victoria Road East/Hyde Street in Winchester (Ottaway et al. 2012). The rite is not dissimilar to that in the Late Iron Age. Urned and un-urned cremations with one or two pots, though sometimes as many as seven or eight pots and occasionally a casket, are the normal urban rites. However, Millett has observed that in rural areas cremations had significantly more pots associated with them, often 10 or more and occasionally over 50; this he distinguished as the ‘East Hampshire tradition’ and interpreted as part of a phenomenon whereby elites did not take up residence in towns until later (Millett 1987). While cremations predominate, there are also occasional inhumations.

The evidence at Silchester will now be reviewed.

**CREMATIONS INSERTED INTO THE OUTER EARTHWORK (RAMPIER COPSE)**

In 1900 an unlocated excavation in Rampier Copse reported on by Karslake found what appears to be a kind of bustum, where a body was burnt and buried in situ. The description suggests a cutting was made into the Outer Earthwork Bank; then the corpse was laid-out on a north–south bier and burnt, leaving the remains of charcoal, nails and hobnails where the feet had been. The cremated remains were then separated and placed in a greyware pot placed where the head had been. It is not quite clear if this was on the inside or outside of the earthwork, though Karslake also reported that ‘burials seem almost continuous on the inner slope of the mound’, suggesting his activities were not limited to the one cutting into the bank (Karslake 1910, 330). A similar feature was noted by St John Hope and Stephenson in another section of the Outer Earthwork within Rampier Copse, excavated in 1909 (their second cutting, east of their exceptionally long 1000 ft trench; figs 6.50, 59 and 62). This time they found a platform cut into the mound with calcined bone and burnt bronze, but no urn (St John Hope and Stephenson 1910, 318, 326–7). Bearing in mind it was only Karslake who reported finding a cremation urn, it would make sense
if this was the late first- to early second-century cooking pot containing cremated bone observed by Timby in Reading Museum, labelled ‘Rampier Copse’ (Fulford and Timby 2001, 294). Black, in his survey of burial customs in South-East Britain, considered this kind of busta relatively common in the Rhineland, but fairly rare in Britain (Black 1986, 210, 217; see also Booth 2010, 502–4; Pearce 2013, 31–3).

The Rampier Copse enclosure, of course, is no longer a complete enclosure. Its northern and eastern banks were levelled. When this happened is unclear. Colt Hoare still depicted the eastern side showing to some degree at the start of the nineteenth century (Hoare 1821). However, it was ploughed so flat that Fulford began to doubt its existence (Fulford 1984, 82–3). It was noticeable that Corney came up with a pre-Claudian scatter of pottery over precisely this area, dominated by early handmade grog-tempered ware with distinctive squared-off rims (Corney 1984, 249). Could it be that these were ploughed-out ceramics inserted into the earthwork, as had happened on the south-western side?

No interments have been reported in any of the other cuttings into the Outer Earthwork; this suggests the phenomenon was limited to the Rampier Copse stretch which may have been a deliberate reuse of this probably earlier earthwork.

Another location where pits were cut into the back of a bank is in that of the North-West Annex (LP 4172, Exterior 8, Figs 6.23–25). The geophysical results show that immediately inside the bank there is a large number of small pits. They are not particularly magnetic, so unlikely to be busta, and without excavation it is impossible to say if they might be cremations; no cremated bone was reported by Corney from fieldwalking that part of the field. But if any future work is planned, it is worth investigating whether it is a related phenomenon or something entirely different.

If we look to see if similar things happened elsewhere, then Oram’s Arbour, the earlier boundary enclosure at Winchester, and Dyke Hills at Dorchester-on-Thames are obvious parallels to examine. At both no cremations have been reported inserted into the banks, though later Roman inhumations had been inserted into each of them (Ottaway et al. 2012, 171; Booth 2014).

THE WESTERN CREMATION CEMETERY

A second area known from fieldwalking and excavation is in LP 4172 (Exterior 13, Figs 6.38–40, 13.2, 13.8). The plough brought up a cluster of pottery and calcined bone in 1979, so a one-day excavation was undertaken by Corney to investigate the survival of the likely cremations. Two small trenches were dug; one contained six urned burials of which three were lifted, while the other revealed a single burial. The date range was a.d. 80–130, and their compact spread within the main trench suggested an intensive use of space (Corney 1984, 293–7; Grew et al. 1980, 394–5). Each burial contained one or two pots, except for one which included eight. This pattern is comparable to that at Victoria Road East, Winchester, where three-quarters of the burials had one or two pots with them, while a few had significantly more (Ottaway et al. 2012, 85).

The fluxgate gradiometry showed these cremations were within an irregularly shaped spread of small anomalies which had firm northern and eastern boundaries. To the north is the putative early road, giving the burials a prime roadside location (see p. 327), while on the eastern edge of the burials is an area containing a series of small rectilinear enclosures, perhaps shrines or small individual burial enclosures. Curiously the arrangement was exceptionally reminiscent of the layout at the earlier cemetery at Westhampnett, even though the latter is considerably earlier. These are both shown on the same scale and orientation in Fig. 13.2 (Fitzpatrick 1997; 2000, 22–7).

Corney’s excavation took place on the western edge of the main pottery scatter, FH:86, which was a 2150 m² spread of predominantly Flavian-Hadrianic material, lacking earlier and later material, so fitting in with the broad dating of the excavated remains. If the cremation urns were being brought up by the plough, then a correlation with the pottery scatter might have been expected. It could be that the pottery scatters represent an area that only now survived broken up in the plough-zone, while the geophysically signed area shows those left. However, the hard eastern edge to the geophysical cremation pattern suggests a real demarcation. Perhaps the pottery comes from pyre sites in an adjacent area around these ‘shrines’ and small enclosures.
English Heritage conducted a Caesium Vapour magnetometer survey in this part of the field to see if any greater clarity could be observed; the results are unsurprisingly very similar to the standard fluxgate gradiometry survey (Fig. 13.2). One area did have an enhanced, but not exceptionally high, reading, and that was an east–west feature adjacent to the northernmost enclosure/shrine.

**CREMATIONS TO THE EAST AND SOUTH OF THE TOWN**

To the south and east there are two further areas where calcined human bone has been brought up by the plough and cremation cemeteries are presumed: in LP 0068 to the south and along the London Road to the east (Fig. 13.8). In both cases, unlike the western cemetery, there is no clear geophysical corollary showing a pattern of intensive pitting. This is probably because these sites are off the gravel plateaus and have topsoils above Bagshot formation fine-medium sand with silt and clay laminae which do not respond as well.

First, close by the Roman road to Winchester to the south, within LP 0068, patches of dark soil and calcined bone were found in the same area as Late Iron Age to Claudio-Neronian pottery (PC:5 and CN:16, Exterior 21, Fig. 6.62) (Corney 1984, 253); in addition a little to the south-west another discrete Claudio-Neronian scatter and cremated bone were also observed (CN:19, Exterior 24, Fig. 6.71). In the latter case there was ‘a spread of cremated bone and dark soil, 1 m by 50 cm, surrounded by pottery, including a samian Ritterling 12, 0.15 kg of “Silchester Ware”, 0.60 kg of other coarse wares, including two-thirds of the rim of a cordoned bowl’ (Corney 1984, 257). The size of the first pottery scatter appears to decrease over time: it covers a smaller area in the Flavian to Hadrianic period (FH:30) just when the western cemetery was flourishing. There are also further clusters of pottery slightly to the west of these in the same field (PC:6, CN:17, FH:31, AE3:49 and LR:68; and CN:18, AE3:48, LR38), though whether these are also from cremation burials is unclear.

Secondly, to the east of the town, on the north side of the London Road within LP 6346, a scatter of Antonine to Late Roman pottery together with tile also produced calcined bone (AE3:60 and LR:80, Exterior 15, Fig. 6.44). This scatter has a small, tight focus bounded by the Roman road to the south and on the north side by an east–west ditch. The geophysics suggest...
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an area of small pitting here. Boon had wondered if a small structure 70 m to the west was a mausoleum, and the geophysics have suggested there might be several other small structures within this area (Corney 1984, 263, 291; Boon 1974, 186).

In conclusion, there appear to be multiple cremation cemeteries on the roads to the west, south and east. They may occur to the north as well in some of the deeply pitted enclosures, but there has been little fieldwalking in this area, which is now pasture, to provide any corroboratory evidence.

THE LOCATION OF THE FUNERARY PYRES

We have, therefore, three potential cremation cemetery areas covering the early Roman period: a late Augustan to Neronian scatter in the south, a Flavian to Hadrianic cemetery in the west and a potentially enclosed Antonine and later cemetery to the east. This sequential dating is neat, but could be entirely a coincidence brought about by the very small sample sizes of material. What is abundantly clear is that the areas involved in these clusters are still very small given the size of the town. Geophysics do not always show clearly cremation burials and the extent of cremation cemeteries. The burials might be too small to show, or it is also possible that many might have been ploughed out only to remain in the plough-zone; but in that case the visibility of calcined bone over a larger area might have been expected when Corney was fieldwalking.

There is, however, another approach that can be taken to the geophysical data. Rather than looking for the burials, it can be used to look for the pyre sites.

Burial is only one of the later stages in the funerary rite; before that there is the conflagration of the funerary pyre itself. Finding and excavating these pyre sites has usually been a secondary priority to excavating the graves. Pearce called pyre sites the poor relation to graves in cemetery studies given the less critical attention paid to their identification and study in the past (Pearce 1999, 37; 2013, 27). Where they have been recognised, traces can often be very ephemeral: many may have just been set on the ground surface and later dispersed by wind and weather. Where known, there appears to be a mixture of patterning regarding their location: sometimes there are multiple pyre sites mixed amongst the burials (as at St Pancras in Chichester, Hooper Street in the East London cemetery, St Stephen’s in St Albans, the northern cemetery at Kempten and the south-western cemetery from Tongeren and Wederath); other times the pyres are in separate areas on the margins of the burial ground or on the other side of a road (as at York Trenholme Drive, Baldock-Royston Road, Seebuck-Bedaium, Mainz-Weisenau, Salzburg and Reichenhall) (Pearce 1999, 50; 2013, 29–31).

In theory a range of activities associated with pyres and commemoration have the potential to leave heat-signatures: the pyres themselves, the spread of pyre debris and its incorporation into other fills, pyre material in the burials themselves, and burnt material related to commemorative activity (for summaries of the variety of material, see Abegg-Wigg 2008; McKinley 2013).

**Fig. 13.3** shows the distribution of non-linear features which have a magnetic reading greater than 10 nT, excluding dipoles or ‘spikes’ which are likely to be metal objects. The results for both the interior and exterior of the town are shown. It is immediately clear that there are more signs for burning or other forms of magnetic enhancement just outside the Town Walls than inside the town, even though inside is where one might expect all the hearths, ovens, hypocausts and other features to keep the populace warm and fed. Outside there are significant clusters of ‘hotspots’ near the North Gate, the East Gate, to the south, and particularly between the Town Wall and the Outer Earthwork to the west, though carefully avoiding the interior of the Rampier Copse enclosure which appears to be a reserved area.

These ‘hotspots’ could represent all sorts of thermal activity, such as temporary clamps for firing tiles, kilns, furnaces, or other noxious industrial activities which might need to be removed from high density wooden and thatched housing. They could also represent middens; various bacteria produce magnetically-enhanced excreta, so middens show as elevated readings. Perhaps the most famous example of this kind of smouldering activity in the Roman world is Gehenna, where waste was dumped outside of Jerusalem; fires were always burning there (as well as ‘unclean’ bodies), hence its name became a metaphor in the New Testament for the final place of punishment of the wicked after the resurrection, often referred to as ‘hell’. However, the areas here
are more discrete than a broad spread of midden material might cover. They could also represent areas where funerary pyres were constructed and individuals burnt. Funerary pyres, of course, need not have been close to where selected cremations were finally interred, if they were interred at all. Elms Farm, Heybridge, is a cautionary tale here, where 19 funerary pyres were discovered, but only two cremation burials found in one area (Niblett 2004, 30). The interpretation of these areas outside the urban core of Silchester cannot be simply pinned down to pyres; but in places the associated distribution of these signals and burials is highly suggestive, such as the signatures around the three western burial enclosures, and the complementary distribution of heat signatures to the north of the road to London and inhumation to the south. Examining magnetic signatures in this way around towns in large-scale surveys offers an additional way to investigate the funerary and industrial landscapes of towns.

In addition to these ‘hotspots’, there may have been formal cremation platforms for repeated use (*ustrinae*). Those argued to be combustion platforms appear to be very variable in form (Pearce 1999, 40; 2013, 29–31). One possibility for such a structure comes from a nineteenth-century reference to the site. In a garden near the Amphitheatre there was found:

… a large flat piece of stone found upon digging. It is [2.24 m] high and [0.61 m] thick, probably weighing nearly a ton [907 kg]. When discovered, Mr Wills states, it was flat, on a setting of brickwork and rubble but the men turned it up on its side, where it now remains. Mr Layard and Mr Petigrew had made an inspection of these remains and conceived they may have constituted portions of some erection of civil or sacred purposes.  (Anon. 1860, 92)

The particular location is unknown; however, because it was found in a garden adjoining another garden near the site of the Amphitheatre, it is presumed to have been in one of the houses adjacent to the Town Wall north of the East Gate. The description indicates a massive raised-up horizontal slab which suggests either a large altar or quite possibly a pyre platform.

---

**FIG. 13.3.** Geomagnetic ‘hot points’ within and outside the Town Walls: discrete features with signatures $>10$ nT.
CEMETERIES AND HUMAN REMAINS

WELWYN-TYPE BURIALS AND BURIAL ENCLOSURES

EXPECTATIONS

In the Late Iron Age, alongside the development of the Aylesford-style urned cremations, a small number of more richly furnished graves also appeared, nowadays called ‘Welwyn-type’ burials, often un-urned within a chamber and accompanied by significantly more material culture and generally at least one amphora. The earliest, in the first half of the first century B.C. at Baldock, was contained within a 1.6 m circular pit; it included a Dressel 1 amphora, a cauldron and ‘firedogs’ (Stead and Rigby 1986, 52–3). However, many later burials took place within timber-lined rectangular chambers, such as a later first-century B.C. example from Welwyn Garden City, with its Dressel 1B amphora and Italian silver (Stead 1967).

FIG. 13.4. The Western Enclosures (±15 nT with readings over 15 nT in red).
Their apogee was reached with a small number of significantly richer burials. At Colchester there were the Lexden (Laver 1927; Foster 1986), Gosbecks and Stanway burial enclosures (Gosbecks as yet unexcavated, Crummy et al. 2007), while at Verulamium there was the 2 ha Folly Lane enclosure (Niblett 1999). These varied in size and in the details of the rites performed, but a greater destruction of objects can be noted than in the smaller Welwyn-type graves. Some of these sites, particularly Folly Lane and Gosbecks, were monumentalised and became the focus of development and commemoration through the Early Roman period. In an earlier book (Creighton 2006, 123–56) I explored how this might relate to the politics of the

---

**Fig. 13.5.** The Insula XXXVI enclosure (±15 nT with readings over 15 nT in red).

**Fig. 13.6.** The Silchester enclosures and comparative examples: Clemency (after Metzler et al. 1991); Folly Lane (after Niblett and Thompson 2005); King Harry Lane (Stead and Rigby 1989); Gosbecks and Stanway (Crummy et al. 2007).
developing province, as cities founded by friendly kings and their retinues became incorporated into the Roman world. *Calleva* is often associated with Commius and his descendants surviving down to Cogidubnus’ client kingdom, so where are these individuals and their kin buried and commemorated? I had ventured a guess as to where some might be, but some solid evidence would have been nice and this was one of the questions this project set out to answer (Creighton 2006, 135–42).

THREE ENCLOSURES TO THE NORTH-WEST

To the north-west a series of at least three enclosures was constructed immediately outside and alongside the Inner Earthwork bank and ditch (Figs 13.4, 13.8).

Enclosure 1 (LP 3950) is slightly trapezoidal, but approximately 36 x 36 m square. There is a series of large anomalies within it focused towards the centre, 4–5 m in size. The surrounding ditch appears to be clear of ‘noise’ (metallic spikes or secondary pits).

Enclosure 2 (LP 3950) is perhaps the clearest, c. 44 x 36 m, containing two central presumed burial pits. Within the boundary ditch, on the north-western side, is a series of smaller pits with strong magnetic signatures. These could be secondary burials, which can be seen at sites like Clemency (Lux.). Here there was a central burial vault under a presumed tumulus keeping the rest of the interior of the enclosure relatively clear; but in front, crossing the enclosure ditch and predominantly on the right, when facing the mound, there was a large number of offering pits, which we may see at Silchester too. Also in front of the Clemency enclosure were pyre sites, and here too there are a couple of strong magnetic anomalies in front of Enclosure 2 which might be pyres, another chamber or something completely unrelated (Metzler *et al.* 1991, 36; Fitzpatrick 2000, 18–20).

Enclosure 3 (LP 6667) is the largest and appears to have been extended, with a secondary ditch added to the north-east. Its south-western side is a little unclear but overall the enclosure appears to be about 56 x 26 m.

A close interval contour analysis of the LiDAR data gave no evidence to support the notion that there were tumuli here; however, the earthworks in the fields have also been ploughed totally flat over the years, so the absence of evidence does not preclude it.

The positioning of the three enclosures in front of the Inner Earthwork suggests they could date to any time from the digging of this feature onwards (*terminus post quem* of the late first century B.C. or early first century A.D.). It looks as if the early layout of the street-grid respects and goes around these features as the insulae were extended out into LP 6667, providing a *terminus ante quem* in, perhaps, the Flavian period (see discussion p. 392). Dating evidence from fieldwalking is marginal. In the field of Enclosure 1 and 2 the majority of scatters were bounded on the west by the Inner Earthwork. Between the two enclosures there was a scatter of Augustan to mid-first-century A.D. pottery (PC:13), while the interiors of the enclosures are actually fairly clear (Corney 1984, 249). There was no fieldwalking in the field of Enclosure 3.

Given that Stanway provides one of the parallels for these, and a set of surgical instruments was found in one of the graves there (Crummy *et al.* 2007, 201–2), it is worth noting as an aside that in a section through the Town Wall ditch by the Antiquaries, the ditch cut an earlier feature (Section 3 just north of the West Gate, see p. 295). When excavated, this earlier feature included within it Claudian to later first-century material and what was interpreted as a bronze surgical implement (St John Hope and Stephenson 1910, 326). Unfortunately the publication does not make clear to which of the various medical-related finds listed by Boon in the collections this refers (Boon 1974, 137). The co-location may be entirely fortuitous; but the presence of Greek doctors in the Augustan court influenced their adoption by the friendly kings of the Empire. For example, Juba II of Mauretania employed Euphorbus, the brother of Augustus’ doctor Musa (Pliny, *NH* 25.38).

THE INSULA XXX MULTIPLE TEMPLE TEMENOS

At *Verulamium*, Folly Lane was the main burial that was monumentalised. It had a Romano-Celtic temple added on one side, and the site remained in use as a place of commemorative
action into the third century. This enclosure was situated outside the town, overlooking it in a visually obvious location. Silchester lies in a very different topographic position, being on the top of a gravel spur, rather than in a valley bottom. The points with the highest visibility are the edges of the terrace as the town is approached from the north, east and south and this is where the Amphitheatre and the two Insula XXX Romano-Celtic temples were located (Figs 5.35–7).

The temples, like Folly Lane, are situated in a position inextricably bound up with the location of the Forum. At Verulamium the burial enclosure and the forum and theatre all visually inter-relate; at Silchester too, the Forum exit leads along the seriously off-grid-alignment street towards the temenos enclosure. While these temples now appear within the Town Walls, up until the Claudian period they would have been outside the early Inner Earthwork enclosure, and across a spring and small stream, just as at Verulamium it was necessary to cross the River Ver to pass from the town to Folly Lane. Similarly a second route at Verulamium passed the Branch Road baths, and at Silchester the Public Baths are situated in a comparable position.

We do not know when the Temples were founded, but the temenos in which they were situated had significant visual prominence, as did Folly Lane within Verulamium. At some point it was enclosed with a brick wall, but there may have been an earlier ditched enclosure, though not aligned to the Flavian street-grid. Traces of a ditch or linear feature can be seen immediately to the south-west of the walled area in the geophysics. Also, to the north, Fulford excavated a very significant ditch running west-north-west to east-south-east parallel to the northern side of the temenos wall (Fulford 1984, 37). It went down to 4.2 m below modern ground level. The feature did not make sense as a roadside ditch since it was far too deep and early (alas the road itself did not survive, the stratigraphy having been truncated with only this deeper-cut feature remaining visible). Fulford rejected the idea that it was an early temenos boundary as it was approximately on the northern side of the path of the later Roman road, and instead interpreted the feature as a major defensive ditch. The only problem with the latter interpretation is that it cannot be seen continuing anywhere in the geophysics if projected west, or indeed east beyond the Town Wall; other major ditches show, such as the Inner Earthwork, despite being overlain by four centuries of Roman stratigraphy, so this is a genuine absence. The simplest explanation is that it is indeed an early temenos enclosure ditch, and that in due course it was replaced in stone, with the stone wall being set in from the ditch.

Fulford dated the ditch to the second half of the first century A.D., with the primary silts dating to around the A.D. 70s and the ditch continuing to gradually fill up until reinforced with a palisade on the southern side around A.D. 100 (F42), and then perhaps later by the undated temenos wall c. 7 m to the south (F21) (Fulford 1984, 37–41). The gap between the northern temenos later wall and the early ditch is about the same as in the south-east corner between the known temenos wall there and the geophysical anomaly suggestive of a ditch, and the road eventually constructed over the filled-in ditch.

The two temples within the enclosure include the largest known in Britain so far at 22.3 m square, with the southern one 15.3 m square. Boon wondered if the modern later Church of St Mary’s was not built on top of a third as it had a similar alignment. There is little dating evidence, though Boon noted they were on the Public Baths alignment suggesting they were early (Boon 1974, 155–6).

There is no proof that this is a burial enclosure; if there was a chamber, then it is likely it would have been under the manor house, so inaccessible to investigation now. However, by analogy with Verulamium, it is perfectly possible. The Folly Lane enclosure was Later Iron Age, but the burial dated to the early years of conquest. Here at Silchester, we have earlier signs of activity at the temple area (see p. 341), but the enclosure itself is early post-conquest up to the A.D. 70s, perhaps dating to the end of Cogidubnus’ kingdom.

INSULA XXXVI WALLED ENCLOSURE

Another walled enclosure exists in this part of town within Insula XXXVI, outside the original Inner Earthwork oppidum. Off-set within the 29 x 35 m precinct was Block XXXVI.I, a single cell building about 5.8 m square, adorned with wall-plaster, though only the foundations remained.
The Antiquaries and Boon considered it to be a shrine of some sort (St John Hope 1909a, 479–80; Boon 1974, 152–3).

Within the enclosure the geophysics show a 3 x 4 m feature in the centre (many of the other features are metallic di-poles and lie along an old fence-line). The positioning is suggestive of a possible burial chamber, and its size is not dissimilar to those at Stanway, Lexden and Gosbecks (Crummy et al. 2007, 448).

During the Antiquaries’ excavations they partly cut into this feature, calling it ‘Pit 4’. Uncommonly in this case they provided a description of the pit. They said it was cut 2.1 m deep into the gravel and was 2.7 m in diameter. In it they found: ‘a few fragments of broken pottery, mostly black and grey, and a few bones; a small brass of Carausius on the bottom; two coins of the Constantine family, and five other illegible between [1.4 m] down, and a large brass of Hadrian at [0.9 m]; five bone pins and fragments of others; and one square green glass object, perhaps from a brooch’ (St John Hope 1909c, 479). The mixture in dates of the material described is remarkable, suggesting considerable disturbance. Although no human remains were identified in the report among the bones which were found, discoveries of calcined human bone were not mentioned in any of the other reports with the sole exception of the intact cremation discovered in Insula XIX. Some GPR on the site might productively be undertaken to see if the remains of a larger chamber are visible as at Gosbecks (Crummy et al. 2007, 449).

Whether this enclosure was actually a burial location or not, it is curious that both the enclosure here in Insula XXXVI and that in XXX were built in stone with the construction of shrines or temples, and that the main road into town was constructed to pass between the two of them, forcing people to swerve on their arrival or departure and ensuring that they achieved visual prominence. These two enclosures were remembered and monumentalised in a way the three, presumably earlier, enclosures to the west were not.

OTHER POTENTIAL ENCLOSURES

If we examine other areas just outside the Inner Earthwork but inside the later Town Walls, there are a number of linears to the north-east, and some possible features perpendicular to these. Alas the detail of these is unclear, masked by four centuries of later occupation. That there was pre-conquest material culture in this area, even outside the Inner Earthwork was revealed by Cotton’s sections into the later Town Wall. Early material was found in her Sites A, B, C and E, but structures were found only in A (a sealed pit) and E (three post-holes). There must be some activity resulting in all this material culture being found outside the Inner Earthwork.

THE INHUMATIONS

INHUMATION CEMETERY ON THE LONDON ROAD

In the later Roman period we find extensive ‘managed’ cemeteries being developed outside many town walls (Thomas 1981, 232; Philpott 1991, 226). The main examples in southern England are Lankhills outside Winchester (Clarke 1979; Booth 2010), Poundbury outside Dorchester (Dorset) (Farwell and Molleson 1993), Butt Road outside Colchester (Crummy et al. 1993), the Eastern Cemetery outside Roman London (Barber and Bowsher 2000), and Bath Gate outside Cirencester (McWhirr et al. 1982). It looks as if there is a similar style of cemetery on the eastern side of Silchester.

Crossing LP 4426, 6530 and 6346 is an extensive distribution of pit-like features detected in the geophysics which have the scale and rhythm to them of a managed cemetery (Exterior 18). Its position is set a little to the south of the London road, which would make sense if the land right by the road was already in use for other purposes before the cemetery was instituted. The patterning has clearly defined edges, though no obvious boundary ditch, and there appears to be a gap or possible trackway between two areas of it.

At Lankhills about 20 per cent of inhumations included ceramics, though this is a much higher proportion than at other cemeteries such as Poundbury. Curiously Corney identified ceramic
The interpretation of the geophysical response in the hypothesised eastern cemetery has not been confirmed by ground-truthing, but some similar ‘elongated rhythmic pitting’ can be seen in a number of other areas around the town.

To the south, close to the cremation cemetery in LP 0069, there are several areas just to the north in LP 1100 which might represent inhumations (Exteriors 21–22). There was no spread of pottery associated with this feature. The smaller the cluster the less certain the interpretation of the geophysics must be; however, the cluster within Exterior 22 appears to be associated with a large rectangular enclosure. It is also an area where a small copse has been allowed to stand in the middle of the field since the first edition OS maps. Occasionally the reason for this can be that the plough has been hitting stone or other obstructions so the area has been left to grow trees and provide cover for game; so there could be a structure here. This area is just inside the South-Eastern Enclosure bank.

There are two more patches just north of the town on either side of the Clad Gully Outer...
Earthwork in LP 2088 and 0085. Both are small areas close to what were probably disused earthworks by the later Roman period.

There is no secondary evidence to support either of these interpretations.

MAUSOLEUM AND UNVERIFIED CEMETERY AREA TO THE NORTH

To the north of the town OS maps for a long time noted ‘Roman Burials’. Curiously, despite this apparent certainty, this is the area we know least about. The only secure find comes from just outside the northern entrance through the Outer Earthwork. Here, just to the west of where the Roman road passes (though east of where it is inaccurately shown on OS maps), a Bath stone sarcophagus was discovered in 1852 in LP 8024 (Exterior 5, FIG. 6.14). The tomb was found within a 6 m diameter circular mausoleum, and the only recorded find within was an early third-century ceramic sprinkler-bottle (Boon 1974, 186). There are no primary published records relating to this find, though it appears on the earliest OS map, and Hodge made sure he extended his Great Plan of 1885 north to include it (Hilton Price 1887, pl. 15). Unfortunately modern disturbance meant it was not possible to see this in the results of the fluxgate gradiometry, but it appears to lie on a break in slope in the road leading up to the town, so would have marked the visual summit walking up from the north. This is also where the main roadside ditches appear in the fluxgate gradiometry survey. There is a small D-shaped enclosure on the other side of the road from the mausoleum which might have a comparable structure in it, both providing a welcome to visitors to the town.

Perhaps surprisingly the geophysical survey has not revealed additional mausolea or funerary
buildings along the roads out of the town, but then the response of buildings on the gravel is not especially good, as can be seen from the results in the interior.

To the south of this 1852 mausoleum, between the Outer Earthwork and the Town Wall, the OS designated an area of ‘Roman Interments’, labelling it thus on the advice of Mill Stephenson on the reprinting of their 1872 1:2500 edition maps (Boon 1957, 229). In the same way that we have no specific primary reference for the stone sarcophagus, there is no indication to say why Stephenson advised the OS to do this. By the 1969 edition the language was changed and this became ‘Roman Burial Ground’ for these mystery interments, perpetuating this unverified assertion, while the actual mausoleum for which we have solid evidence disappeared off the map.

It would not be surprising if there are more burials in this area, but no further evidence has come from the many development-led interventions around the modern farm and housing, or from the water main trench. Sieving during the excavation at Rye Cottage did not reveal any human skeletal remains (Fulford et al. 1997, 154). The only place human bone has been found is around the North Gate, as discussed above.

There is, nonetheless, extensive pitting and activity in this area on the geophysics, with a number of roads and lanes, but nothing with a signature like the possible inhumation cemetery to the east. There are enclosures running off the lane heading to the possible inhumation cemetery to the east. There are enclosures running off the lane heading to the possible inhumation cemetery to the east. There are enclosures running off the lane heading to the possible inhumation cemetery to the east. There are enclosures running off the lane heading to the possible inhumation cemetery to the east. There are enclosures running off the lane heading to the possible inhumation cemetery to the east.

**DISCUSSION**

Esmonde Cleary’s survey of the extramural areas of Romano-British towns observed, as expected, that there was a preference for cemetery locations to be along the major routes from town, especially towards London (Esmonde Cleary 1987, 168). This reflects the development of monumentalised *gräberstrassen*, mirroring in a provincial way the grandeur of the roads leading to Rome, Pompeii and Ostia. At Silchester, with qualification, that certainly seems to be the case. Apart from the cremations cut into the Rampier Copse earthwork, and a few small clusters of possible inhumations, all the major cemeteries are on the major roads out to the north, south, east and west. As of yet, nothing has been noticed along the line of the road to Old Sarum, a notable absence, nor along the hypothesised road towards *Verulamium*.

The early evidence appears to be on the roads to the west and south (not east towards London). This is where the early burial enclosures can be seen, and the cremated bone was ploughed up with Claudio-Neronian pottery.

It may be that the inhumation cemetery to the east, south of the London road, masks a cremation cemetery and it had mixed use, but there is no early pottery scatter to suggest it.

**TABLE 13.5. POTENTIAL SILCHESTER BURIAL AREAS AND ENCLOSURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Burial enclosures</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1–3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,450 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insula XXX enclosure (burial?)</td>
<td>Probably early to mid-first century A.D.</td>
<td>8,000–11,000 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern cremaion cemetery (LP 0068)</td>
<td>Claudio-Neronian, declining Flavian-Hadrianic</td>
<td>1,750 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insula XXVI enclosure (burial?)</td>
<td>No indication</td>
<td>1,100 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rampier Copse cremations in the bank</td>
<td>Late first to early second century A.D.</td>
<td>along 300 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western cremaion cemetery (LP 4173)</td>
<td>A.D. 80–130</td>
<td>1,300 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern cremation cemetery (LP 6346)</td>
<td>Antonine onwards pottery</td>
<td>500 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern mausoleum (LP 8024)</td>
<td>Early third century, c. 7 m diameter</td>
<td>38 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London road inhumation cemetery</td>
<td>Flavian onwards, but mainly later Roman</td>
<td>c. 33,000 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhumations? LP 1100</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>c. 5,400 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhumations? LP 2088 and 0085</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>970 and 530 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, the road to London does take centre stage when it comes to the two possible burial enclosures (Insulae XXX and XXXVI). The former, with its two Romano-Celtic Temples, would have been the landmark people travelled towards from the east. But both enclosures had to be passed to enter the town from London. If these are burial enclosures on analogy with Folly Lane and Gosbecks, then whoever they represented, the structures got monumentalised into the new fabric of the town – stone – in a way the burial enclosures to the west did not.

The smaller three enclosures to the west were at first respected as the town developed. As the street system developed insulae were extended around them, unusually incorporating them within the street-grid. But then in A.D. 180–200, with the construction of the new Town Bank and Ditch, they were clearly excluded by the line chosen for the new boundary of the town, while the same process chose to include the two stone enclosures in the east. It was to be the Insula XXX temple enclosure that dominated the major later Roman inhumation cemetery on the slope beneath. By the time this was established the new road to the west had been constructed sweeping through and across the area of the old Flavian cremation cemetery, consigning memory to the plough zone.

This survey has revealed for the first time several Later Iron Age or Early Roman burial enclosures and several potential cremation and inhumation areas, and allowed hypotheses concerning possible pyre zones on the edge of the town. However, the areas of burial still look small when compared to other Romano-British towns such as Colchester (Radford et al. 2013, fig. 7.22).

Certain speculations require ground-truthing, but from the knowledge-base of Boon’s two pages we have moved to a stage where there is a reasonably comprehensive outline of what might surround the town. The Silchester landscape offers a brilliant potential sampling ground to test a Romano-British population, examining chronological trends and engaging all the modern techniques of burial analysis, including isotopic and DNA work. This chapter helps set the groundwork for the ground-truthing and analysis that must lie sometime in the future.