LATE IRON AGE AND ROMAN POTTERY

By Edward Biddulph

Introduction

Almost 8000 sherds of pottery, weighing 89kg, were recovered from the Aylesbury Berryfields MDA. The assemblage was recorded to the standard recommended by period-specific pottery study groups (PCRG *et al.* 2016). Table 1 lists quantities of pottery from the various phases of investigation.

[INSERT TABLE 1]

All the material, excluding unstratified and pottery recovered by sieving from environmental samples, was fully recorded and analysed in order to refine or confirm the ceramic dates of each context group, and to address areas of research outlined at assessment, in particular pottery trade and production, site chronology, site status and function, patterns of ceramic deposition and context formation, and pottery use. The unstratified and sieved pottery was scanned to identify pottery of intrinsic interest and, in the case of the sieved pottery, to provide a spot-date where no other pottery existed.

Each context group was sorted into wares, which were assigned codes taken from Oxford Archaeology's guidelines for recording Roman pottery (Booth 2016). Forms were identified by rim and similarly assigned standard OA form codes (expressed as a two-letter code, such as CK for 'cooking pot' type jar, sometimes followed by a three-digit rim code, for example JB 110, a plain-rimmed curving-sided dish). Each vessel was quantified by sherd count, weight, number of vessels (MV) based on rim, and sherd count estimated vessel equivalent (EVE), which measures the surviving percentage of the circumference of a rim. Thus, a complete rim was recorded as 100%, while half a rim was recorded as 50%. In this report, percentages have been converted to fractions of a whole, 100% becoming 1 EVE and 50% becoming 0.5 EVE. Forms were matched where possible with well-established regional or industry-based corpora, such as those for Milton Keynes (Marney 1989), the Oxford region (Young 1977), pottery of late Iron Age/early Roman tradition (Thompson 1982; Hawkes and Hull 1947), and the samian industries (cf. Webster 1996). Ware codes pertaining to regionally significant fabrics were cross-referenced with the National Roman Fabric Reference Collection (Tomber and Dore 1998). Quantification of forms and fabrics is given in Tables 2 and 3. The figures exclude unstratified pottery, but include a proportion of the sieved material; that is, in cases where no other pottery from the context was recovered or where the pottery was deemed to enhance the existing context-group (for example in terms of dating or identifiable forms or fabrics). This amounts to 211 sherds, 1378g, 7 vessels (MV) and 2.11 EVE.

[INSERT TABLE 2]
[INSERT TABLE 3]

Assemblage composition and pottery supply

Sources of supply

Amphora reached the area uncovered at the Berryfields MDA from three principal sources: southern Spain (A11), from where olive oil containers (Dressel 20) were exported, southern Gaul (A13), whose potters were responsible for wine amphora (though no types were recognised by rim), and the Campanian region of Italy (A35), where wine container were also produced, although a suspected Dressel 1 or Dressel 2-4 amphora from Berryfields was

identified only by body sherds. Of these sources, southern Spain was the most important, as measured by all methods of quantification, and arrived mainly during the early Roman period. An amphora of broadly Gauloise type was also recorded in Verulamium-region white ware (W21).

Black-burnished wares arrived from Dorset (B11) from the mid-2nd century onwards. Most forms identified by rim are dishes, specifically plain-rimmed types (JB 110), though a 'cooking-pot' type jar (CK) was also recorded. More plain-rimmed dishes were seen in wheel-made black-burnished wares (B20), whose source may include Colchester or Mucking in Essex. More plain-rimmed dishes were supplied in imitation black-burnished wares (B30), whose source is likely to have been more local. That the forms identified in black-burnished wares are almost exclusively plain-rimmed dishes suggests that the inhabitants of Berryfields strongly associated the form with those wares, possibly owing to functional specialisation, for instance cooking or as table ware, and points to a degree of selection in the pottery supply.

Shelly wares have been divided into two categories: C10, which encompasses all shelly ware except that belonging to groups dated to the late Roman period, and C11, which comprises shelly ware in groups dated to the late Roman period or identified on form or fabric grounds as late Roman shelly ware, such as that manufactured in Harrold, Bedfordshire (Brown 1994, figs 29-40; Tomber and Dore 1998, 115). The former was available as necked jars (CD) and a wide-mouthed bowl (D) and is likely to have derived from manufacturing sites situated on the shell-rich Jurassic Beds to the west of Bedford, among them Emberton and Lavendon, as well as Harrold itself (PKRB, nd), the last being in operation from the later 1st to 4th century (Brown 1994, 20-21). It should be noted, however, that channel-rimmed or lid-seated jars, which are among the principal earlier Roman products of those workshops, were not recorded at Berryfields, suggesting that supply was irregular or that the source of the pottery lay elsewhere. The forms identified in C11 – necked jars with rilled bodies and bowls with dropped-flange rims – are typical of the Harrold repertoire.

Fabrics of late Iron Age/early Roman tradition (E wares) are predominantly grog-tempered (E80), but include smaller quantities of sand-tempered pottery (E20/E30), which also contain occasional grog inclusions. The sandy fabrics were available mainly as lid-seated jars (CJ; eg Thompson 1982, type C5-1) and medium-mouthed jars (CD) with rilled shoulders (Thompson 1982, type C7-1), but a necked high-shouldered jar (CE), globular jar (CG), butt-beaker (EA) and platters (JC) based on Gallo-Belgic prototypes, *Cam* 28 and *Cam* 30 (Hawkes and Hull 1947), were also recorded. The source of the pottery is unknown, but presumed to be local. Some occurrences contained glauconitic inclusions, which is likely to have derived from the Upper Greensand Formation that lies across the southern and eastern of Aylesbury (BGS, nd). An exposure of glauconitic beds has been recorded in Buckingham Street in the centre of the modern town (Radley 1993).

A much wider range of forms was available in fabric E80, but principal forms comprised storage jars (CN), CD-type jars – some with, others without, necks – and platters, among them *Cam* 26, *Cam* 28 and *Cam* 32 (Hawkes and Hull 1947). Bowls, beakers, and lids were also recorded. Fabric E80 was available in oxidised and reduced variants; the latter was better represented, but there was no strong association between surface colour and form. The pottery, as with fabrics E20/E30, is presumed to be of local origin. No kilns producing grog-tempered wares are known in the Aylesbury area, but the structures are likely to have been shallow or, essentially, surface features that are particularly prone to denudation and removal by later truncation, for example ploughing. That said, such kilns are attested in the Milton Keynes area at Caldecotte (Marney 1989, 95-100) and Broughton (Lyons 2014, 99-103) and to the south-east of Aylesbury at Bricket Wood, near Verulamium (Poole *et al.* forthcoming). Indeed, it is not impossible that products of those kilns are among the grog-tempered pottery found at Berryfields. Grog-and-sand-tempered fabrics (E810) were recorded in smaller

quantities, but was available in a similar range of forms, including types CD, EA and JC. A single vessel was recorded in grog-and-shell-tempered fabric (E820), although shell or the angular and plate-like voids of leached-out shell were occasionally seen in fabric E80. The vessel assigned to fabric E820 is a jar with a lid-seated and bifid rim (CJ; as Marney 1989, fig. 7, no. 7) and is likely to have a similar source to fabric C10.

It is evident from the quantity of Oxford red/brown colour-coated ware (F51) that the pottery industry of the Oxford region was an important source of ceramics to Aylesbury Berryfields. The ware took the largest share of fine wares at the site and arrived from the mid-3rd century AD onwards. Forms were largely confined to dish type JB (Young 1977, type C45), based on samian prototypes Drag. 31, and necked bowl HD (Young 1977, type C75), but hemispherical bowls and a cup, based on samian forms Drag. 38 and Drag. 33 respectively, were attested by body sherds. Nene Valley colour-coated ware (F52) was also relatively well-represented. It was available as dropped-flange bowls (HB 440) and beakers (a bag-shaped beaker (EC) was recognised by rim, but funnel-necked and indented beakers are also likely to be present). Fine wares also arrived from Central Gaul (F43), East Gaul (F44), Colchester (F55) and Hadham (F56), but in much smaller quantities. Beakers were recorded in fabrics F43 and F44, a funnel-necked, globular beaker (ED; *Cam* 395 (Hull 1963)) was seen in F55, while a shallow, flanged dish (Going 1987, type B10) was present in F56. A reasonably large proportion of colour-coated wares (F60) could not be assigned with certainty to the major industries, either because the fabrics were not sufficiently diagnostic or did not match the standard descriptions. Forms were limited to a necked bowl (HD) and a beaker, probably a funnel-necked vessel. While it is likely that the material does indeed belong to the major industries, the possibility that at least a proportion of it derives from a minor producer (for instance, from North Wiltshire or somewhere more local) cannot be excluded.

The Oxford-region industry also dominated the supply of mortaria. Oxford white-ware mortaria (M22) arrived from the 2nd century AD. Forms included hooked rim types (KA; Young 1977, types M2 and M6) and bead-and-flange types (KE; Young 1977, type M17, M18 and M21). Oxfordshire red colour-coated mortaria (M41), confined to form KE (Young 1977, type C100), reached the site in the 4th century AD. Other mortaria arrived from the Verulamium region (M21) – a hooked-rim type made by Matugenus was recorded – and the Nene Valley (M24).

Turning to oxidised wares, a single vessel, a bowl with a hooked rim, was attributed to the Oxfordshire industry (O11), but most fine oxidised wares could not be sourced (O10). A wide range of forms were recorded in fabric O10, though the emphasis was on table and specialist forms, particularly flagons (B) and beakers (E). A flanged dish (JB; as Going 1987, type B10) and a medium-mouthed jar (CD) were also recorded. Other fine oxidised wares, including potential Hadham products, were recorded as fabric O50. Forms comprised a necked jar (C) with a hooked rim, a cup-mouthed flagon (BA) and a bowl (H). Sandy oxidised wares (O20) were similarly of uncertain origin. However, a bowl or dish with an incipient bead-and-flanged rim (IB 430), whose fabric was reminiscent of the Oxford fabric (Tomber and Dore 1998, 173-7), and a flanged bowl (HC) copying samian form Ritterling 12 and similar to an O11 type (Young 1977, type O39), suggests that the Oxford industry is responsible for some of the occurrences. Pink grogged ware (O81) was much more diagnostic. Production is strongly suspected to be located at Stowe in northern Buckinghamshire, where possible kiln sites have been found (Taylor 2004; P Booth, pers. comm.). Forms identified by rim were confined to storage jars (CN).

Reduced wares made the largest contribution to the assemblage, and of this category, medium sandy reduced wares (R30) dominated. Jars, beakers, dishes and lids were recorded, the best-represented forms being medium-mouthed jars (CD), usually necked, and dishes or

bowls with plain or beaded rims (JB 110/210). The material is unsourced, but local production is presumed in most cases. No kilns producing coarse reduced wares or otherwise are known in the southern part of Aylesbury Vale, where Berryfields is situated. This is in contrast to the northern part of the county around Buckingham, as well as Milton Keynes and further south in the Colne Valley, where production is attested (Radford and Zeepvat 2009, 63). However, occasional misshapen pottery from the Berryfields assemblage (see below) hints at nearby kiln sites, and a jar containing glauconitic inclusions may have been made in or to the south or east of Aylesbury. Nevertheless, there are indications that some of the R30 pottery arrived from further afield. Three bowls – two necked vessels (HD) and a carinated bowl (HA) – recall types recorded and presumably manufactured in the Milton Keynes area (Marney 1989, fig 12, no. 53; fig. 16, no. 5; fig. 51, no. 11). Similarly, a narrow-necked jar (CC) with a distinctive bifid and frilled rim resembled a vessel recovered from a site in the northern Milton Keynes area; the parallel had been determined by petrological analysis to be of local manufacture (Marney 1989, 81-3, fig. 33, no. 11). It should be noted, however, that the fabric of the Berryfields example does not match that of its parallel (Marney 1989, 184, fabric 28). The jar may instead be a locally made vessel copying products of, say, the Hadham industry, some of which also had bifid rims with frilled decoration (eg Going 1987, types G26 and H17). Indeed, a dish with frilled decoration in fabric R30 (Fig. 00, no. 15), though too sandy to be Hadham reduced ware, does appear to be copying the style of Hadham products in an additional way, also having burnished surfaces.

Three body sherds were recorded in a medium sandy fabric (R30) with dark grey surfaces and a pale grey core may have originated west of the site. The fabric is near-identical to a reduced fabric (R37) found in quantity in west Oxfordshire, dominating assemblages at, for example, Yarnton, Asthall and Wilcote, and likely to have been produced in that area (Booth 2011, 371). All three sherds are probably part of the same vessel, a large jar with burnished lattice decoration, and recovered from Phase 6 pit, 3067.

More Oxfordshire pottery was recorded as fine reduced ware (R11), which was represented by a jar, a bowl or jar, and miscellaneous body sherds. Most fine reduced fabrics, however, could not be assigned to source (R10). Much of this material is likely to have been locally made, although the possibility of there being further R11 products within this group cannot be discounted. Jars, beakers, bowls and dishes were represented in fabric R10. Forms included medium-mouthed jars (CD), narrow-necked jars (CC), indented beakers (EE), poppyhead beakers (EF), and plain-rimmed (JB 110) and flanged dishes (JB 410). Sandier unsourced reduced wares were placed in the general category R20. Forms were confined to jars, which predominated, and dishes and bowls. Three vessels – a bead-rimmed dish (JB 210), a CD-type necked jar, and a jar not identified to type (C) – assigned to this fabric group contained glauconite in addition to quartz and may have a local origin.

The Verulamium region is suggested as the source of another sandy reduced fabric, R44, which took a relatively large share of the reduced ware group (11% of R wares by sherd count). The ware is characterised by a granular fabric of rounded grey and clear quartz and occasional dark grains. The surfaces and core tend to be a uniform light or darker grey. The fabric is identical to Verulamium-region grey ware (cf. Tomber and Dore 1999, 154; Davies *et al.* 1994, 52) under microscopic and macroscopic examination, and occurrences have been tentatively attributed to that source. It is, after all, not unreasonable to suggest that the industry's grey ware products travelled with its more familiar white wares (W21), which also reached Aylesbury Berryfields (W21). However, that fabric R44 is so well represented raises the possibility that a more local producer was responsible. Some 15% of grey wares from College Road, Aston Clinton, comprised coarser fabrics similar to those produced at Oxfordshire or Verulamium (Perrin 2013, 42). A grey ware fabric described as coarse and gritty with abundant ill-sorted quartz grains and sparse black iron ore was recorded in some

quantity from the Aston Clinton Bypass (fabric R06B; Slowikowski 2008a, 228). The fabric as a whole was not ascribed to source, though Milton Keynes was suggested for the source of a variant with conspicuous white quartz (Slowikowski 2008a, 228; Marney 1989, 184). The question of source will not be resolved without petrological analysis, but it is interesting to note that forms seen in fabric R06B – cordoned jars, everted rim jars, flagons, and flanged and plain-rim dishes, were not recorded in fabric R44, in which a variety of jars – medium-mouthed (CD), narrow-necked (CC), wide-mouthed (CM) and lid-seated (CJ) – were available. Other regional industries responsible for the supply of reduced wares, albeit in small quantities included the Nene Valley (R46) and the Hadham region (R40).

Dark-surfaced wares (R50) represented a range of sandy fabrics united by their very dark grey or black surfaces, and available in forms not typically found in black-burnished wares. A medium-mouthed necked jar (CD), lid-seated jars (CJ), and platters (JC) were recorded. Base sherds in a sand- and limestone-tempered fabric (R70) were also recovered. The fabric is likely to be local; Radley (1993) records units of Aylesbury Limestone in the centre of Aylesbury. Coarse fabric R90, largely tempered with sand and grog, was reserved almost exclusively for storage jars (CN).

Samian wares arrived from the industry's principal suppliers. Pre-Flavian importation (up to *c* AD 70) from South Gaul (S20) is indicated by a Drag. 24/25 cup, while Drag. 29 decorated bowls arrived from the same source at this time or a little later during the early Flavian period. Cup forms Drag. 27 and 42 are also represented. A Drag. 33 cup and a Drag. 18/31 dish may have arrived from Les Martres-de-Veyre (S32) during the early 2nd century. Central Gaulish samian was otherwise best represented by products from Lezoux, which was responsible for dishes in the Drag. 18/31-31 range, dish form Curle 15, bowl form Curle 11, and a Drag. 33 cup. Small quantities of samian ware are likely to have arrived from East Gaulish factories (S40).

Regional industries were responsible for a small proportion of white wares. Products from Oxfordshire (W11, W12), the Nene Valley (W14) and the Verulamium region (W21) are represented. The last was the most important in terms of quantity, and supplied flagons (BA) and jars (CD), in addition to mortaria already mentioned. No forms were recognised by rim in fabric W14, while Oxford-region products include carinated bowls (HA; Young 1977, type P24) and ring-necked flagons (BA; Young 1977, type W6). Flagons and butt-beakers (EA) were available in North Gaulish white ware (W30), though only a single beaker was recorded by rim. Jars (CC and CD), a dish (JB 210) and a bowl (H) were recorded in unsourced sandy white ware (W20); it is possible that some occurrences more properly be attributed to the Verulamium region. A butt-beaker was recorded in unsourced fine white ware (W10).

Chronological trends from phased groups

Ceramic groups dated by pottery to the late Iron Age or early Roman period and belonging to contexts assigned to Phase 3 (*c* 50 BC to AD 100) accounted for 4% of the entire pottery assemblage by EVE (Table 4). The phased assemblage was dominated by grog-tempered wares (E80). Smaller quantities of sand-tempered fabrics (E30 and E810) were also available. A relatively narrow range of forms – identified as jars, beakers and bowls – were recorded. The presence of Campanian amphora fabric, represented by few body sherds, hints at the arrival of Italian wine before AD 43 or within a decade or two after that date.

The scale of pottery deposition increased during the early Roman period. Ceramic groups belonging to Phase 4 deposits (*c* AD 43-120) and dated on pottery grounds to that period accounted for 23% of the assemblage by EVE (Table 5). Grog-tempered wares (E80) remained important, though now took a smaller share as sand-tempered, wheel-thrown reduced wares, represented largely by fabric R30, began to be deposited. During this time,

olive oil containers reached the site from southern Spain (A11), while samian arrived from South Gaulish samian (S20). Of the regional industries, the Verulamium region was one of the most important, contributing both reduced (R44) and white ware pottery (W21). A more diverse range of forms was recorded in Phase 4, compared with Phase 3. Jars dominated, but the phase also saw the introduction of cups, dishes or platters and flagons, which attest to the influence of Continental-style ceramics or dining practices.

The volume of pottery deposition fell during the middle Roman period. Pottery groups dating to Phase 5 (*c* AD 120-240/50) and dated by pottery to that period accounted for 13% of the entire assemblage by EVE (Table 6). A greater range of forms and fabrics is evident, reflecting an increase in the availability of pottery from diverse sources. Reduced wares continue to be dominated by unsourced, but probably local, fabrics (R30), but were joined by reduced wares from the Verulamium region (R44), Oxfordshire (R11), and the Nene Valley (R46). The Verulamium-region and Oxfordshire industries also supplied white wares (M22, W12, and W21) in this phase, while the Nene Valley industry supplied colour-coated fine ware (F52). Pottery also arrived from the Stowe area in the form of pink-grogged ware (O81) storage jars, and handmade black-burnished ware from Dorset (B11) also reached the site, though in very small quantities. Other black-burnished wares were in wheel-thrown (B20) or imitations (B30) fabrics. Samian wares arrived mainly from Central Gaul (S30), a region that also supplied black-slipped 'Rhenish' ware (R43). Olive oil continued to reach the site from Spain, while wine arrived in containers from southern Gaul (A13). Jars as a class decreased significantly in number in this phase, accounting for 29% by EVE, compared with 73% in Phase 4. The decrease was met by an increase in the numbers of flagons (although this class is to some extent over-represented, given that the narrow rims of flagons tend to survive intact better than the rims of wider-mouthed vessels), beakers, bowls and dishes.

Ceramic groups dated by pottery to the late Roman period and assigned to Phase 6 (*c* AD 240/50-410) accounted for 22% of the entire assemblage by EVE (Table 7). Local potters are likely to have remained the main supplier of pottery, particularly reduced wares (R30), but the period is characterised by the increasing importance of regional producers, particularly the Oxford region (F51, M22, M41, O11, R11, W11 and W12) and the Nene Valley (F52, M24 and W14) industries. Other sources of pottery included Dorset (B11), Harrold or neighbouring areas (C11), the Stowe area (O81) and Hadham (F56), although it can be observed that some of these regional producers were poorly represented, and indeed had declined in importance since Phase 5. The only continental wares represented are amphorae and samian, with both being residual by this time. Indeed, it should be noted that the proportion of residual pottery generally could be considered high; judging by the fabrics present, some 12% of the phased assemblage by EVE was obviously residual. The phased assemblage was, unsurprisingly, dominated by jars, but higher proportions of bowls and mortaria were deposited in this phase, compared with Phase 5, largely reflecting the increased importance of the Oxford-region and Nene Valley industries.

Special deposits

Pit 3067

Pit 3067 was an oval-shaped feature that had been cut into the fills of pond 3062. The pit contained nine fills, with pottery being recovered from seven of them. The sequence of deposition consisted of a primary fill (3074), two fills at the edge of the pit representing natural silting (3072 and 3075), and a further sequence of six fills (from lowest to highest: 3073, 3071, 3081, 3070, 3068 and 3069). The pit contained a remarkable assemblage of finds, including complete or near-complete pottery vessels, coins, a wooden basket, the remains of eggs, leather shoes, and animal bone, which together point to episodes of

structured deposition. The dating of the pottery recovered from the earliest fill, 3074, suggests that the feature received material from the late 3rd century onwards. A large proportion of the assemblage from the feature, some 11% by EVE, was obviously residual, including samian wares and grog-tempered fabric E80. Much of this dated to the 2nd century and is likely to have been brought up from the underlying pond and subsequently redeposited when the pit was dug.

The complete or near-complete pottery was recovered from primary fill 3074. Four vessels were recorded: an indented beaker (EE), a necked bowl (HD), a medium-mouthed necked jar (CD), and the lower half of a 'cooking-pot'-type jar (CK). The last is in black-burnished ware (B11), the others in medium sandy reduced wares (R30). Other pottery from the deposit was more fragmented, though had a higher than average mean sherd weight. Excluding the complete or near-complete vessels, context-group 3074 had a value of 26g, compared with a value of 38g including the complete vessels, and a site-wide value of 10g. Indeed, noticeably higher than average values were calculated for the groups from contexts 3073 and 3071 (37g and 20g respectively). By comparison, values for silting fills 3072 and 3075 and upper fills 3068 and 3070 (13g, 5g, 8g and 9g respectively) are lower, suggesting that the pottery in these deposits had been subject to different processes. This is supported by the fact that the pottery from contexts 3070 and 3075 is entirely residual, dating to the second half of the 1st century AD.

These factors together suggest that contexts 3071, 3073 and 3074 contain pottery, particularly the complete or near-complete vessels, that had undergone relatively few episodes of deposition, having been deposited soon after initial breakage or in a deliberate, structured manner. We can also note that the groups from the three contexts have a greater emphasis on specialised or dining forms – beakers, dishes and bowls, pointing to a degree of selection (Table x). The underling pond may itself have been a focus for structured deposition, although the residual pottery in, say, the primary fill of the pit, is too incomplete to allow a firmer view on this, and equally the pottery could have been deposited in the pond as normal household waste, with the feature's wet and soft fills providing a conducive environment for the pottery's subsequent preservation. The condition of the pottery recovered from the pit's silting and upper fills is more consistent with incidental re-deposition of long-discarded and broken-up material.

Funerary pottery

Cremation grave 2994 contained three vessels deposited as grave goods. A medium mouthed necked jar (CD) in a medium sandy reduced ware (R30) served as the cremation urn (context 2998), having been filled with cremated bone. Another CD-type jar in fabric R30 (context 3000), smaller than the urn, was deposited as an ancillary vessel. This was joined by another ancillary vessel in fabric R30 (context 2996). No rim survived, but the vessel is likely to be a small jar. None of the pottery can be closely dated within the Roman period, but is consistent with the radiocarbon date of cal AD 86-244 (95.4%; SUERC-75476) obtained from the cremated bone. All three vessels were largely complete, but had become highly fragmented after deposition. The urn had a mean sherd weight of just 4g, while vessels 2996 and 3000 had values of 6g and 8g respectively. Vessel 2996 appears to be blackened on the external surface of the base and lower wall and may have been burnt, having been placed on or near the pyre.

No pottery was deposited as grave goods in grave 3003, but nine body sherds – in fabrics R30, R44 and an unsourced amphora fabric (A) – were recovered from the backfill. The presence of fabric R44 suggests that the pottery was deposited during the second half of the 1st century or first half of the 2nd century AD or later. Although pottery recovered from grave backfills potentially relates to funerary practices conducted before, during or after

burial (Biddulph 2015), in the case of grave 3003, all the pottery is likely to be residual. Charred plant remains also recovered from the backfill is consistent with redeposited waste material from nearby crop processing activities, and the pottery may well have been collected with this as incidental occurrences.

Other complete or near-complete pots

Other complete or near-complete vessels were recorded. A butt-beaker (EA) in grog-tempered ware (E80) was recovered from Phase 3 pit 3059 (which underlay pond 3062). This had been repaired in antiquity with a pitch-like substance (see below). A medium-mouthed jar (CD, fabric E80) with rilled shoulder and deep finger marks extending vertically on the interior surface was recovered from Phase 3 ditch 8021, which was part of an early Roman field system off Akeman Street. The vessel had been perforated through the base after firing (also see below). A butt-beaker with elongated vertical indentations was collected from Phase 4 roadside ditch 3353, while Phase 4 pit 3857, within an enclosure associated with the ladder settlement, contained a near-complete medium-mouthed necked jar (CD; SF2788) in fabric R50; the latter vessel is likely to have been whole on deposition, but had been damaged by later ploughing. The substantial remains of a necked bowl (HD; SF2637) in fabric R30 was deposited in Phase 6 on top of a stone surface (3276) within Phase 5 pit 3270. Another group of pottery is worth highlighting. Ditch segment 3122, also part of field system off Akeman Street, contained the base and body sherds of a storage jar with multiple perforations through its base. The sherds were deposited in a group and were associated with charcoal, though no charcoal was found within the vessel itself.

Of these vessels, two – the butt-beaker from pit 3059 and bowl from pit 3270 – were part of larger ceramic groups of fragmented pottery of various forms and fabrics and presumably deposited as waste. The remaining vessels had been deposited as individual items, possibly having served ritual or profane functions or contained substances that isolated them from other pottery and routine means of disposal. It is notable that all but one vessel are jars or jar-like bowls, which could have served a variety of domestic purposes not necessarily relating to cooking and food storage. The perforated storage jar from ditch 3122, given its perforated base, size and associated charcoal, is especially intriguing. The storage jar may have been used as a latrine and was eventually dumped into the ditch, along with the charcoal to dampen the odours.

Pattern of pottery deposition

Pottery was recovered from a range of feature types across the site (Table 8). Ditches received the largest share of the pottery. The features provided convenient open spaces for household waste, if necessary away from the core areas of domestic activity, and may in addition have contained redeposited material initially scattered or dumped into the fields that the ditches defined. A large amount of pottery was also recovered from pits, but the pottery here appears to be of different character to the material from the ditches. The mean sherd weight (MSW; weight / sherd count) for the ditch assemblage is noticeably lower than that for the pit material. The sherds from the ditches are, on average, smaller and more fragmented, suggesting that the ditch and pit assemblages have had different depositional histories. Assemblages ultimately deposited into pits may have been exposed to fewer episodes of redeposition and weathering than the pottery that would be deposited into ditches, and once deposited in the pits were sealed relatively quickly, preventing further significant damage. Indeed, one of the features, pit 3067, contained a number of complete vessels (see below). That said, the ‘completeness’ statistic (EVE / number of vessels or MV), which records the average size of surviving rim – 1 EVE equating to a complete circumference or

100% – suggests that the condition of pottery in ditches and pits is rather more similar, both having values of 0.1 EVE or 10%. Some other observations may usefully be made. Furrows represented the third largest feature-type group by weight. As the furrows are medieval in date, all the pottery represents redeposited and residual material brought up or dragged by the plough. Tree-throw holes also contained a relatively large amount of pottery. The tree-throw holes were concentrated in an area of roadside enclosures and may represent one or more phases of tree clearance to prepare the land for farming. The subsequent holes were subsequently filled with domestic waste, possibly deliberately taken from convenient dumps or middens, judging by the condition of the pottery, in order to level the ground. Road surfaces contained very little pottery, but the pottery that was recovered had the highest MSW (23g) out of all the feature types. The completeness statistic is, by contrast, very small (0.03 EVE), indicating a high degree of fragmentation. The category 'pottery vessel' represents complete or near-complete vessels deposited in graves or other features and assigned their own context numbers on site. Some of these are discussed in more detail below (see 'Special deposits').

Examining the distribution of pottery by major landscape division (Table 9), we see that features along Akeman Street – roadside ditches, field ditches extending alongside or perpendicular to the road, and a nearby pit and pond – were the focus for pottery deposition. Trackway group G7 also received a relatively large amount of pottery. The features along the road and trackway were accessible, away from living spaces, and likely to have captured material from passing travellers, as well as local inhabitants. Pottery was deliberately deposited into pit 3067 (G10) in the late 3rd century, but as the long sequence of coin deposition (extending from the 1st to the late 4th century) suggests, the location appears to have been a special place that people visited before the late 3rd century and indeed continued to visit throughout the Roman period. It is worth noting, too, that the complete or near-complete vessels described above (excluding those from graves and pit 3067) were from features associated with, or close to, Akeman Street, that is, roadside ditches (G8), field ditches (G14) extending from the road, pit 3059, and another pit (3270) associated with group G10. To these, we can add other relatively well-preserved vessels, such as a storage jar in fabric R39 with almost half of its rim intact and many base and body sherds present, which was found in roadside ditch 8018 (G8).

This mixture of deliberate and more incidental deposition that appears to characterise the pattern of deposition along Akeman Street is supported by analysis of pottery condition. Comparing the two measures of condition introduced above – mean sherd weight (MSW) and completeness – allows us to separate groups of pottery based on their condition more readily than using a single measure alone. When we calculate MSW and completeness for each landscape division, we obtain two sets of values that can be plotted on a scattergram. (For our purposes, completeness values have been obtained from EVE values expressed as percentages, a complete vessel being 100%, rather than 1 EVE. This makes the two sets of final values more comparable.) The scattergram (Figure 0.00) shows MSW on the X axis – the higher the value, the less fragmented the pottery – and completeness on the Y axis – the higher the value, the more complete the pottery rims. A group of whole pots would therefore be plotted in the top right hand corner, while a group of tiny fragments would be plotted closer to the axial origin. Pit/pond group G10 includes the structured deposit group of complete or near-complete vessels from pit 3067 and therefore has a relatively high MSW and completeness. We can detect a loose grouping (group 1) of landscape groups close to the centre of the plot (and closest to group G10), whose pottery is characterised by relatively large sherds and a middling to high degree of rim completeness. Another loose grouping (group 2) can be seen closer to the axial intersection and is characterised by relatively low MSW values and a low degree of rim completeness. Tellingly, the central grouping largely

comprises groups associated with Akeman Street, while the grouping closer to the axial intersection comprises groups located away from Akeman Street or groups with prehistoric origins. The values give the Akeman Street-related grouping a degree of coherence and the two groupings are suggestive of different depositional histories. A third grouping (group 3), overlapping somewhat with the central group, has relatively high completeness and middling to low MSW values, and mainly comprises landscape groups associated with the ladder settlement (eg G12) and a trackway (eg G7) in the central and northern part of the site.

The character of this third grouping – relatively complete, but fragmented pottery – may reflect the proximity of the group to the core of settlement, its pottery having undergone a sequence of initial breakage, discard onto middens or household waste deposits (there subject to further breakage), and final deposition in nearby ditches and pits. The pottery from medieval settlement group G22, though residual, is similarly relatively well preserved because the material was redeposited from locations close to settlement. The central grouping values – relatively large sherds, but a greater degree of separation of component parts of the vessel – reflect good accessibility provided by the road, and the combination of deliberately deposited complete vessels and more mundane incidental and waste deposition. The more fragmented and separated character of the grouping around the axial origin reflects a greater degree of redeposition and incidental waste, the pottery having been, for example, incorporated into manure spreads or deposited away from the core of settlement.

One outlier is also of interest. Road surface group G9, as mentioned above, has a high MSW but low completeness, the result of a few sherds of relatively large and heavy amphorae body sherds, possibly deposited as a road repair.

Settlement status and function

The archaeological remains at Berryfields are located largely on the opposite side of Akeman Street to the putative core of the nucleated settlement or 'small town' of Fleet Marston, whose existence has long been surmised by a wealth of finds spots and structural evidence (Radford and Zeepvat 2009, 57). How the evidence at Berryfields relates to this urban centre (does it, for instance, form part of Fleet Marston's rural hinterland, comprising fields, satellite farms and smaller settlements?) remains a matter of discussion (though see Chapter X: Overall Discussion). Pottery can help inform the debate, and a number of measures can be employed to highlight differences and similarities within and between sites. Jeremy Evans (2001, 26-31) explored the relationship between certain open forms and jars, and the use of the resulting ratio as an index to site type. He found that basic rural sites have relatively high proportions of jars (suggesting continuation of Iron Age cooking and dining practices) and low proportions of dishes/bowls (denoting specialist dining vessels and continentally influenced foodways). Urban sites tended to have higher proportions of dishes/bowls and fewer jars, while villas lay in between the two site types. Paul Booth's survey of pottery assemblages from Upper Thames Valley sites (Booth 2004), meanwhile, revealed the usefulness of assigning pottery to one of two categories: fine and specialist wares (comprising samian, amphorae, mortaria, white wares, fine wares, and white-slipped wares), which were usually traded and acquired more out of choice than necessity, and other, typically coarse, wares (black-burnished, reduced, calcareous, and oxidised). Assemblages from higher-status sites are characterised by relatively high proportions of fine and specialist wares. Samian is another obvious means by which site type can be assessed, with the amount of decorated pottery compared with plain forms providing a useful index. Steve Willis (1998, 105-111; 2005, section 7.3.2) records higher than average proportions of decorated samian at military and urban sites, and lower than average proportions at basic rural sites.

Using Evans' measure first, Figure 0.00 plots values derived from Berryfields' phased assemblages (Tables 4-7) against values from a selection of settlements that also lie along or close to Akeman Street. The selection comprises data from Alchester (Evans 2002, table 7.31; Booth 2018, pp), Aston Clinton Bypass 'Site B' (Slowikowski 2008b, tables 18 and 19), Asthall in Oxfordshire (Booth 1997, table 5.20), and Kingshill South (Biddulph 2018, tables 3.5-3.8) on the outskirts of *Corinium*, where the road ends. It should be noted that the Some of the Alchester data (Evans 2002, table 7.31) exclude samian, while the Aston Clinton data are based on vessel count calculated from all sherds (Slowikowski 2008b, 78). The remaining data are based on EVEs. The Alchester data are of particular interest, deriving from the extramural settlements to the north and east of the major nucleated settlement or 'small town' (Booth *et al.* 2002, 443). If Berryfields has an analogous relationship to Fleet Marston, then we may expect the ceramic profiles of Berryfields and extramural Alchester to be similar.

A number of observations can be made from the scattergram (Fig. 00). The mid-1st century or military phase of Alchester's eastern extramural settlement (LLE or Langford Lane East) and the early Roman phases of Asthall, Kingshill South and Berryfields form a loose grouping, with assemblages characterised by relatively high proportions of jars and low proportions of dishes and bowls. Kingshill South at this time comprised an agricultural landscape of fields and enclosures peripheral to the putative estate centre (Simmonds *et al.* 2018). Despite the mid-1st century activity at Langford Lane East being contemporary with the occupation of a legionary fort at Alchester, its position on the plot suggests that the inhabitants of the civilian settlement did not benefit from military supply. Asthall, like Fleet Marston, is a major nucleated roadside settlement (Booth 1997, 158), but its positioning closer to Berryfields suggests that in this early phase, Asthall was similarly of a more basic character. After *c* AD 70, when it is likely that the town of Alchester itself was established (Simmonds et al. 2018, pp), the early Roman eastern extramural area of Alchester saw a dramatic increase in the proportion of dish and bowls at the expense of jars; the town's northern extramural area is also separated from other early Roman sites, though not to the same extent. Notably, the northern area during this time is joined by Aston Clinton, a settlement of uncertain status.

The gap between Asthall and Alchester is retained in the mid-Roman period, hinting as some differences in pottery use and settlement status (adding Alchester's samian wares, in which dishes and bowls are a significant element, would only serve to widen the gap). This, however, conflicts with the picture obtained from a ranking of sites based on the proportions of fine and specialist wares (Booth 2004), which suggests that early Roman Alchester and Asthall are much closer in status than the form comparison allows. First- and 2nd-century assemblages from both sites have levels of 7/8% by sherd count (Booth 2004, tables 1 and 2). Values obtained for Berryfields sit comfortably alongside these figures: 10.3% fine and specialist wares by sherd count in Phase 4 and 16.3% in Phase 5.

Returning to Figure 0.00, Asthall and Kingshill South are brought closer together in the mid-Roman period – a villa-like building or proto-villa had been established at Kingshill South during the 2nd century (Simmonds *et al.* 2018) – but mid-Roman Berryfields is closer to mid-Roman phases of both northern and eastern extramural areas of Alchester, characterised by relatively low proportions of jars and high proportions of bowls and dishes.

Berryfields joins Kingshill South, the northern extra-mural area of Alchester and Aston Clinton in a loose late Roman cluster, suggesting that the sites during this time were of broadly similar status, although the increased supply of Oxford industry products, particularly its red colour-coated ware (F51) in which bowls and jars were preferentially supplied (Young 1977) is undoubtedly a factor here, serving to flatten differences between sites (cf. Booth 2004, fig. 3). As in the early and mid-Roman periods, Asthall and Alchester are divergent in

the late Roman period, Asthall having higher proportions of jars. The difference is reflected in the proportions of fine and specialist wares: 16% by sherd count at Asthall, compared to 23% at Alchester's northern extramural settlement, a figure reached in the 4th century (Booth 2004, tables 1 and 3). At 18.5%, the value for Berryfields in Phase 6 is within the range set by these figures. Notably, the pottery assemblage collected from the mainly late Roman agricultural settlement at Weedon Hill just 2km east of the Berryfields MDA has a low-status character (Seager Smith 2013, 14), with 7% fine and specialist wares by sherd count (although this figure is based on the entire assemblage, not only groups dated specifically to the late Roman period, and therefore the percentage for the late Roman period could be higher).

The profile of Aston Clinton, as shown on Figure 0.00, is of interest. Analysis of the excavated evidence suggested that the earlier Roman settlement was of a modest character, while in the late Roman period, the 'farm had never developed a particularly high status' (Masefield 2008, 194). From a ceramic standpoint, however, there is little to separate the site in both the earlier and later Roman periods from others of a purported higher status. However, what impact the different pottery quantification method employed for the Aston Clinton material may have had on the comparison is uncertain.

Turning to decorated samian, Berryfields appears to take a middling position. Ten per cent of samian by vessel count (based on all sherds) is decorated at Berryfields, compared with 19% at Alchester (Dickinson 2002, tables 7.11 and 7.12), 12% at Asthall (Mills 1997, tables 5.9 and 5.14), 10% at Kingshill South (Biddulph 2018, 77), and, befitting its more modest status suggested by the archaeological remains, 8% at Aston Clinton (Wild 2008, 112).

Clearly, there is no simple correlation between the status of a site and its pottery, and the results of the various measures are not necessarily consistent. However, considering all the measurements together, the strong impression is that the pottery of Berryfields is consistent with settlement associated with nucleated settlements along Akeman Street, albeit on the lower end of the rankings. This may reflect the site's roadside setting on the periphery of the putative 'small town' of Fleet Marston and but the comparison also supports the possibility of a specialist function – whether religious, industrial or agricultural – at least during the mid- and late Roman periods. Quite how the Weedon Hill settlement, whose activities including malting, related to Berryfields or Fleet Marston is uncertain (see 'Discussion'), but a combination of distance from urban or villa-estate centres and its own specialist function may well account for the site's lower-status signature.

Aspects of pottery use

Burning, blackening and lime scale

Almost 30 vessels displayed evidence of burning or blackening or internal deposits. Medium-mouthed (usually necked) jars (CD), mainly in reduced fabrics, lid-seated jars (CJ), a black-burnished ware jar (CK), and a necked bowl (HD) were sooted externally or had an internal off-white coating characteristic of lime scale. The evidence indicates that the vessels were placed on the hearth and used for cooking and boiling water, although the use of hot stones to heat water might be a possibility in the case of vessels with internal lime scale, but no external sooting. Oxfordshire white ware mortaria (M22) were relatively well represented. These were typically blackened on the rim, and examples were also noted with blackening on the exterior and interior surfaces, including the interior surface of the base. Such evidence is known elsewhere, for example at the Chemistry Research Laboratory site in Oxford, where a number of Oxfordshire white ware mortaria were uniformly burnt on the flanges and rims (Biddulph 2005, 163). One interpretation of this evidence is that mortaria were used as

cooking vessels, as well as food preparation vessels. The pattern of blackening suggests that the mortaria were inverted over cooking vessels or food such as bread in the manner of a *testum* or *patina* and set on the hearth casserole-like, with hot embers placed on top of the mortaria (Grocock and Grainger 2006, 77-82). An alternative and perhaps more plausible explanation is that the blackening was a product of the kiln firing, the rising carbon particles being trapped by the vessels' broad rims and deep bodies. This is consistent with analysis of organic residues on some 250 mortaria from Britain and Germany. This showed no evidence of heating, but instead indicated that the vessels had been used to process a range of unheated plant and animal products (Cramp *et al.* 2011).

Use-wear

Clear evidence of use-wear was recorded on a single vessel. The red slip across the base of a cup in South Gaulish samian ware (S20) had been removed through use. The size of the sherd did not permit the extent of the wear to be determined, but slip was entirely absent from the centre of the vessel. The form is uncertain, but the wear is consistent with the pattern typically associated with Drag. 27 cups (Biddulph 2008). The footring was broken, but it is unclear whether it had been removed accidentally or deliberately (Fig. 0, no. 34).

Graffiti

Two examples of graffiti were recorded. A body sherd with traces of incised lines that may once have been an X was noted on a body sherd of a plain vessel in South Gaulish samian ware (S20). A large pedestal base from a beaker in fine oxidised ware (O10) has six notches on the edge of its bottom surface (Fig. 0, no. 36).

Modifications

Modifications made after firing were seen in seven vessels. All had been perforated through the base. Vessels identified to form comprise a storage jar (CN) and a necked jar (CD; Fig. 0, no. 4) in grog-tempered ware (E80), and a necked bowl (HD) in medium sandy reduced ware (R30). The jars have multiple small perforations, but the bowl has a single large hole in the centre (Fig. 0, no. 23). The edges of the hole are ragged, suggesting either that a ring of small holes had been made, with the centre being lost subsequently as a weak point (Peña 2011, 144-5), or that the ring provided the means by which the centre could be punched out. A similar hole was noted on a high-shouldered necked jar (Going 1987, type G19.4) from Elms Farm, Heybridge (Biddulph *et al.* 2015, KPG 17). All three vessels are complete or substantially complete. Multiple perforations were also recorded in the bases of four vessels in fabrics E80, O81, and R11. It is not known whether these perforations were made when the vessels were complete, or represent opportunistic modifications of already broken pottery. It can be noted, however, that the assemblage, including the pottery not identified to form, is dominated by utilitarian vessels in coarse fabrics, suggesting that the use to which the vessels were subsequently put required similarly robust pottery. A purpose-made strainer (MG) was present in a medium sandy reduced ware (R30). At least six perforations were made through the base of the jar- or bowl-shaped vessel before firing (Fig. 0, no. 32). The precise function of all these vessels beyond strainer is difficult to ascertain without further, scientific analysis (for example organic residue analysis), but it is not implausible that the vessels served as colanders in the kitchen, cheesepresses or flowerpots.

Repair

Four vessels have evidence of repair. A necked jar (HD; Thompson 1982, type C7-1) in sandy fabric E30 has a rivet hole through its neck. Another rivet hole perforated the shoulder of a necked jar or bowl in fabric E80. The vessel also has what appears to be an attempted

hole; the wall of the neck is not perforated, but has a rounded dent. The holes may represent repairs, although, given their location and the utilitarian character of the pottery, the possibility that the perforations are suspension or steam holes may also be considered (Peña 2011, 236). Two vessels had more certain evidence of repair. A small hole with an *in situ* lead rivet was recorded on a Curle 11 bowl in Central Gaulish samian ware (S30). A butt-beaker (EA; cf. Hawkes and Hull 1947, *Cam* form 119) had cracked longitudinally in two places from the rim to *c* 50mm above the base, and had been repaired by means of a line of pitch or tar that extended along each crack on the external surface of the vessel (Fig. 00, no. 2). The use of pitch or tar as a glue is attested elsewhere in Roman Britain, with examples known at Springhead in north Kent and Asthall in Oxfordshire (Booth 1997, 123; Seager Smith *et al.* 2011, 124-5), among others. Analysis of samples from Springhead identified the substance used as birch bark tar (Seager Smith *et al.* 2011, 125), which had also been used to line the interior surface of two flagons and a cup from a mid-1st century burial on the A2, also in north Kent [Example of a birch bark repair on a jar from Ecton]. The substance used for the repair on the *Cam* 113 beaker may similarly have been birch bark tar, and applied as much for its properties as a sealant, as an adhesive.

Local production

Four vessels are potentially identified as kiln 'seconds', and may be the products of local pottery manufacture. A lid-seated jar (CJ) in dark-surfaced reduced ware (R50) and a necked jar (CD) in a medium sandy reduced ware (R30) have misshapen rims (Fig. 0, no. 35), which must have dropped or otherwise become distorted before or during firing. A medium-mouthed and neckless jar (CD), also in fabric R30, is overfired, as is a vessel of unknown form in sandy oxidised ware (O20). While pottery with production faults is likely to be found closest to the workshops that produced it (Orton and Hughes 146) 2013), it should be borne in mind pottery which is otherwise serviceable could be traded and therefore found some distance from its source, as samian with distorted rims found in Britain testifies [example?]. We cannot be certain, therefore, that these four vessels indicate pottery production in the vicinity of the site.

Catalogue of illustrated pottery

A selection of pottery is presented here in order to illustrate the chronological sequence. Pottery of intrinsic interest is also shown.

Context 3060, fill of pit 3059. AYLBER10

1. Bead-rimmed jar (CH), grog-tempered ware (E80).
2. Butt-beaker (EA; Hawkes and Hull 1947, *Cam* 119), grog- and sand-tempered ware (E810). Strip of pitch or tar along two vertical cracks, applied as repair.
3. Carinated bowl (HA), grog-tempered ware (E80).

Phase 3. Ceramic date: early/mid-1st century AD

Ditch 3364, group 8021. AYLBER10

4. Medium-mouthed jar (CD) with rilled shoulder and deep finger marks extending vertically on interior surface. Six perforations made through base after firing. Context 3368.
5. Wide-mouthed jar (CM, similar to Hawkes and Hull 1947, *Cam* 264), grog-tempered ware (E80). Burnished on neck and shoulder. Context 3367.
6. Complete base from large jar, grog-tempered ware (E80). Regular pattern of faint linear incisions on interior surface of lower wall made before firing – manufacturing marks. Context 3367.

Phase 3. Ceramic date early/mid-1st century AD

Context 3017, fill of pit 3008. AYLBER10
7. Necked, cordoned jar (CE; Thompson 1982, type B1-1), grog-tempered ware (E80).
8. Storage jar (CN; Thompson 1982, type C6-1), grog-tempered ware, oxidised (E80).
9. Storage jar (CN; Thompson 1982, type C6-1), grog-tempered ware, oxidised (E80).
10. Storage jar (CN; Thompson 1982, type C6-1), grog-tempered ware (E80). Impressed herringbone decoration on shoulder.
11. Platter (JC; Hawkes and Hull 1947, *Cam* 28), coarse sand-tempered fabric (E30)
12. Platter (JC), grog-tempered ware (E80).
Phase 4. Ceramic date: Mid-1st century AD

Ditch group 660. ABPR07/08
13 1. Medium-mouthed jar (CD), grog-tempered ware (E80). Context 431, fill of ditch 430.
14 2. Necked jar (CD), grog-tempered ware, oxidised (E80). Context 431, fill of ditch 430.
15 3. Necked jar (CE), grog-tempered ware, oxidised (E80) Context 431, fill of ditch 430.
16 4. Butt-beaker (EA), grog-tempered ware (E80). Context 499, fill of ditch 498.
Ceramic date: Mid-late 1st century AD

Context 3849, fill of pit 3848. QAVC12
17 13. Narrow-necked jar (CC), medium sandy reduced ware (R30).
18 14. Curving-sided dish or bowl (IB) with bead-and-flanged rim, sandy oxidised ware (O20). The fabric contains clear, grey and rose-coloured quartz grains, which characterise fabrics of the Oxfordshire industry (Tomber and Dore 1998, 174), and it is possible that the vessel is an Oxfordshire product, although the form is not precisely attested among the repertoire (Young 1977).
19 15. Curving-sided dish or bowl (IB) with flanged rim, medium sandy reduced ware (R30).
20 16. Curving-sided dish or bowl (IB with flanged rim. A shallow groove extends around the tip of the upper surface of the flange. Medium sandy reduced ware (R30).
21 17. Curving-sided dish or bowl (IB with flanged rim, sandy oxidised ware (O20).
Phase ?. Ceramic date: Mid-2nd century AD

Context 3074, fill of pit 3067, G10. AYBER10
22 18. Medium-mouthed, globular necked jar (CD), recovered substantially complete (SF 2654), medium sandy reduced ware (R30). Sooting on exterior surface, 'lime scale' on interior surface.
23 19. Medium-mouth jar (CD) with short neck and hooked rim, medium sandy reduced ware (R30).
24 20. 'Cooking-pot' jar (CK), black-burnished ware (B11). Lower half of vessel recovered complete (SF 2686). Sooting on exterior surface, 'lime scale' on interior surface. Incisions on interior surface and base made in antiquity, ?cleaning marks.
25 21. Bag-shaped beaker (EC), fine oxidised ware (O10).
26 22. Indented beaker (EE), recovered substantially complete (SF 2686), medium sandy reduced ware (R30).
27 23. Necked bowl (HD), recovered complete (SF 2655), except for hole in the base made after firing. Medium sandy reduced ware (R30), light grey with orange-red patches.
28 24. Straight-sided dish or bowl (IA) with flanged rim, medium sandy reduced ware (R30).
29 25. Curving-sided dish (JB) with plain rim, wheel-made black-burnished ware (B30).
30 26. Curving-sided dish (JB; Drag. 31) with bead rim, South Gaulish samian ware (S30).
Phase 5. Ceramic date: Late 2nd-early 3rd century AD

Context 3275, fill of pit 3270, G10. AYLBER10
31 27. Necked jar (C), late Roman shelly ware (C11).
32 28. Necked bowl (HD, similar to Marney (1989), fig. 12, no. 53. Medium sandy reduced ware (R30). SF2637.
33 29. Flanged bowl (H) copying samian form Drag. 38, fine oxidised ware (O10).
34 30. Mortarium with prominent bead and wide, hooked flange (KE, Young 1977, type M17), Oxfordshire white ware (M22). Blackening on rim.
35 31. Mortarium with prominent bead and downward-pointing flange (KE, Young 1977, type M21), Oxfordshire white ware (M22). Blackening on rim.
36 32. Base of strainer (MG) with six or more small perforations made before firing, medium sandy reduced ware (R30).
Phase 6. Pottery group date: Mid-late 3rd century AD

Context 447, fill of pit 446. ABPR07/08
37 5. Ring-necked flagon (BA), Verulamium-region white ware (W21), residual.
38 6. Flagon or beaker, Nene Valley colour-coated ware (F52).
39 7. Narrow-necked jar (CC) with frilled decoration (cf. Marney 1989, fig. 33.11), medium sandy reduced ware (R30).
40 8. Medium-mouthed necked jar (CD), medium sandy reduced ware (R30).
41 9. Medium-mouthed necked jar, sandy oxidised ware (O20).
42 10. Medium-mouthed necked jar (CD), medium sandy reduced ware (R30).
43 11. Storage jar (CN), pink grogged ware (O81).
44 12. Carinated bowl (HA; Young 1977, type P24), Oxford parchment ware (W11).
45 13. Bead-rimmed dish (JB 210; Young 1977, type C45), Oxford red colour-coated ware (F51).
46 14. Flanged dish (JB; Going 1987, type B10), Hadham oxidised ware (F56).
47 15. Dish (JB) with groove and frilling below rim and burnished surfaced, medium sandy reduced ware (R30).
48 16. Bowl (Drag. 29) in South Gaulish samian ware (S20) with unusual freestyle decoration depicting at four animals: a bear (Hermet 1934, plate 26, no. 1), an eagle (Hermet 1934, plate 28, no. 8), a lion (Hermet 1934, 25, no. 26), and probably a deer. AD 60-80. (Identification by Joanna Bird.).
Ceramic date: 4th century AD

Context 448, fill of pit 446. ABPR07/08
49 17. Medium-mouthed necked jar (CD), sandy white ware (W20), possibly Verulamium (and residual)
50 18. Necked bowl (HD), brown-slipped ware with red core (F60)
51 19. Bead-rimmed dish (JB 210) copying Drag. 31, sandy white ware (W20)
Ceramic date: 4th century AD

Context 334, fill of ditch 333, group 358. ABPR07/08
52 20. Necked bowl (HD; Young 1977, type C75) with rouletted decoration, Oxford red colour-coated ware (F51)
Ceramic date: AD 325-400

Context 540, fill of pit 539. ABPR07/08
53 21. Funnel-necked beaker with globular body (ED), Colchester colour-coated ware (F55)
Ceramic date: Mid 3rd to 4th century AD

Pottery of intrinsic interest

54 33. Hook-rimmed mortarium (KA), Verulamium-region white ware (M21). Potter's stamp on flange: FECIT with herringbone-patterned border. Counterstamp of Matugenus, who worked within the period AD 80-125 (Hartley 1999, 195). Context 3963, fill of pit 3962. QAVC12. Phase 0 [why unphased?].

55 34. Base of cup or, less likely, a bowl, in South Gaulish samian ware (S20). Slip completely worn away across interior surface of base. There is a thumb-sized dent in the centre of the base, which may be an accidental mark made by the potter, or a deliberate impression made in lieu of a name-stamp. Context 7098, fill of ditch 7097, group 8050. AYLBER14. Phase 10.

56 35. Medium-mouthed necked jar (CD), medium sandy reduced ware (R30). The vessel has a distorted rim, potentially identifying it as a 'second' from a local production site. Context 3996, fill of waterhole 3993. QAVC12. Phase 11.

57 36. Pedestal base of beaker with six notches on edge of base. Fine oxidised ware (O10). Context 3981, fill of ditch 3980. QAVC12. Phase 10.

58 37. Carinated bowl (HA, Drag. 29), South Gaulish samian ware (S20). Context 3073, fill of pit 3067. AYLBER10. Phase 5.

59 38. Amphora (A), Gauloise-type, Verulamium-region white ware (W21). Context 3066, fill of pond 3062. AYLBER10. Phase 5.