

Northamptonshire Archaeology

Archaeological Excavation at Pineham North Upton, Northampton July to October 2006

Settlement 2, Assessment Report



Simon Carlyle January 2007 Report 06/177

Northamptonshire Archaeology 2 Bolton House Wootton Hall Park Northampton NN4 8BE w. www.northantsarchaeology.co.uk t. 01604 700493/4 f. 01604 702822 e. sparry@northamptonshire.gov.uk



STAFF

Project Managers:	Adam Yates BA AIFA and Tony Walsh BA
Text:	Simon Carlyle MSc AIFA
Worked flint:	Yvonne B Wolframm-Murray BSc PhD
Iron Age and Roman pottery:	Ed McSloy BA MIFA
Roman glass:	Hilary Cool PhD
Small finds:	Tora Hylton, and Ian Meadows BA
Querns and grinding stones:	Andy Chapman BSc MIFA
Slag:	Andy Chapman
Fired clay:	Pat Chapman BA PIFA
Human bone:	Teresa Hawtin BA MSc PIFA
Animal bone:	Matilda Holmes BSc MSc
Plant macro-fossils and charcoal:	Karen Deighton MSc
Illustrations:	Jacqueline Harding BA HND
Metal detecting:	Steve Critchley MSc

QUALITY CONTROL

	Print Name	Signed	Date
Checked by	P Chapman		
Verified by	A Yates		
Approved by	A Chapman		

CONTENTS

1		INTRODUCTION	1
2		BACKGROUND	2
	2.1	Topography and geology	2
	2.2	Archaeological and historical background	2
3		EXCAVATION METHODOLOGY	3
4		SUMMARY OF EXCAVATION RESULTS	4
	4.1	Condition of archaeological remains	4
	4.2	Site chronology	5
	4.3	Neolithic/early Bronze Age flint scatter	6
	4.4	A late Iron Age roundhouse and pits (2nd-1st century BC)	6
	4.5	A late Iron Age/early Roman ditched enclosure (1 st century AD)	6
	4.6	The growth of the Romano-British settlement (late 1st-early 3rd century)	7
	4.7	The re-organisation of the Romano-British settlement (late 3rd-4th century)	8
	4.8	The possible early Saxon burial (5th-6th centuries AD)	8
	4.9	Medieval ridge and furrow	8
	4.10	Modern field boundary	8
	4.11	Undated features	9
	4.12	Quantification; the site archive	9
5		FINDS ASSESSMENT	10
	5.1	Worked flint by Yvonne B Wolframm-Murry	10
	5.2	Iron Age and Roman pottery by Ed McSloy	11
	5.3	Roman glass by Hilary Cool	15
	5.4	Roman finds by Tora Hylton and Ian Meadows	17
	5.5	Querns and grinding stones by Andy Chapman	20
	5.6	Fired clay by Pat Chapman	23
	5.7	Slag by Andy Chapman	25
	5.8	Saxon finds by Tora Hylton and Ian Meadows	25
	5.9	Medieval and post-medieval finds by Tora Hylton and Ian Meadows	26

6		FAUNAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE	26
	6.1	Human bone by Teresa Hawtin	26
	6.2	Animal bone by Matilda Holmes	30
	6.3	Charcoal and plant macro-fossils by Karen Deighton	33
	6.4	Phosphate analysis by Simon Carlyle	35
7		STORAGE AND CURATION	35
8		SUMMARY	36

BIBLIOGRAPHY APPENDICES

TABLES

Table 1 Summary of worked flint

Table 2 Cremation deposits 1-3. Summary of ceramic present

Table 3 Summary of assemblage according to Ceramic Phase

Table 4 Summary of glass by context

Table 5 Summary of small finds by material type

Table 6 Functional range of small finds

Table 7 The querns: geologies, dimensions and comments

Table 8 Quantification of kiln furniture

Table 9 The fuel ash slag

Table 10 Metrical analysis of bone fragmentation in the cremations

Table 11 Weights of different skeletal elements identified

 Table 12 Condition of bones (after Serjeantson 1996)

Table 13 Frequency of taphonomic factors

 Table 14 Species representation (fragment count)

Table 15 Summary of ecofacts per sample

Table 16 Summary of phosphate test results

GRAPHS

- Graph 1 Cattle fusion data
- Graph 2 Cattle toothwear data
- Graph 3 Sheep/goat fusion data
- Graph 4 Sheep/goat toothwear data

FIGURES

Figure 1 Site location plan

Figure 2 Provisional phase plan 1:750

(Front cover: Glass and ceramic vessels from late 1st/early 2nd century cremation burials)

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EXCAVATION AT PINEHAM NORTH UPTON, NORTHAMPTON DECEMBER 2006

Settlement 2, Assessment Report

Abstract

Northamptonshire Archaeology carried out an archaeological excavation, commissioned by ProLogis Developments Ltd via Under Construction Archaeology, on land at Pineham North, Upton, Northampton. The work was carried out in advance of a major residential and business/industrial development. The site, designated Settlement 2, had been identified from fieldwalking, geophysical investigation and trial trenching. The excavation forms one part of an ongoing programme of mitigation works, other parts of which will be the subject of separate assessment reports.

The earliest evidence for human activity on the site dated to the Neolithic/early Bronze Age and comprised a number of flint tools and waste flakes, occurring as residual finds in later features. In the 2nd/1st century BC a small farming settlement was established, and continued in occupation until the late 4th century AD, although there may have been a brief hiatus in occupation in the 3rd century AD. The settlement underwent significant morphological changes during its history and at least four main phases have been identified. Associated with the settlement were three cremation burials, dating to the late 1st/early 2nd century, a circular stone and timber building and a T-shaped malting oven.

Following its abandonment, no further activity was evident on the site until the medieval period, although there is circumstantial evidence for there having been one or more early Saxon graves on or near the abandoned settlement; part of a shield boss and an iron spearhead which date to the late 5th/6th century and were often placed as grave goods, were recovered from the plough soil.

In the medieval period the site was incorporated into an open field system of ridge and furrow, and was later, in the late medieval period, probably converted to pasture. The site was enclosed in the 18th/19th century and reverted to arable production in recent times. This report presents an assessment of the findings from the excavation of Settlement 2.

1 INTRODUCTION

Between July and October 2006, Northamptonshire Archaeology (NA), acting on behalf of Under Construction Archaeology (UCA), carried out an archaeological excavation on land at Pineham North, Upton, Northampton (site centred on NGR SP 712 582; Fig 1). The work was undertaken prior to the construction of residential and business/industrial areas by ProLogis Developments Ltd.

The overall development area covers 1.16km² and comprises mainly arable land between the M1 Motorway and the River Nene, to the west of Northampton. The

excavation formed part of a programme of archaeological investigation, designed to mitigate against the impact of the development on buried archaeological remains within the development area. The area was known to contain later prehistoric and Roman remains, so consequently, the Northamptonshire County Council Environmental Planning Officer (NCCEPO) advised that a condition be applied to the consent for planning, requiring that a programme of archaeological investigation should be carried out prior to the development of the land.

Initial investigation identified three settlement sites (designated Settlements 1, 2 and 3), dating to the Iron Age and Roman periods, and the possible remains of a World War II bombing decoy. Three areas were designated for open area excavation (Settlements 1-3) and three areas of Strip, Map and Sample (SMS). This report summarizes and assesses the findings from the excavation of Settlement 2, a Late Iron Age and Romano-British settlement occupied from the 2nd/1st centuries BC through to the 4th century AD. The remaining areas will be the subject of separate reports.

The mitigation strategy was set out in the Archaeological Management Plan issued by UCA (2005) and a Project Design for Archaeological Works was prepared by NA (2006) in accordance with the requirements of the management plan. This Assessment Report meets the requirements of the Archaeological Management Plan and has been designed in accordance with *Appendix 5* of *Management of Archaeological Projects* (EH 1991) and appropriate national standards and guidelines, as recommended by the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA). An integrated Updated Project Design will be prepared at a later date, following the excavation and assessment of Settlements 1 and 3 and the SMS excavations of the intervening areas.

2 BACKGROUND

2.1 Topography and geology

The Settlement 2 excavation area was located at the south-eastern end of a large arable field on the south-western outskirts of Upton, Northampton, adjacent and to the north of the M1 Motorway. It covered an area of approximately 2.8 hectares and was situated on a south-east facing slope leading down to a tributary of the River Nene. The ground descended from c 70.1m at the northern edge of the site to c 66.6m aOD on the floodplain to the south.

The soils on the slope were of the Wick 1 (541r) soil association, comprising deep, well-drained coarse loamy typical brown earths of the Wick series, intermixed with gleyic brown earths of the Arrow series and the typical brown sands of the Newport series (SSEW 1983). These had developed over the underlying Jurassic Middle Lias Silts and Clays; the surface of the Middle Lias deposits had been modified by periglacial action. On the floodplain (alluvium) the soils were of the Denchworth (712b) soil association, comprising seasonally waterlogged clayey soils. Thin colluvial deposits had accumulated at the base of the slope.

2.2 Archaeological and historical background

The proposed development at Upton, Northampton, which incorporates the area of Settlement 2, has been subject to extensive archaeological investigation over the past

nine years. An initial desk-based assessment prepared by John Samuels Archaeological Consultants (JSAC 1998) identified the potential for remains dating to the Iron Age and Roman periods within the development area. Subsequent geophysical survey, undertaken by GSB Prospection (GSB 1999, 2001), located three areas of archaeological activity dating to these periods, designated Settlement 1, Settlement 2 and Settlement 3. These areas were further investigated through a programme of fieldwalking (NA 2002) and trial trench evaluation (Buteaux and Jones 2000; NA 2005).

A summary of the findings of the preliminary archaeological work is given in the mitigation strategy prepared by UCA (2005). In brief, Settlement 1, to the north and west of Pineham Barn, is a mid to late Iron Age (450BC-AD43) occupation site comprising a series of enclosures containing pits, ditches and ring gullies. Settlement 2, the subject of this report, lies in the south-western corner of the development area and comprises a multi-phased Roman site, initially believed to date to the 1st and 2nd centuries AD, but in the light of subsequent excavation it has been shown that occupation continued through to the 4th century AD. Settlement 3, to the north-west of Pineham Barn, is also of Roman date and comprises a series of enclosures dated to the 2nd to 4th centuries AD. Trackways lead from this settlement to the east, west and south-west.

In addition to the settlement sites, a cropmark identified from aerial photographs in the north-western corner of the site (SMR 5088/0/1) is believed to be a World War II bombing decoy.

3 EXCAVATION METHODOLOGY

The location of the excavation area was established by NA using Leica System 1200 RTK GPS surveying equipment. The areas were stripped under archaeological supervision using a 360° tracked mechanical excavator fitted with a toothless ditching bucket. The topsoil and subsoil were removed to reveal any significant archaeological remains or, where these were absent, the natural substrate. The topsoil and subsoil was moved to the edge of the site in 30-tonne dumper trucks and stored separately in temporary bunds.

Once the areas had been opened up and the archaeological surface cleaned sufficiently to enhance the features, a grid was established and related to the Ordnance Survey National Grid by GPS. The general site plan was hand drawn at a scale of 1:100, and selected features were planned at a scale of 1:20.

Discrete features were half-sectioned and where they were shown to form part of recognisable structures, contain deposits of particular value or significant artefact or environmental assemblages, they were fully excavated.

Intersections were investigated to establish stratigraphic relationships. Representative sections of linear and curvilinear features were sample excavated away from intersections with other features or deposits, to obtain unmixed samples of material. Sections were drawn at a scale of 1:10 or 1:20, as appropriate. All levels have been related to Ordnance Survey Datum.

With the consent of NCCEPO, the upper fills of several sections in the large enclosure and boundary ditches were partly excavated using a JCB-type excavator,

leaving the lower fills to be removed by hand. In selected areas, an excavator was used to strip back furrows to clarify and confirm the continuation and relationship of the larger ditches.

Artefacts and ecofacts were collected by hand and retained, receiving appropriate care prior to removal from site (Watkinson and Neal 1998). Unstratified animal bones and modern material were not collected. The excavated area and spoil heaps were scanned with a metal detector to ensure maximum finds retrieval.

Significant finds were recorded individually and have been entered on an Access database. A basic catalogue has been compiled, comprising material type and object identifications, together with stratigraphic information. All finds have been boxed by material type, in numerical small find order.

Samples of a minimum of 40 litres were taken for flotation from dateable contexts with a potential for the recovery of charcoal and carbonised plant remains. Phosphate tests were carried out across the site and 10 litre samples were taken for further analysis from deposits shown to have high to medium phosphate levels. Specialist environmental advice was provided by Dr Helen Keeley.

Human remains were excavated following notification of the relevant authorities, and were removed under Department of Constitutional Affairs licence.

A photographic record of the project was maintained using 35mm black and white negative and colour transparency film, supplemented with digital images. All records were compiled during fieldwork into a comprehensive and fully cross-referenced site archive.

The project was overseen by UCA on behalf of ProLogis Developments Ltd. UCA were responsible for liaison with the curatorial authority (NCCEPO), who monitored the works, to ensure that all aspects of the project were undertaken to a satisfactory standard. All works were conducted in accordance with the *IFA Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Excavations (1994, revised 1999)* and the *Code of Conduct* of the Institute of Field Archaeologists (1985, revised 2000). In addition, all works complied with the guidelines detailed in *Standards for Field Archaeology in the East of England* (Gurney 2002).

4 SUMMARY OF EXCAVATION RESULTS

4.1 Condition of archaeological remains

The preservation, definition and visibility of the archaeological remains across the site were variable. Medieval furrows, which were up to 4m wide, had caused significant though localised damage to the archaeological horizon across the entire site, with the centre of the furrows penetrating the stripped surface to a depth of c 0.3m. As a consequence, shallow features were entirely or partially removed within the areas of the furrows.

Aside from the furrows, the condition of the archaeological remains across the site could be broadly divided into three zones. At the top of the slope, along the northwestern edge of the site, modern ploughing had caused significant damage to buried archaeological remains. The absence of subsoil in this area had resulted in plough damage penetrating archaeological horizons, causing scarring, truncation and mixing of upper fills and extensive damage to shallow features such as gullies and postholes. The natural substrate was also scarred, reducing the definition of feature boundaries. In addition, bull-dozing of the ridge and furrow earthworks within the last twenty years had caused extensive disturbance in the northern corner of the site.

The central area of the site was better preserved and the archaeological remains were clearly defined against the Middle Lias Silts and Clays. Features had suffered less from truncation, with the majority of the damage in this area having being caused by medieval ploughing.

At the base of the slope, along the south-eastern edge of the site, the archaeological features were cut into a thin layer of colluvium. The upper fills of many of the features were very similar to the colluvium, which reduced the definition of feature boundaries. Damage by modern ploughing was minimal, with most of the damage being caused by medieval ploughing and the insertion of land drains in modern times.

4.2 Site chronology

The excavation demonstrated human activity on the site from the Neolithic/early Bronze Age period through to modern times. The earliest activity on the site was represented by Neolithic/early Bronze Age flint tools and waste flakes, which were recovered from the topsoil, the subsoil and as residual finds from later features. In the late Iron Age, probably in the 2nd/1st century BC, a farming settlement was established on the site. Although the settlement underwent significant changes and re-structuring, it was occupied through to the 4th century AD, with an apparent hiatus in occupation in the early to mid 3rd century. Following the abandonment of the site in the later 4th century, the land probably became derelict. The only evidence for activity on the site prior to the medieval period was the presence of an early Saxon spearhead and shield boss fragment, probably originating from ploughed out burials. In the medieval period the land was probably converted to pasture, and was eventually enclosed in the 18th/19th century. In recent times, probably since the levelling of the ridge and furrow, the land has been used for arable farming.

The archaeological sequence has been characterized as follows:

- Neolithic/early Bronze Age flint scatter
- A Late Iron Age roundhouse and pits (2nd-1st century BC)
- A late Iron Age/early Roman ditched enclosure (1st century AD)
- The growth of the Romano-British settlement (late 1st-early 3rd century)
- The re-organisation of the Romano-British settlement (late 3rd-4th century)
- Possible early Saxon burials (5th-6th centuries AD)
- Medieval ridge and furrow
- Modern field boundary

A summary of the archaeological features associated with each of the above headings is given below and a context summary is provided in Appendix 1. The provisional phase plan is presented in Figure 2.

4.3 Neolithic/early Bronze Age flint scatter

Although there were no features dating to the Neolithic/early Bronze Age within the excavation area, evidence for activity in the vicinity during this period is attested by the presence of flint tools and waste flakes across the site. These were recovered from the topsoil, the subsoil and as residual finds in Iron Age and Roman deposits.

4.4 A late Iron Age roundhouse and pits (2nd-1st century BC)

On the western side of the site there were several features that exclusively contained hand-built late Iron Age pottery and probably date to the 2nd/1st centuries BC. The features comprised five gullies, including a roundhouse (S1), and at least three pits. These features are probably the remains of the initial farming settlement prior to the construction of the large enclosure ditches in the 1st century AD. Although several sherds of Late Iron Age pottery were found in the enclosure ditches, these are probably residual and it appears that the settlement was unenclosed when it was first established.

4.5 A late Iron Age/early Roman ditched enclosure (1st century AD)

In the 1st century AD, probably prior to the Roman conquest (AD43), the settlement greatly expanded. A rectangular area (Enclosure 1) of approximately 1.7 hectares was encompassed by a large ditch to the north and west of the original unenclosed settlement. At its south-eastern end the ditch appeared to stop at the edge of the floodplain, suggesting that the area adjacent to the stream was at least seasonally flooded and was probably meadow. The north-eastern end of the ditch petered out in an area that had been heavily disturbed by modern activity. The area encompassed by the ditch was either open on the eastern side, or it may have been defined by a hedge or fence. It is possible that it was enclosed by a ditch, as there is a discontinuous 1st century ditch extending across the north-eastern edge of the site; however, the alignment differs markedly from the main ditches, suggesting it is probably unrelated and may predate Enclosure 1.

The nucleus of the original settlement was enclosed by a further large ditch, creating a roughly square enclosure (Enclosure 2) with an entrance to the north-east. It appears that a smaller outer ditch was also constructed at around the same time, creating in effect a double-ditched enclosure on three sides. Within the enclosure there were two, or possibly three overlapping roundhouses (S2-4) overlying the earlier late Iron Age roundhouse (S1), indicating that up to four successive roundhouses had been built on the same spot. There were at least two contemporary pits within the enclosure.

Near the centre of the site there was a sizeable ditch, aligned from north-east to southwest, which pre-dated the 2nd century enclosure (see below). There was a possible opening near the centre of the ditch, as was suggested by a worn hollow consolidated with pebbles and small cobbles.

Also dating to the 1st century AD, there were a number of small boundary ditches and a cluster of postholes on the far eastern side of the site, and a number of ditches to the north of the square enclosure; these probably demarcated outlying fields or paddocks.

4.6 The growth of the Romano-British settlement (late 1st-early 3rd century)

In the late 1st or early 2nd century AD the settlement was substantially re-modelled. Occupation in Enclosure 2 appears to have ceased and a new rectangular enclosure (Enclosure 3) was laid out to the east, with a broad opening to the south. However, the substantial ditches of the earlier enclosures and the equally substantial earthen banks are likely to have been incorporated into the re-modelled settlement, and several of the ditches were recut.

The interior of Enclosure 3 was relatively clear of features, with the exception of a circular roundhouse (S6) with a diameter of c 14m, and a pair of internal postholes. Entrance to the roundhouse was gained on its eastern side.

Beyond Enclosure 3 and immediately to the north of the roundhouse there were two smaller, roughly rectangular enclosures. The smaller of the two (Enclosure 4) butted against the northern edge of Enclosure 3, whilst the other, less regular enclosure (Enclosure 5), which appeared to have a small subsidiary enclosure attached to its northern side, was positioned separately. Immediately to the north and probably associated with Enclosure 5 was a T-shaped malting oven and a hearth. There were a number of stone-packed postholes surrounding the malting oven, suggesting that it was probably covered by a shelter.

Close to the south-western corner of the Enclosure 3, and on the edge of the floodplain, there were the remains of a circular building with a diameter of c 14m (S5). The building was probably made from timber supported on a low, stone footing. The surviving footings, of which two to three courses survived in places, were made from un-mortared shelly limestone rubble set in a shallow foundation trench. There was an opening on the eastern side, the threshold consolidated by a spread of pebbles and small cobbles. The concentration of roof tile fragments in this area indicates that the roof was probably tiled. There were no surviving internal features related to the building. Given the location of the building in relation to the contemporary enclosure, its position at the edge of the floodplain and the high occurrence of small finds from this area, it is possible that it may have been a shrine, although this is highly speculative at this stage.

To the west of building S5 and on the western margin of the settlement there were two cremation burials (HB1 and HB2). They were both accompanied by a range of luxury items, including a small range of Roman finewares and conical glass jugs. They date to the late 1st to early 2nd century AD. A third cremation burial (HB3), deposited in an earthenware urn towards the north-western corner of the site, was of a similar date.

Across the remainder of the excavation area there were numerous boundary and drainage ditches, and a number of pits and postholes dating to this period. These represent the continuous alteration of the settlement between the late 1st and early 3rd century in response to the changing needs of the resident community.

Coin and pottery evidence and the shifting pattern of settlement suggest that there was a tailing-off of activity in the late 2nd/ early 3rd century and that the site may have been temporarily abandoned, or at least sparsely inhabited, during much of the 3rd century.

4.7 The re-organisation of the Romano-British settlement (late 3rd-4th century)

In the late 3rd century there was a marked increase in activity on the site, with the construction of a series of relatively small square and rectangular enclosures, forming a grid-like pattern across the central and western part of the site. The nucleus of the settlement appears to lie directly to the east of the 1st century Enclosure 1. The size of the enclosures may reflect a shift in the site's economic base, with an increased emphasis on the keeping of livestock as opposed to arable production. The circular building (S5), tentatively interpreted as a shrine, was either demolished or had gone out of use by this time as a late 3rd/4th century ditch cut through its northern and western perimeter and the demolition debris overlying the collapsed stonework contained late Roman pottery and coins. Layers of dark soil collected at the base of the slope and in hollows across the site, masking earlier features. The accumulation of these deposits may be related to climatic change and the raising of the water table in the late Roman period.

4.8 Possible early Saxon burials (5th-6th centuries AD)

There were no archaeological features within the excavation area dating to the Saxon period. However, scanning with a metal detector recovered an iron spearhead from the topsoil and part of an iron shield boss from the subsoil. Both items were found in the central northern part of the site and were in poor condition. It is likely that they derive from a shallow, early Saxon grave that was destroyed by ploughing in the medieval period. It is possible that there may have been more than one grave. Early Saxon burials were often interred on the sites of abandoned Romano-British settlements and villas (Lucy 2000).

4.9 Medieval ridge and furrow

Medieval plough furrows, spaced approximately 9m apart, were recorded across the entire site. The broad furrows were aligned from north-west to south-east and displayed the aratral curve (reversed S-shape) typically created by early medieval ox drawn ploughing (Rackham 1986, 167-180). In conversation with the farmer, it was learnt that the substantial earthworks were razed using a bulldozer approximately twenty years ago.

The survival of the ridge and furrow earthworks in their original form until their recent levelling suggests that land-use changed in the later medieval period to pasture. Had the open field system of arable farming been maintained into the later medieval period and beyond, the straight, narrow furrows produced by horse drawn plough teams would have been superimposed over the earlier sinuous furrows.

4.10 Modern field boundary

Passing from north-east to south-west across the south-eastern edge of the site there was a field boundary ditch. The remains of tree roots were found in the ditch fill, suggesting that there had been an associated hedge.

The ditch cut the medieval furrows, indicating that it is late medieval or later in date, and historical map evidence suggests that the boundary actually dates to the 19th century. The boundary does not appear on the Rectorial Tithe and Glebe map of 1790 (NRO ref. 358D), but it is shown on the 1889 (1st edition) Ordnance Survey map, suggesting that it is a sub-division of enclosed land. The hedgerow was grubbed up and the ditch was back-filled by the farmer in the last twenty years (Mr Banner, pers comm).

4.11 Undated features

The majority of the archaeological features could be dated, either from artefactual evidence, feature type, stratigraphic relationships or by association with other features. However, there were a number of features, predominantly pits and postholes, which could not be dated, although it is likely, given the history of the site, that they relate to the period of settlement from the late Iron Age to the 4th century AD. The exception to this was a line of stone-packed postholes running across the grain of the settlement and the ridge and furrow, on a north to south alignment. They post-dated the Romano-British settlement but it was not certain if they pre- or post-dated the ridge and furrow.

4.12 Quantification; the site archive

Site records

Plans: 21 A2 sheets at 1:50 and 1:100
Sections: 46 A2 sheets at 1:10 and 1:20
Contexts: 1884 on individual *pro-forma* record sheets
Supporting records: 136 on individual *pro-forma* record sheets
Colour slides: 720
Black and white: 20 films

Finds

Prehistoric pottery (boxes): 1 Roman pottery (boxes): 28 Animal bone (boxes): 21 Human bone (boxes): 1 (3 cremations) Other finds (boxes): 6 Small finds (boxes): 9 (small)

Environmental and dating samples

Bulk soil samples (40 litre): **56** Bulk soil samples for phosphate analysis (10litre): **24** Radiocarbon samples (to be obtained from bone and charcoal in soil samples)

5 FINDS ASSESSMENT

5.1 Worked flint by Yvonne B Wolframm-Murray

A total of 60 pieces of flint were recovered. The flints come from late Iron Age and Roman contexts and are therefore residual. The general composition of the assemblage is summarised below in Table 1.

Description	Quantity
Core	6
Waste flake	17
Waste blade	6
Scraper (end)	2
Scraper (side)	2
Scraper (discoidal)	1
Leaf shaped arrowhead	1
Knife	1
Misc. retouched flake	8
Misc. retouched blade	3
Fragment	2
Total	49

Table 1: Summary of worked flint

The raw material is mostly a vitreous flint that is a light honey to a deep honey/grey colour with a light to mid brown cortex. A few flints are of the vitreous black/dark grey flint and the opaque granular flint of a mid grey colour. The composition of the raw material is unusual, with the proportion of the vitreous honey coloured flint more common than the vitreous black/grey flint.

There are six cores, all of which have multiple platforms. The cores were mostly exhausted before being discarded. The assemblage consists mostly of flakes and there is a good representation of blades; there are also a couple of fragments. There is evidence of the flakes and blades having been soft hammer as well as hard hammer struck. Some of the flakes and blades show miscellaneous retouch around the edges; the retouch is systematic and ranges from small areas to the whole sides of the flakes or blades.

The dominant implement type is the scraper. There are five scrapers in total, comprising two end scrapers, two side scrapers and a discoidal scraper. There is a leaf-shaped arrowhead, which has been roughly shaped and may not be completed.

One knife was recovered, which is 70 mm long and 34 mm wide. A small part from the proximal end is missing. The flint from which it is made, an opaque mid orangey brown colour with small to large sized light greyish brown inclusions, differs from the rest of the assemblage. The dagger is bi-facially retouched, the retouch covering the complete surface, and edge-polish is evident on one edge, probably from use. There are few pieces of burnt flint, mostly of natural origin.

The general makeup of the assemblage indicates that it ranges from the Neolithic to the early Bronze Age. As the flint assemblage is entirely residual, no further work is recommended; however, given the quality of the flint knife and the relative rarity of the find, it should be drawn for inclusion in the final report.

5.2 Iron Age and Roman pottery by Ed McSloy

A total of 30 boxes of pottery were submitted for assessment. Included are three cremation groups that include complete or substantially complete vessels (Table 2).

Pottery amounting to 12,152 sherds (*c* 207kg) was recovered from 574 contexts, consisting of fills of negative features, mainly ditches. The condition of the pottery is typically good, with surfaces and inclusions well-preserved. Substantially complete vessels were recovered from three cremations and several other deposits (ditch fills 203, 351, 741, 1469). Average sherd weight is moderately high for a Roman assemblage at 17.04g, which is consistent with low levels of disturbance.

The potential for dating evidence was from the outset considered high due to relatively well understood ceramic sequence in the region. Understandably, given the nature and intensity of activity demonstrated, context 'integrity' is variable and residual pottery was routinely present in later Roman groups (CP 4/5).

As ever, precision or 'narrowness' of context dating is dependent largely on context size. A significant number of contexts exist, mostly small groups, for which it is only possible to allocate a broad date span. Similarly a relatively small number of 'mixed-date' contexts exist where is has not been possible to determine dating from either the proportions of material present, or material condition.

Evaluation of the dating potential of this assemblage was a primary objective of this assessment. The moderately high levels of residuality notwithstanding (below), the assemblage can be demonstrated to provide good chronological information suitable for use in establishing the sequence for the site.

A number of larger (between 150-500 sherds), better-preserved and discretely dated groups which may be suitable for selective study at analysis stage, have been identified (see Appendix 2).

Methodology

The pottery was scanned by context and quantified by sherd count (a record of weight per context already existed). Quantified data, a note of fabrics present and a context dating expressed as a *terminus post quem* were recorded on an Access database. Provisional ceramic phasing (see Appendix 2) has been constructed from this data.

Range and Variety

Iron Age

Fabrics and forms among the small late prehistoric component are consistent with middle/late Iron Age dating. Identifiable forms comprise mainly slack-shouldered jars, a few of which feature light vertical scoring or 'twig-brushing'. Most informative are those sherds, decorated with curvilinear La Tène type decoration, of the well-known and local Hunsbury style. Dating within the 2nd/1st centuries BC is probable for this material, and quite feasibly the remainder of the assemblage.

'Transitional' and Roman

A much larger portion of the assemblage is attributable to the 1st century AD and spans the late Iron Age to Roman transition. As is entirely typical for the region, fabrics comprise grog-tempered and (fewer) shell-tempered types, most likely of local origin. Forms identified comprise wheel-thrown necked jars and bowls, lid-seated jars and cups.

Roman pottery fabrics encountered are set out in Appendix 2. The composition of the assemblage compares with the larger group from Stanwick, Northants (McSloy *et al*, forthcoming). For this reason pottery codes used for this assessment are adapted from those utilised for analysis of the Stanwick assemblage. Roman coarsewares correspond to a variety of traditions of which the reduced sandy greywares (C4 and C11) and 'Romanised grog-tempered' wares (A1 and A3) are particularly prominent. These, together with whiteware type D6/9 are commonly encountered in Roman assemblages from the Northampton environs and undoubtedly of local, Upper Nene valley manufacture. Forms in greyware fabrics primarily consist of necked jars or neckless, lid-seated jars, dishes and bowls some comparing with kiln groups known locally from Ecton, Northants (Johnston 1969). The common occurrence of Gallo-Belgic inspired platters and local Belgic-style carinated cups, attests to a significant component dating from the later 1st or early 2nd century AD. Forms among the Romanised grogged wares comprise mainly jars, with lid-seated types evolving from early/mid 1st century types well represented.

Pink grog-tempered ware (fabric A2), probably originating in the Milton Keynes/Towcester area is moderately common in the assemblage, occurring as widemouthed bowls and large storage jars. This ware provides a useful chronological marker, indicating dating after the late 2nd century AD. Shell-tempered wares occur primarily in later Roman contexts and there is little doubt that most or all derives from Harrold, Beds (Brown 1994). Forms, mostly jars and wide-mouthed flanged bowls, correspond to types known from the Harrold kiln groups. Dorset Black-Burnished ware is present in modest levels and would appear to be confined to Ceramic Phases 4/5. Represented forms comprise mainly plain-rimmed dishes and flanged bowls.

Verulamium region whitewares are moderately common. Forms comprise mainly flagons, of ring-necked type and a two handled large flagon amphora from enclosure ditch fill 351. More unusual is a probable tazza base from gully fill 565, which appears to have been trimmed down and re-used as a lid.

Mortaria derives from four sources, the most common being Mancetter Hartshill, Warwickshire. Almost all material relates to the later Roman period with a single Verulamium region product, dateable before the mid 2nd century.

Finewares are a mix of local ware types, and regional or continental imports. Local types are confined to a few sherds of Upper Nene type colour-coated type wares (fabric D13) of 2nd century date. Forms noted include beakers and at least one dish with clay roughcasting and more unusually a bag-shaped beaker with applied clay pads.

Lower Nene Valley colour-coated ware products are well-represented. A small number of roughcast-decorated and other bag-shaped/cornice-rimmed beakers are representative of early phases of production (mid 2nd to early 3rd century). The ware type is however largely confined to later Roman contexts where they occur primarily as 'coarseware' type forms including plain-rimmed dishes, flanged bowls and necked

jars. A few sherds of fine greyware, decorated in the London ware style, and fine creamwares (fabric D21) may originate from this production centre.

Oxfordshire red/brown colour-coated wares are considered in Late Roman (CP 5) contexts. Represented forms are exclusively bowls, predominantly flanged types imitating samian Drag. 38 forms or wall-sided types.

Gaulish samian accounts for the bulk of continental wares, amounting to 120 sherds (0.93%) of the assemblage. Products from South Gaul (La Graufesenque) and Central Gaul (Lezoux) are identifiable with South Gaulish material, including the complete vessels deposited with cremation deposits HB1 and HB2 (Table 2), seemingly more abundant. The majority of represented forms are plain types, mainly cups; Drag. 27 and Drag. 35. A small number of decorated forms, types Drag. 29 and Drag.37 are also present.

Further continental finewares present consist of a heavily fragmented cup in *Terra Nigra* eggshell fabric from HB 1, a stray *Terra Nigra* sherd residual in ditch fill 1469 and a sherd from Central Gaulish colour-coated ware beaker with applied 'hairpin' decoration from enclosure ditch fill 109.

Deposit	Small	Description	Date
	find no.		
HB 1	54	Veru. Region whiteware ring-necked	Late 1st to early 2nd century
		flagon	
	55	TN eggshell CAM 120 carinated cup	Late Neronian-Flavian
	56	South Gaulish Drag. 36 bowl	Flavian-Early Trajanic
	57	South Gaulish Drag. 36 bowl	Flavian-Early Trajanic
	58	South Gaulish Drag. 35 cup	Flavian-Early Trajanic
	59	South Gaulish Drag. 35 cup	Flavian-Early Trajanic
HB 2	61	South Gaulish Drag. 35 cup	Flavian-Early Trajanic
	62	South Gaulish Drag. 18/31 dish	Late Flavian-EarlyTrajanic
	64	Lid-seated jar, Fabric A1	Late 1st to 2nd century
	73	South Gaulish Drag. 36 bowl	Flavian-Early Trajanic
HB 3	-	Neckless (?Lid seated) jar, Fabric A3	Late 1st to 2nd century

Table 2: Cremation deposits 1-3. Summary of ceramic present

Table 3: Summary of assemblage according to Ceramic Phase (groups of uncertai	n,
mixed or broad dating are omitted)	

CP*	CP Description	Sherd count	%sherd
			count
1	Mid to late IA	98	1%
2	1st century AD	614	6.1
2.1	Early to mid 1st century AD	676	6.7
2.2	Mid to late 1st century AD	1649	16.4
3	Late 1st to 2nd/early 3rd centuries AD	1550	15.4
3.1	Late 1st to early/mid 2nd Century AD	2087	20.7
3.2	Mid 2nd to early 3rd century AD	392	3.9
4	Late 2nd to mid 3rd century AD (prob. EMC3)	619	6.1
5	Late 3rd to 4th centuries AD	1193	11.8
5.1	Late 3rd to early or mid 4th century AD	640	6.4
5.2	Mid to late 4th century AD	552	5.5
		10070	

CP Ceramic Phase

Chronology

Context *termini post quem* have been utilised to construct provisional Ceramic Phases that are presented above (Table 3). Dating for Roman groups is provided by a variety of chronological markers, some of which are described above. Coarsewares are typically less 'sensitive' as indicators of date and to a large extent closer dating is dependent on presence of although the occurrence of certain types, pink grogged type A2.

Table 3 indicates a marked emphasis on 1st and (early/mid) 2nd century material earlier Roman contexts. This is most clearly indicated from the abundance of 'Belgic' (fabric A) and Romanised grog-tempered wares (types A1 and A3), typically occurring as lid-seated jars. Several large groups clearly relate to this period (Appendix 2), as do the Cremation deposits HB1 and HB2. The ceramic grave goods accompanying HB1 and 2 (Table 2) would indicate that these are broadly contemporary, with Flavian-Trajanic (*c* AD 70-110) range. HB1 is perhaps the earlier, containing as it does an eggshell Terra Nigra cup, typically of Neronian-Early Flavian date. The inclusion, in HB2, of a Drag. 18/31 dish, a form typically Late Flavian or Early Trajanic is in accord with a slightly later date for HB2. Comparably rich groups appear to be rare in the region.

Perhaps unusually the period between the mid 2nd and early 3rd century, a period typically highly visible from ceramic evidence is poorly represented (Table 3). Scarcity or absence of Central or East Gaulish samian, Gaulish black-slipped wares and certain Lower Nene Valley products, suggests that there is a real contraction or shift away of activity at this time. The apparent bias towards South Gaulish material is at odds with the usual pattern of samian use for rural sites, which sees Central Gaulish typically most abundant.

Late Roman material (Ceramic Phase 5) is moderately well represented in the assemblage. Groups of this date are typically modest in size and frequently include sizeable residual components. There are indications, provided by certain Oxfordshire colour-coated ware and Harrold shell-tempered ware forms, for activity continuing into the second half of the 4th century. However, largely due to the generally small-size of context groups, there is no clear or overt evidence of activity into the latest years of the 4th and the 5th centuries.

Research Potential

The good condition of the pottery demonstrates low levels of disturbance. Similarly the presence of large, discrete and well dated groups, are likely indicative of close proximity to areas of habitation.

Good potential can be demonstrated for the dating of contexts (and feature groups), with a strong likelihood that the same dating scheme can be applied to adjacent, unexcavated areas of the site.

Activity extending from the late Iron Age and throughout the Roman period is demonstrable, with emphasis on the 1st and earlier/middle 2nd centuries AD. Some aspects of the chronological make-up of the site are unusual, in particular an apparent hiatus or shifting away of activity in the mid 2nd to earlier 3rd century AD. It is entirely possible that future investigations of unexcavated areas may redress this, and provide evidence for settlement movement.

Although comparably large (or larger) assemblages from the Northampton/Upper Nene Valley have been studied, it remains the case that little is published. The Pineham North assemblage, as it stands, is of some regional significance, in particular demonstrating good potential to address questions relating to pottery use across the important Late Iron Age/Early Roman transition.

The Iron Age and early/middle 1st century assemblages demonstrate no clear indications of 'high status', present for example at Piddington in the form of imported Gallo-Belgic wares or amphora sherds. There are indications for increased access to imported continental finewares (mainly South Gaulish samian), in the later 1st century AD. This may possibly reflect an increase in wealth and 'status' at this time. The moderately richly-furnished cremation deposits HB1 and HB2 also clearly date to this period. The deposition of samian as matched sets, glassware and in the case of HB1, the inclusion of a serving vessel, demonstrates relative wealth and familiarity with Roman eating/drinking habits.

The low levels overall of Gaulish samian (below 1% by count) may be masked by the apparent dearth of Antonine dated contexts; the peak period for samian consumption on most Romano-British sites. Similarly the virtual absence of amphora might reflect more the chronological division of the assemblage rather than its status. Further investigation by a samian specialist is recommended to further investigate the pattern of samian use on this site.

Tasks recommended at analysis stage:

- The appointment of a samian specialist capable of full recording of source to and beyond regional centres, form and identification (and closer dating of) potters stamps and decorated sherds.
- To enable refinement of site chronology and a full appreciation of pottery supply, full recording of the Late Prehistoric and Roman assemblages is recommended to the standards specified by the Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group (PCRG 1997) and Study Group for Roman Pottery (SGRP 1994). To facilitate full understanding of the assemblage, full integration of pottery records with the site stratigraphic sequence is recommended.
- Approximately 50 pottery vessels are considered to merit illustration, either as part of the large, discrete groups or as of intrinsic interest (see Appendix 2).

5.3 Glass by Hilary Cool

Introduction

This assessment is based on personal inspection of all the finds. A basic archive catalogue following the guidelines set out in *RFG & FRG 1993* of the material from the settlement site was prepared and was entered onto an Access database. This records small find number, context, count, colour, simple name and spot date. This catalogue will provide sufficient information about the less diagnostic fragments for the full catalogue at the analysis stage, and the fragments themselves will not need to be inspected again. The information in this database is presented Table 4 below:

Context	Feature	Small find	Simple name	Spot date
no.		no.		
2	Subsoil	251	Bead	Post med / modern
102	Burial [102]	53	Conical jug	Mid-late 1st century
131	Burial [132]	63	Conical jug	Mid 1st-mid 2nd centuries
319	Ditch [320]	136	Body fragment	1st - 3rd centuries
351	Ditch [352]	138	Prismatic bottle	Late 1st - early 3rd century
435	Ditch [436]	139	Body fragment	1st-3rd
520	Ditch [521]	125	Pillar moulded bowl	Mid 1st
764	Ditch [765]	170	Prismatic bottle	Late C1 - early C3
805	Ditch [804]	173	Body fragment	1st - 3rd centuries
862	Ditch [863]	175	Tubular rimmed bowl	Mid 1st-mid 2nd centuries
862	Ditch [863]	174	Body fragment	Mid 1st-mid 2nd centuries
1075	Wall [1074]	206	Prismatic bottle	Late 1st - early 3rd century
1122	Gully [1123]	207	Prismatic bottle	Late 1st - early 3rd century
1495	Furrow	253	Body fragment	Modern

Table 4: Summary of glass by context

The funerary finds

Two glass vessels, which had originally been deposited complete as grave goods, were recovered from HB1 and 2. That from HB1 (context 102, small find 53) is the most complete. It is a dark yellow/brown conical ribbed jug of Isings form 55 (see Price and Cottam 1998, 155-6). These are a mid 1st to mid 2nd century type, but the colour of this indicates it is of 1st century date. That from HB2 (context 131, small find 63) is similar, but made of a lighter green-tinged yellow/brown glass and so can only be dated to the broad date band of the type.

Both are fragmented but would be reconstructable. This could be done as part of the analysis programme if all that was required was a temporary reconstruction to allow the items to be photographed and drawn. This would establish whether permanent reconstruction was appropriate. The types are common ones so the question of whether the expense of professional reconstruction would be warranted would depend on whether the receiving museum wished to put the items on display.

The material from the settlement

Twenty fragments of glass were recovered from the settlement. Of these, one (context 1495, small find 253) was modern. There was one fragment of a polychrome pillar moulded bowl of mid 1st century date (context 520, small find 125), the complete base of a tubular-rimmed bowl of mid 1st to mid 2nd century date (context 862, small find 175) and five fragments from square bottles of the later 1st to earlier 3rd century (contexts 351, 764, 1075, 1122). The rest of the fragments are not sufficiently diagnostic to be closely dated but have a 1st to 3rd century date range. The single bead is of relatively recent date.

Condition

All the material is in excellent condition and adequately packaged for long term storage.

The potential

The items from the cemetery will help to date the graves and will help place the individuals buried there into their social context. They will need to be viewed alongside all of the other vessels in the grave as they might have been there either as accoutrements to sacrifice or, more likely, as part of a drinking service.

The items from the settlement will help characterise the nature of the occupation there as the concentration on bowl and bottle forms is typical of 1st to 2nd century native rural communities.

The jugs from the cemetery will be temporarily reconstructed using invisible tape to allow them to be drawn and photographed. Decisions on whether permanent reconstruction would be appropriate can then be made.

Typology and dating

A discussion providing typological date and sufficient *comparanda* to identify them and set them in context will be produced.

Illustration

Material will be selected for illustration and the finds researcher will liaise with the illustrator over the production of the illustrations. It is estimated that one line drawing will be required for the settlement finds. The jugs should be drawn and photographed.

5.4 **Roman finds** by Tora Hylton and Ian Meadows

Introduction

The excavation produced a small collection of small finds, with the majority of the assemblage dating to the Roman period. The assemblage is small and dominated by coins, although there are several items of personal adornment and a small range of tools.

Quantity of material

The excavations produced 184 individual or group recorded small finds dating to the Roman period. All the common materials are represented and are quantified by material type in Table 5 below.

Material	Total
Silver	1
Copper alloy	75
Iron objects	52
Lead	5
Stone	13
Glass	16
Bone	2
Ceramic	19
Total	184

Table 5: Summary of Roman finds by material type

Data collection

All the finds were recorded on site following NA guidelines. The majority were recovered by hand, while smaller numbers were located using a metal detector. A metal detector was used in advance of machining and its use increased the recovery of metal objects, particularly the copper alloy objects, predominantly coins. Metal detecting was carried out at regular intervals throughout the excavation, by undertaking the systematic coverage of the exposed surface of the site and scanning the spoil heaps. The position

of all excavated finds was recorded by three-dimensional co-ordinates, and the metal detected finds were given co-ordinates where possible.

All the individually recorded finds have been entered on to an Access database. A basic catalogue has been compiled, comprising material type and object identifications, together with stratigraphic information. All finds have been boxed by material type, in numerical small find order.

Condition

The copper alloy is in a stable condition, but a small number of objects may require cleaning to reveal features of interest. The ironwork is in a reasonable state of preservation, though much of it is encrusted in corrosion products. With the exception of nails and small fragments, all the iron work is in the process of being x-rayed by Buckinghamshire County Museum Conservation Service. This will not only provide a permanent record, but help in the identification of the objects and highlighted features of interest.

The small Roman assemblage is comparable with those from other small settlements of a similar date. Of particular interest is the presence of a large silver cross-brooch recovered from the topsoil. Where possible, all the finds have been assigned functional groups. Table 6 below provides an indication of the range of finds represented

Functional category	No. of items
Personal Possessions	
Costume and jewellery	17
Personal equipment	2
Equipment and furnishings	
Building equipment	
General ironwork	1
Nails (inc. hob nails)	40
Vessel glass	15
Knives	4
Hones/sharpeners	2
Querns	7
Tools (textile working)	3
Coins	51
Miscellaneous and unidentified	
Copper alloy	4
Iron	10
Lead	3
Bone	3

Table 6: Functional range of Roman finds

Coins

An assemblage of fifty-one coins was examined; a catalogue of the coins is given in Appendix 3. The assemblage comprised almost entirely 4th century copper alloy issues, with the exception of one Iron Age unit, one late 3rd century radiate, a 1st century Flavian sestertius and four illegible flans that could not be dated beyond the 3rd to 4th century. The Iron Age unit would suggest activity in the pre-conquest period on the site; the near absence of 1st and 2nd century coins is not unusual as they are generally poorly represented in rural assemblages but the lack of 3rd century issue is remarkable.

The lack of the radiate issues might reflect a 3rd century hiatus in occupation, as they normally are common in rural assemblages, especially when occupation can be demonstrated for the 4th century. The 4th century issues range from the first to the third quarter of the 4th century but the last quarter is absent, possibly reflecting the reduction in money supply. Although the coins were predominantly from the topsoil and subsoil they were in remarkably good condition, allowing their identification in many cases down to type and mint. Their condition is probably a reflection of only a short period of active cultivation of these soil horizons.

The coins came, as is normal, from predominantly the western mints at Trier, Lyons, Amiens and Arles; a single example came from Rome and one coin had probably been produced in one of the eastern mints.

No further work is worth carrying out on these coins although a second opinion on the possible Iron Age unit would be advisable. All of the Roman coins were copper alloy and represent low denomination coin. As so few coins were stratified their significance to the understanding of the site may be to see if their distribution is concentrated in any part of the area.

Copper alloy

With the exception of the coins (see above), the identifiable objects are predominantly represented by items for personal adornment. They include eight brooches, one brooch pin, one ?earring, one pin and one bracelet. The brooches have been assessed by Don Mackreth and he has identified five types, three Colchester types, three Colchester derivative, one Harlow Type, one early birdlip type, one rear hook type. They date from the mid-late 1st to 2nd century. The only other artefacts worthy of note are one half of a pair of tweezers and a nail cleaner.

Iron

In total, fifty-four individual or group recorded iron objects were recovered from Roman deposits and well over half that number (thirty-six) is made up of single examples or groups of nails, totalling forty individual examples. With the exception of hobnails for use with shoes, and a small number recovered from grave deposits, the remainder were probably used for construction. The remaining assemblage is small and provides little insight into aspects of life at the settlement. There are two knives and two blade fragments, a holdfast for joining two pieces of wood together, and a small number of unidentifiable rod fragments and strips.

Lead

There is one spindle whorl and two pot repairs from topsoil deposits and a molten driblet.

Ceramic

Ceramic objects are represented by one spindle whorl manufactured from a body sherd from a grog-tempered/greyware vessel.

Worked bone

Four objects of worked bone were recovered, a pin, a complete sheep/goat metatarsal showing signs of extreme wear and fragments from two objects of unknown use.

Stone

With the exception of the querns, which have been reported on separately (see 5.5 below), stone items consist of two whetstones and a spindle whorl. In addition, there are parts of two items manufactured from jet, a pin and ?handle.

Proposals for further analysis and reporting

All ironwork, with the exception of identifiable nails and fragments, is in the process of being x-rayed by Buckinghamshire County Museum Conservation Service. Once this has been undertaken, the finds catalogue will be completed. It is envisaged that a small number of objects may require basic cleaning to reveal and help determine the nature of technical features visible on the x-ray.

The assemblage as a whole is small, but once the stratigraphic work is complete, basic analysis of finds distributions will be undertaken. In addition, there will be some further work on finds of individual interest or groups of finds from individual deposits.

5.5 **Querns and grinding stones** by Andy Chapman

Parts of eight querns were recovered; including two halves of upper stones and two near complete lower stones, with a range of geological types represented (Table 7). In addition, three stones with worn surfaces appear to have been used with rubbing stones for grinding.

All of the querns are from simple flat-topped rotary querns, characteristic of the Roman period (Watts 2002, 32-38). There are fragments from two upper stones (SF 66 and SF 164/87) in coarse grained sandstone, brown with pink mineral inclusions, which is most probably Millstone Grit from Derbyshire. There are three stones in sandstone conglomerates of unknown sources, but with the basic matrix broadly similar to the Millstone Grit querns. One contains sparse small pebbles, partly of quartz and typically no larger than 15mm long (SF 157/169), while the other two (SF 236 and 141) have a higher density of larger pebbles, principally of quartz, up to 30mm long.

There are both upper (SF 168) and lower (SF 167) stones in a fine-grained sandstone, with a grey-brown weathered surface but in a fresh break it is light creamy-grey with fine specks of dark grey mineral inclusions. This is most probably Spilsby Sandstone from the Lincolnshire Wolds. This is the second most common geology, after Millstone Grit, in the large assemblage of 124 Iron Age querns from Hunsbury hillfort, and examples have come from as far south as Essex and Hertfordshire (Ingle 1993/94, 28-30).

Finally, there is a complete lower stone in Hertfordshire puddingstone (SF 166), containing dense large pebbles of brown flint, up to 50mm long in the upper, grinding surface and up to 90mm long as exposed in the underside of the stone.

Four of the upper stones have measurable diameters, and these range from 330-420mm, while the two lower stones are slightly smaller, at 290-310mm in diameter.

The upper stones have upper surfaces and circumferences that have been worked roughly smooth, and the majority of the stones show remnant circular dimpled tool marks. The circumferences are typically slightly splayed, but the upper stone in the fine-grained Spilsby sandstone (SF 168) has been better finished than the others, and has a near horizontal top surface and vertical edges, with vertical tooled chisel lines around the circumference.

The central eye had been partly lost on the Spilsby upper stone (SF 168), but it is around 80mm in diameter, with a simple, roughly-worked chamfered surround. The eye on the conglomerate stone (SF 236) is 75mm in diameter, and is surrounded by a recessed, rounded collar, 16m wide and 5mm deep. Two small fragments of Millstone Grit (SF 164 & 87) are from an eye 80mm in diameter, surrounded by a raised collar, 32mm wide by 5mm high, with a decorative central groove. The size of the eyes on these stones indicates that they had all been mounted on a rynd, a length of wood or iron bridging the eye and locating on the spindle set in the lower stone.

The Spilsby upper stone (SF 168) has fractured across a broad, square handle slot, 50mm wide by 20mm deep and 100mm long, running almost to the central eye, while a conglomerate stone (SF 236) had also fractured along a handle slot, but this example is 20mm deep by 75mm long, stopping 60mm short of the eye. The small fragment from the circumference of a gritstone quern (SF 66) has also fractured along a handle slot 25mm deep and in excess of 100mm long.

All the grinding surfaces on upper and lower stones are worn smooth, with no surviving tool marks. The grinding surfaces of the two conglomerate upper stones (SF 157/169 and SF 236) are only very slightly concave. On the best preserved example (SF 236) the stone is 30mm thick at the eye (ignoring the recessed collar) and increases to only 42mm thick at the circumference. The conglomerate lower stone (SF 141) is similarly only slightly convex, and the puddingstone lower stone (SF 166) has a similar curvature. In contrast, the upper and lower stones in Spilsby sandstone (SF 168 and 167) are deeply concave, with the upper stone 82mm thick at the circumference and only 24mm thick at the eye. A fragment from a Millstone Grit upper stone (SF 66) is also deeply concave towards its circumference.

Three lower stones have at least partly surviving spindle sockets. The puddingstone and Spilsby lower stones (SF 166 and 167) have conical spindle sockets, 40-60mm deep and 30-40mm in diameter, which do not penetrate right through the stones. The conglomerate lower stone (SF 141) has a spindle hole that penetrates right through the 85mm thick stone. It comprises opposed conical sockets, the upper one 50mm deep and the lower 35mmm deep, indicating that holes were bored from either face of the stone.

Context/	Geology	Dimensions	Dia.	Comments
feature				
(small find no.)				
342	Millstone Grit	10% surviving	400mm	Upper stone
(SF 66)		140mm x 110mm		(deeply concave)
		36-60mm thick		Worn dimples top
		(circumference)		Dimpled circumference
590/591 & U/S	Millstone Grit	85mm x 47mm		Upper stone
(SF 164 & 87)		& 78mm x 56mm	Eye	Eye, with broad grooved
		27-32 mm thick (eye)	80mm	collar
624/625	Sandstone	20% surviving	420mm	Upper stone
(SF 157 & 169)	Conglomerate	250mm x 130mm		(slightly concave)
		46-48mm thick		
879/880	Sandstone	40% surviving	330mm	Upper stone
(SF 168)	(Spilsby ?)	24-82mm thick	Eye	(deeply concave)
			80mm	Fragment of handle slot
1444/1447	Sandstone	95% surviving	310mm	Lower stone
(SF 167)	(Spilsby)	46-80mm thick		Strongly domed
				spindle socket survives
1431/1430	Puddingstone	95% surviving	290mm	Lower stone
(SF 166)	-	20-75mm thick		(slightly domed)
				spindle socket survives
1824/1825	Conglomerate	45% surviving	360mm	Upper stone
(SF 236)		30-42mm thick	eye	(slightly concave)
		collar 23mm thick	75mm	Recessed collar & part of
				handle slot
404/405	Conglomerate	50% surviving	290mm	Lower stone
(SF 141)		59-85mm thick		(slightly domed)
				spindle hole partially
				survives

Table 7: the querns: geologies, dimensions and comments

Grinding stones

Three stones, all fragments of large water worn cobbles, have one surface that is worn smooth probably as a result of use as grinding, polishing or sharpening stones. Two of these are small pieces, from contexts 1392, the fill of ditch [1393], and 1720, the layer overlying ditch [1722]. The third piece (SF 156), from the fill 624 of pit [625], is larger, but still broken, 240mm long by 150mm wide and up to 60mm thick, with a concave surface, most highly polished towards the original circumference of the stone. The concave surface suggests that the stone was probably used with a rubbing stone for grinding.

Discussion and recommendations

This is a small but interesting group of querns, in a range of geologies, with a number of examples sufficiently complete to enable full dimensions to be calculated. While there are two instances of upper and lower stones in the same geologies, the differing stone sizes and differing curvatures of the grinding surfaces suggests that they are not from single sets. The stones recovered therefore appear to derive from at least eight separate querns. It may be noted that these are all small rotary querns, for hand use, and there are no stones from larger, animal-powered millstones. No further analysis of the querns themselves is required.

It is recommended that five of the stones should be drawn for publication as they are sufficiently complete to accurately record overall form and dimensions (SFs 87/164,

141, 166, 168 and 236). The stones have been photographed individually and as a group as part of the assessment; the publication drawings need only be basic outlines to record form and dimensions. The distribution of the querns across the site should also be considered as it may indicate the location of a specific crop processing area.

5.6 Fired clay by Pat Chapman

Tile

This assemblage of 95 fragments of ceramic tile, weighs 11.034kg. There are sixteen *tegula* sherds, four *imbrex* sherds, five box flue tile sherds and a complete *bessalis* tile. The remaining sherds differ in thickness and fabric type. The quantification of the assemblage is presented in Appendix 4.

The *tegulae* are between 15mm and 25mm thick with the flanges up to 50mm high and 30mm thick at the base, with the tops squared or chamfered down towards the body. An end sherd has had the flange cut away for the overlap with the tile on the next row. Some of the body sherds have shallow curving grooves on the upper surface that are probably finger marks, fairly common to *tegula* tiles. There are also three sherds with traces of a maroon wash, a decorative style that has been noted on tile from other villas; Piddington (Ward 1999, 15) and Wootton (Hylton and Chapman 2005, 102; Chapman 2005, 102; Hylton 2005, 103) in Northamptonshire and at Yaxley in Cambridgeshire (Chapman 2006). There is one cross-fit, of *tegula* sherds, between contexts (86) and (181).

The box flue tile sherds are recognisable by the combing on the body; these vary between deep straight grooves and shallow broad sometimes curving grooves.

The *bessalis* floor tile, which has a damaged corner, is the type often used for the hypocaust pillars. It is 195mm square and 35mm thick, which is standard for this tile (Ward 1999, 42). There are some other fragments from floor tiles which are between 40mm or 60mm thick

Some of the tile sherds are well worn and eroded while others have clean breaks with sharp edges, indicating that while some sherds were on the surface for some considerable time, others had been buried soon after the breakage.

Eleven fabric types were noted, although some of these are probably subdivisions within fabric types, but have been affected by differing firing conditions or a variation in the mix of tempering. The commonest fabric was F6, the shell tempered fabric, followed by F5 and F4.

Fabric

- F1 very soft orange surface, black core, fine grog
- F2 soft pink to buff brown no core, fine grog
- F3 orange, soft surface, hard core, flint and grog
- F4 hard sandy pink, grog and flint
- F5 hard sandy orange, buff streaks, lumps of grog
- F6 shelly, pink, brown and black
- F7 reddish orange yellow very soft (kiln furniture type)
- F8 pink orange surface, black core, grog, flint, shell
- F9 soft pink surface, core, dense flint

F10 – very hard purple reddish, medium grey core if present, stone, shell, grog

F11 – hard pink, slight core, dense grog

The small amount of tile would seem to indicate that there may have been a small tiled building in the vicinity, or that the material had been introduced to the site from further afield, possibly from Duston Roman town.

Kiln furniture

There are 248 fragments of probable kiln furniture, weighing 5.198kg. The great majority of these fragments come from plates, generally between 30mm and 40mm thick. The edges tend to be slightly ridged, then dipping into a dished surface. The fabric tends to be very fine, smooth and slightly soft, orange to pink to yellow in colour with grey streaks, with only occasionally inclusions of grog or the glitter of tiny quartz grains. However, there are no indications of perforations on any of these plates. There are also the remains of two kiln bars. It is known that there are waster pots from the area and these kiln furniture elements may be part of that original process.

Context/feature	Feature type	No.	Weight (g)
683/684	Ditch	2	100
696/697	Ditch	16	604
841/842	Pit	122	1403
888/889	Ditch	5	399
892/893	Ditch	3	199
913/915	Ditch	6	292
945/946	Ditch	13	437
968/948	Ditch	1	34
1070/1071	Ditch	3	127
1178/1179	Slot	1	371
1424/1425	Ditch	65	578
1581/1580	Pit	4	347
1587/1590	Ditch	7	307
Total		248	5198

Table 8: Quantification of kiln furniture

Fired clay

There are 154 fragments, weighing 1.627kg. These fragments come in a variety of types, some are hard or soft amorphous lumps, while others are thin, hard and flat with multiple stem impressions. Only one fragment had a wattle impression. A few have been blackened. Only a few of these fragments of fired clay appear to have any feature that could be regarded as structural, the majority are pieces that could be the by-product from a range of activities.

Assessment

The ceramic tile and the kiln furniture would benefit from further analysis. To record the distribution of the tile sherds to see if there is an indication of the location of a building with which they may be associated, and a closer study of the diagnostic features of the tile, which could be datable. The kiln furniture can be compared to that from the remains of kiln site at Upton (Maull 2001) with a further study to decide what exact type they are.

5.7 Slag by Andy Chapman

A total of 825g of slag was recovered. This came from 16 contexts, which produced between 5g and 160g each, typically as one of more small lumps per context (Table 9). The material is all fuel ash slag, characteristically light in weight, highly vesicular and white to creamy-grey or light grey in colour. Where original surfaces survive, the upper surface is often fluid and glassy, sometimes with a green tinge, while the under surfaces often have burnt soils or clay adhering to them.

This material has all derived from high temperature fires, but none is associated with iron working. One possibility is that it may have been associated with pottery kilns, with the presence of kilns in the area suggested by the recovery of sherds from wasters and kiln furniture.

No further analysis of the material is required. The distribution of the fuel ash slag across the site should be considered as a specific concentration may indicate an activity area.

Context/feature	Feature type	Weight (g)
175/176	Ditch	25
294/296	Ditch	70
404/405	Ditch	140
409 /410	Ditch	5
441/442	Ditch	15
457/458	Ditch	50
692/693	Ditch	5
1101/1103	Ditch	30
1131/1132	Ditch	125
1145/1146	Gully	30
1247/1248	Ditch	10
1272/1273	Gully	160
1363/1366	Ditch	40
1482/1483	Posthole	5
1509/1511	Ditch	30
1672 /1671	Gully	85
Total		825

Table 9: The fuel ash slag

5.8 Saxon finds by Tora Hylton and Ian Meadows

Part of a Saxon shield boss and a spear head were recovered from topsoil/subsoil deposits and probably derive from a burial. Only the apex of the shield boss survives, together with a vestige of the cone. Such items are difficult to date when incomplete, but the flat-topped apex suggests a later 5th to early 6th century date. The spearhead is small, leaf-shaped and resembles a Swanton Type C1 (1974, fig 2). Spearheads of this type are common finds; Swanton has suggested that they fell out of favour towards the middle of the 6th century.

5.9 Medieval and post-medieval finds by Tora Hylton and Ian Meadows

There are a small number of artefacts that date to the medieval and post-medieval periods. Most were recovered from topsoil/subsoil and medieval furrows. The objects include a medieval dagger chape, a silver sixpence of James I, dated 1606, four fragmentary post-medieval buckles, a crotal bell and a 19th century half penny.

6 FAUNAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL EVIDENCE

6.1 Human remains by Teresa Hawtin

Aims

The aims of the assessment were:

- Basic metrical analysis
- Identification of any recognisable skeletal elements
- Estimation of age and sex
- Description of obvious pathological conditions
- Estimation of efficiency of cremation
- Assessment of potential for further analysis

Standards

The work conformed to the relevant sections of the Institute of Field Archaeologists' *Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains* (Brickley & McKinley 2004) and English Heritage's *Human Bones from Archaeological Sites: Guidelines for Producing Assessment Documents and Analytical Reports* (Mays, Brickley & Dodwell 2004) and to the relevant sections of ASC's own Operations Manual.

Analysis

The cremation burials have been sorted, weighed and analysed. The bone was sorted using stacked sieves with mesh sizes of 10mm, 5.6mm and 2mm, and each fraction size was weighed. Any extraneous material was removed before weighing, with the exception of the fine residues where a visual assessment of the percentage of bone present was made.

The colour of the bone, maximum fragment size, unusual warping and any identifiable bone fragments has been recorded. Each bone fragment was analysed for evidence of age, sex and pathological conditions.

The assemblage has also been assessed for its potential for further osteological and scientific analysis.

Fragmentation and skeletal elements present

Table 10 shows the level of fragmentation of these cremation burials, by detailing the weights and proportion of bone retrieved from each sieve fraction. In each case the fine residues contain approximately 40 - 50% bone. No animal bones or duplicated elements were identified, suggesting that these cremation burials each contained a single individual. HB1 included a separate bag labelled "with glass vessel" but there were no duplicated elements so this was included with the rest of the cremated bone from that burial.

HB2 contains the least amount of bone and also displays the highest level of fragmentation, with only 46% of the fragments being greater than 5.6mm in size. The bone in HB3 is the least fragmented, with 81% of the fragments being above 5.6mm in size, and in HB1 this figure is 73%.

Bone fragment size	Weight (g) per bone group		
	HB1	HB2	HB3
>10mm	331	88	349
	(34%)	(14%)	(43%)
>5.6mm <10mm	375	197	303
	(39%)	(32%)	(38%)
> 2mm <5.6mm	192	225	89
	(20%)	(37%)	(11%)
<2mm	65	101	63
	(7%)	(17%)	(8%)
Total weight (g)	963	611	804
Max fragment size (mm)	54 x 19	32 x 21	36 x 31
Additional bones	None identified.	None identified.	None identified.

Table 10: Metrical analysis of bone fragmentation in the cremations

Any identifiable skeletal elements were retrieved from each cremation and Table 11 presents the weights of the different elements present. Where possible, the long bone fragments were allocated to 'upper limb' or 'lower limb'. In this table 'upper limb' and 'lower limb' both consist of the relevant long bones, wrist/ankle bones and hand/foot bones. The upper limb also includes fragments from the shoulder girdle.

Burial no.	HB1	HB2	HB3
Total weight (g)	963	611	804
Unidentified fragments (g)	310	323	306
Skull (g)	105	54	46
Vertebrae (g)	8	1	22
Ribs (g)	14	6	5
Upper limb (g)	108	31	73
Lower limb (g)	176	39	144
Unidentified long bones (g)	152	54	109
Pelvis (g)	25	2	11

Table 11: Weights of different skeletal elements identified

The skull fragments from HB1 included fragments of the frontal bone, parietals, temporals, zygomatic, occipital, sphenoid, maxilla and mandible. The vertebral fragments included almost half of the first cervical vertebra and the right patella was largely complete. Fragments of femur, ulna, fibula, humerus, radius, tibia, clavicle and scapula were present, along with the right lunate, a scaphoid, and parts of two foot phalanges, two hand phalanges and two metatarsals. The fragments from the pelvis included parts of the iliac crest, acetabulum and inferior pubic ramus. Several tooth fragments were present, representing four molar roots, one unidentifiable root tip and seven crown fragments.

HB2 contained fewer identifiable fragments. From the skull, fragments of frontal, parietal, occipital, temporal, maxilla and mandible were present. A fragment of a

hand or foot phalanx, two fragments of pelvis, two fragments of scapula and two vertebral arches were also included. The long bones included parts of femur, tibia, fibula, humerus and radius. The tooth fragments represented an almost complete lower permanent molar, four molar root fragments, one unidentifiable root and one crown fragment.

Burial HB3 contained skull fragments including parts of the frontal (right upper orbit), zygomatic, occipital, temporal, maxilla and mandible. The vertebral fragments included parts of the vertebral body, arch, transverse processes and articular processes. Parts of the glenoid cavity and spinous process of the scapula were present, along with a fragment of patella and four pelvic fragments. The left trapezoid, a lunate, two metacarpals and two phalanges were represented from the hand and wrist. From the foot and ankle the fragments included parts of the talus, the right cuboid, navicular, left intermediate cuneiform, four metatarsals and six phalanges. Long bone fragments represented the femur, fibula, tibia, humerus, ulna, radius and clavicle (sternal end). One tooth was present, which was a near complete upper molar.

Age

Each of the cremation burials was analysed for evidence of the age of the individual. Although no specific age indicators, such as the pubic symphysis or auricular surface, were present, each burial included tooth fragments and long bone fragments that could be analysed for epiphyseal fusion stages. Articular surfaces were also examined for age-related degeneration.

HB1 included fragments of the distal femur, proximal tibia, proximal humerus, several phalanges and iliac crest, all of which had completely fused. Several tooth fragments were present, including roots from permanent molars. There was no evidence of age-related degeneration on any of the articular surfaces present, suggesting that this was a young-mid adult.

Burial HB2 contained a phalanx with fused epiphyses and a permanent lower molar, along with four fragments of roots from other permanent molars. Fewer intact articular surfaces were present, none of which displayed evidence of age-related degeneration. Fewer age-related indicators were present in this burial so this individual can only be described as an adult.

Within HB3 fragments of the distal femur, proximal tibia, distal ulna and several phalanges all exhibited fused epiphyses. None of the articular surfaces displayed signs of age-related degeneration. One tooth, a permanent upper molar (probably the second molar) was present, which exhibited a low degree of wear, suggesting that this individual was a younger adult.

Sex

The human remains were also briefly examined for sexually dimorphic characteristics, but unfortunately none contained any suitably diagnostic elements.

Health and disease

The nature of cremated bone often makes the identification of pathological changes difficult or impossible. During this brief assessment no pathological changes or unusual traits were identified in any of the human remains. No cut marks or evidence of animal gnawing were noted.

Efficiency of cremation

The colour of cremated bone reflects the degree of oxidation of the organic component and is related to the temperature acting on the bone in an oxidising atmosphere. These colours range from orange-brown unburnt bone, to black (indicating charring at a temperature of c 300°C), varying shades of blue and grey (incompletely oxidised bone with temperatures of up to 600°C) and white (fully oxidised bone at temperatures of above 600°C) (Brickley & McKinley 2004: 11).

Most of the cremated bone analysed was creamy-white in colour, having been stained by the surrounding soil over time. The bone from HB1 included a small amount of greyish-white bone and 5-10% was a dark blue-grey. These darker fragments were mostly parts of the lower limbs, including tibia, fibula and foot phalanges. In HB2 less than 5% of the bone was white with blue-grey patches, which included fragments of femur, tibia, fibula and skull. The remains of HB3 also included less than 5% pale greyish-white bone and very occasional dark blue-grey fragments, affecting the femur, fibula, humerus and fragments of rib, hand and pelvis.

Dehydration also leads to shrinkage, fissuring and warping during cremation. Occasional characteristic U-shaped fractures were seen in the denser long bone fragments of all three cremations, particularly in the bones of the legs, many of which also exhibited bluish-grey colouration.

Potential for further analysis

Further analysis of these cremation burials would allow for more accurate identification of the skeletal elements present and partial reconstruction of bones. This may reveal non-metric traits and pathological changes which were not identified during this assessment. However, this would be unlikely to reveal a significant amount of further information or assist with more accurate demographic analysis (age and sex assessment). Due to the small number of cremation burials recovered no statistical analysis would be possible.

Conclusions

Three early Romano-British cremation burials from Pineham North, Upton, Northamptonshire were the subject of macroscopic osteological assessment. All of the cremated remains recovered included a significant quantity of bone, with HB1 and HB3 containing a high proportion of larger fragments.

No skeletal elements were obviously absent from the assemblages, which all included hand or foot phalanges and fragments of teeth. This indicates efficient collection of the remains from the cremation pyre, with no preferential treatment for particular bones or larger elements.

The colour of the cremated bones shows a high degree of oxidation, with most of the bone being white or pale in colour. This indicates that a high temperature acted on them, in the region of 600°C, with the darker-coloured leg fragments reaching slightly lower temperatures.

The three individuals were all thought to be adults as all epiphyses present were completely fused and each of the assemblages included permanent molar teeth. HB3 was identified as a young adult due to the presence of a near complete molar tooth with very little wear. HB1 is likely to represent a young-mid adult as none of the articular surfaces present displayed age-related degeneration. HB2 could not be aged more accurately due to the lack of intact articular surfaces.

No evidence of the sex of the individuals was identified in any of the cremation burials and no pathological changes or other unusual traits were visible.

Further analysis of these remains would be unlikely to reveal a significant amount of further information.

6.2 Animal bone by Matilda Holmes

Methodology

Due to time restraints, only a random sample of approximately 57% of the faunal remains from Pineham North have been catalogued to date; the remainder will be recorded in the coming weeks for inclusion in the archive.

Bones were identified using the author's reference collection, and further guidelines from Cohen and Serjeantson (1996), Bass (1995), Hillson (1992), Prummel (1988) and Schmidt (1972). Due to anatomical similarities between sheep and goat, bones of this type were assigned to the category 'sheep/goat', unless a definite identification using guidelines from Prummel and Frisch (1986), Schmidt (1972) or Payne (1985) could be made. Bones that could not be identified to species were, where possible, categorised according to the relative size of the animal represented (small – rodent /rabbit sized, medium – sheep / pig / dog sized, or large – cattle / horse size). Ribs were not identified to species. All fragments were recorded.

Tooth wear and eruption were noted using guidelines from Grant (1982) and Silver (1969), as were bone fusion (Amorosi 1989, Silver 1969), metrical data (von den Driesch 1976), anatomy, side, zone (Serjeantson 1996), pathology, butchery, bone working and condition (Lyman 1994) of the bones.

The majority of animal bone was hand collected; there is a small assemblage from sieved deposits, which is included in the material yet to be catalogued. Due to the absence of contextual dating at this stage, the potential of the material will be assessed as Roman date.

Taphonomy and condition

The bones were generally in good condition (Table 12), though friable and very fragmentary – 118 showed signs of fresh breakage and 926 could be refitted to make 47 conjoined fragments, although many of these (706) were from 8 skulls. Taphonomic factors affecting the material were recorded (Table 13), which suggested that very few bones had been burnt, although a significant number bore signs of butchery marks and canid and (to a lesser extent) rodent gnawing, suggesting they were left exposed prior to burial. A number of horse and cattle fragments from context 33 could be conjoined with others from context 35.

Thirteen bones showed signs of pathological changes, ranging from broken and rehealed bones to periodontal disease and degeneration of the bone. Fifteen bones had been worked, including a small deposit of sheep / goat metapodials in context 1182 and two scapulae and a metatarsal from context 1295. This indicates that small scale bone working took place on the site.

Cond	lition	No.
1	Excellent	119
2	Good	245
3	Fair	367
4	Poor	76
5	Very Poor	13

Table12: Condition of bones (after Serjeantson 1996)

Table13: Frequency of taphonomic factors

Taphonomy	No.	%
Burnt	42	2
Butchered	148	7
Gnawed	163	7

Articulated remains

A number of associated and articulated fragments were recorded, including 6 cattle skulls and 2 horse skulls, partial skeletons from dog, sheep and cattle and sheep / goat and cattle fore and hind legs. Isolated deposition of skulls may be indicative of ritual activity, and the presence of (nearly) complete limbs may be the remains of feasts or offerings. Further investigation into the spatial positioning of these remains may help understand the presence of deliberate depositions.

Basic description of findings

Table 14 shows the fragment count, of which 48% were identified to species. Cattle and sheep / goat remains dominated the assemblage, although horse and pig bones were also found in significant numbers. Dog, deer, chicken and rat were present, but in a far smaller proportion of the assemblage.

Species	No.	%
Cattle	517	47.9
Sheep/goat	321	29.7
Sheep	32	3.0
Goat	1	0.1
Pig	82	7.6
Horse	100	9.3
Dog	13	1.2
Red Deer	7	0.6
Deer	5	0.5
Chicken	1	0.1
Rat	1	0.1
Total Identified	1080	
Unidentified Large Mammal	689	
Unidentified Medium Mammal	253	
Unidentified Mammal	224	
Total	2246	

Table 14: Species representation (fragment count)
* of approx 57% of the total assemblage - full catalogue in preparation. Articulated remains were counted as the minimum number of individuals represented.

Large quantities of fusion and toothwear data were recorded, a basic evaluation of which suggests that cattle and sheep / goats were often kept into maturity (Graphs 1 and 3). Culls of between 10% and 25% occur at each fusion stage in the cattle assemblage, the largest of these happening between 24 and 36 months, when cattle are at their optimum age for meat production. This is reflected in the toothwear data (Graphs 2 and 4), which further refines the mortality data, suggesting more specific culls of calves, juvenile and old animals. To some extent the same is true of the sheep / goat population, the largest cull occurring between 30 and 36 months of age, although the toothwear data implies that a more consistent cull of adult sheep occurs from wear stage 21 onwards. In both cases, animals were clearly important for secondary products (traction, milk and wool production), which is reflected in the large numbers of old animals present in the faunal remains.





Graph 2: Cattle toothwear data



Graph 3: Sheep / goat fusion data



Graph 4: Sheep/goat toothwear data



Bones from deer, horse and dog were all fused. A number of antlers were recorded, at least one of which had been shed from the animal during its spring moult.

All anatomical elements were recorded, although phalanges were scarce, a phenomenon that is common, as these small bones are often missed during excavation. However, they were rare even from larger species (cattle and horse). This may suggest that primary butchery was carried out in a separate part of the site, or that animals were bought in as dressed carcasses. This is another trend which may benefit from intra-site spatial analysis, as well as comparison with local contemporary sites. Metrical data was also abundant, which can be used for investigating sexual dimorphism, morphology and heights of the main domestic animals.

Potential of material

The material recorded so far is part of a relatively large, well-preserved assemblage, of which a more detailed analysis should be undertaken, once reliable dating evidence has been provided.

Such an analysis should include investigation into the spatial patterning of species and anatomical elements to help in the interpretation of features associated with the occupation of the site (e.g. areas of domestic refuse, primary or secondary butchery, 'ritual' or industrial deposits). While detailed age profiles using fusion and tooth wear evidence, manipulation of metrical data to look at morphology and sex of species and analysis of anatomical elements, pathology and butchery patterns can be used to give an insight of the diet, economy and animal husbandry of the area.

Although at this stage the nature of Pineham Barn is not known, the bones so far show some interesting trends. The results of faunal analysis should be compared with other, contemporary sites, to help understand the site in a regional and national context. If animal bones of similar quantities and condition continue to be recovered in future seasons, this site has potential to be extremely valuable in the understanding of attitudes towards animals during the Romano-British period on a regional, if not national scale.

6.3 Charcoal and plant macrofossils by Karen Deighton

During the course of the excavation, a total of 56 samples were taken from a range of dateable features for environmental analysis. Sample sizes ranged between 20 and 60 litres. Of these, 48 samples were processed using a siraf tank fitted with a 500micron mesh and flot sieve. Any resulting flots were dried and examined under a microscope (10x magnification). Identifications were made with the aid of the author's reference collection and a seed atlas (Schooch et al 1988). The results are presented in Table 15 below.

Cereal included hulled barley (Hordeum vulgare) and bread wheat (Triticum aestivum). A small amount of chaff was present, which appeared to suggest the presence of spelt (Triticum spelta). Wild/weed species included dock (Rumex sp), fat hen (Chenopodium album) and possibly stinking mayweed. The low proportion of wild/weed species to cereal along with the low proportion of chaff could suggest a late stage in crop processing; however, this remains to be confirmed.

Eighteen of the samples produced only small quantities of ecofacts, which probably represents the general background of material dispersed across the settlement by the wind or surface water. Some of this material may have been introduced to the settlement and burned with firewood where the larger concentrations of charcoal occur. Two of the samples (Samples 13 and 17) were sterile. Further analysis of the more productive samples containing a greater concentration of ecofacts, particularly grain and chaff, would assist in clarifying the stages of crop processing being carried out on the site and possibly identify areas where the processing was carried out, or where grain was stored. Features containing significant quantities of grain could be correlated with the distribution of grinding and quern stones, of which a number have been recovered, to identify possible food preparation areas.

The charcoal from the samples was generally small in size (<2mm) and identification, where possible, would add little to the overall picture of how the settlement functioned in terms of its exploitation of wood resources (e.g. coppicing, fuel, timber etc.).

Sample	Context	Feature	Charcoal	Cereal	Wild /weed	Pulse
1	92	Ditch [93]	1			
2	102	Burial HB1	2			
3	131	Burial HB2	1			
4	177	Pit [178]	1			
5	HB1	Fill of flagon	1			
6	209	Pit [210]	1			
7	84	Droveway ditch [85]	1			
8	382	Ditch [383]	1			
9	43	Pit [1875]	1			
10	78	Droveway ditch [79]	1			
11	205	Ditch [206]	5	30		10
12	230	Pit [231]	8	4		
13	285	Ditch [286]				
14	313	Droveway ditch [315]	8	6	3	
15	355	Ditch [356]	7	3	3	
16	422	Ditch [421]	8	50	5	20
17	404	Ditch [405]				
18	682	Ditch [684]	6#	30	2	11
20	945	Ditch [946]	4	12		2
21	1114	Pit [1115]	4	4	4	
22	1188	Posthole [1189]	10	1	5	
23	1190	Posthole [1191]	10	8	1	2
24	1074	Malting oven	4	50		
25	1192	Posthole [1193]	3	1		1
27	1242	Ditch [1244]	4	16	1	12
28	1270	Posthole [1271]	5	8	2	5
29	1269	Ditch [1248]	5	1	1	
30	1303	Ditch [1304]	3	9	6	
31	1354	Ditch [1355]	6			
32	1402	Ditch [1405]	2			
33	1361	Ditch [1366]	10	1	1	
34	1363	Ditch [1366]	2	1		
35	1365	Ditch [1366]	2	2	1	
36	1558	Ditch [1559]	2	4	1	
37	1558	Ditch [1559]	6	35	3	7
39	1509	Ditch [1511]	5		1	
40	1563	Ditch [1567]	6	7		1
41	1571	Ditch [1570]	3	28	6	2
43	1637	Ditch [1638]	6	60	2	

Table 15: Finds by sample and context

PINEHAM NORTH, UPTON, NORTHAMPTON; ASSESSMENT REPORT

44	1664	Pit [1582]	3	4		
45	1587	Ditch [1590]	5	60		
46	1679	Ditch [1680]	8	500+		
47	1655	Ditch [1660]	6	7		1
48	1685	Ditch [1686]	10	4	1	
50	1812	Ditch [1813]	1	2		
51	1821	Layer	3	3		1
56	550	Oven/hearth [552]	6	50		

Key: 1=2-10, 2=10-20, 3=20-30, 4=30-50, 5=50-100, 6=100-200, 7=200-300, 8=300-500, 9=500-1,000, 10=1,000+ # includes nutshell

6.4 **Phosphate analysis** by Simon Carlyle

A total of 65 soil samples (10ml) were taken from suitable ditch and pit deposits across the site and were tested for phosphate content. The aim of the exercise was to identify areas that may have been used to corral livestock or dispose of human faecal waste, thereby building up a picture of how the settlement functioned.

A soil testing kit, of a type commonly available from garden centres, was used to carry out these preliminary tests. The readings varied between High, Medium and Low. The results of the tests are summarized in Table 16 below.

Phosphate range	No. of samples
High	0
High to Medium	22
Medium	2
Medium to Low	0
Low	41
Total samples	65

Table 16: Summary of phosphate test results

None of the samples produced a High reading. A total of 24 samples that produced High to Medium or Medium readings were bulk sampled (10litres) for further analysis.

7 STORAGE AND CURATION

A microfilm copy of the site archive and narrative will be made to RCHME standards and submitted to the National Archaeological Record. The final report will be uploaded onto the Online Access to the Index of Archaeological Investigations (OASIS) and will include the OASIS summary form and reference number.

The site archive will comprise all written, drawn and photographic records, and all material finds and processed sample residues recovered from the excavation. The site archive will be accompanied by the research archive, which will comprise the text, tabulated data, the original drawings and all other records generated in the analysis of the site archive. The archive will be fully catalogued and stored to the requirements of the NCCEPO. It will not contain material requiring special curation. The location for the long-term storage of the site archive has yet to be arranged.

8 SUMMARY

The excavation of Settlement 2 has identified human activity on the site from the Neolithic/early Bronze Age through to modern times. The focus of the archaeological investigation was on the Romano-British settlement that was shown to have been established in the 2nd/1st century BC and to have been occupied until the middle or late 4th century AD, with a possible hiatus in occupation in the 3rd century AD.

The settlement took the form of a shifting pattern of enclosures, paddocks and field boundaries, with evidence for a number of roundhouses and a circular stone and timber building. Other features associated with the farmstead included a T-shaped malting oven and a hearth, and the recovery of a number of quern and grinding stones have provided evidence for grain processing on the site. Fragments of kiln bars and plates indicate local pottery production, although no evidence was found for kilns within the excavation area. Three late 1st/early 2nd century cremations, accompanied by a number of luxury items, were found on the western edge of the site. The changing pattern of settlement is a response to the changing needs of the community, possibly an extended family group, who farmed the land here in the late Iron Age and Roman periods. It may also be a reflection of a change in land ownership and in the community's status.

Further analysis of the stratigraphic relationships between the features, assisted by further work on the pottery, will refine the phasing of the settlement, clarify the dating of the features and provide a more precise picture of how the settlement developed over the period of occupation. Furthermore, more detailed environmental and finds analysis will assist in characterizing the nature of occupation and identify activities to particular areas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amorosi, T, 1989 A postcranial guide to domestic neo-natal and juvenile mammals, British Archaeological Reports Int. series, **533**

Bass, WM, 1995 Human Osteology, Missouri Archaeology Society: Columbia

Brown, A, 1994 A Romano-British shell-tempered pottery and tile manufacturing site at Harrold, Bedfordshire, *Bedfordshire Archaeol J*, **21**, 19-107

Brown, J, 2006 The excavation of an Iron Age and Roman settlement at The Broadway, Yaxley, Huntingdonshire, May 2006. An assessment report and updated project design, Northamptonshire Archaeology Report 06/095

Brickley, M, and McKinley, JI, (eds) 2004 *Guidelines to the Standards for Recording Human Remains*, IFA Paper **7**, British Association for Biological Anthropology and Osteoarchaeology & the Institute of Field Archaeologists

Brothwell, D, and Higgs, ES, 1969 Science and Archaeology, London, Thames and Hudson

Buteaux, S, and Jones, L, 2000 Archaeological Excavation at Pineham Barn, Upton, Northamptonshire, Birmingham University Field Unit Report 665

Campion, G, 2006 The Modern Period (1750-2000), in NJ Cooper (ed), 237-258

Chapman, P, 2005 Roman building materials from the north-eastern area, in A Chapman *et al*, 102

Chapman, P, 2006 Ceramic tile, in J Brown

Chapman, A, Thorne, A, and Upson-Smith, T, 2005 A Roman villa and an Anglo-Saxon burial at Wootton Fields, Northampton, *Northamptonshire Archaeol*, **33**, 79-112

Cohen, A, and Serjeantson, D, 1986 A Manual for the Identification of Bird Bones from Archaeological Sites, London

Cooper, NJ, (ed) *The Archaeology of the East Midlands, an archaeological resource assessment and research agenda*, Leicester Archaeology Monog, **13**

Crosby, V, and Neal, D, forthcoming, Iron Age and Romano-British settlement at Stanwick, Northants

EH 1991 Management of Archaeological Projects, 2nd edition, English Heritage

Grant, A, 1982 The use of toothwear as a guide to the age of domestic ungulates, in B Wilson *et al*, 91-108

GSB Prospection, 1999 Upton Northamptonshire, Geophysical Survey report 99/100

GSB Prospection, 2001 Upton Phase I, Geophysical Survey report 2000/97

Gurney, D, 2002, Standards for Archaeology in the East of England

Hasselgrove, C, Armit, I, Champion, J, Creighton, A, Gwilt, A, Hill, JD, Hunter, F, and Woodward, A, 2001 *Understanding the British Iron Age, an agenda for action*, English Heritage and Historic Scotland

Hillson, S, 1992 Mammal Bones and Teeth, London, Institute of Archaeology

Hylton, T, 2005 Roman building materials from the centre for learning, in A Chapman *et al*, 103

Hylton, T, and Chapman, A, 2005 Roman building materials from the villa, in A Chapman *et al*, 102

IFA 1994, revised 1999 *Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Excavations*, Institute of Field Archaeologists

IFA 1985, revised 2000 Code of Conduct, Institute of Field Archaeologists

Ingle, C, 1993/94 The Quernstones from Hunsbury Hillfort, Northamptonshire, *Northamptonshire Archaeol*, **25**, 21-33

Johnston, DE, 1969 Romano-British Pottery Kilns near Northampton, Antiq J 49, 75-97

JSAC 1998 An Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment of Pineham Barn, Upton, John Samuels Archaeological Consultants, report 464/98/01

Lucy, S, 2000 The Anglo-Saxon Way of Death, Sutton Publishing, Stroud

Lyman, RL, 1994 Vertebrate Taphonomy, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

Maull, A, 2001 Excavation of an Iron Age and Roman occupation site at Upton, Northampton SW District, Northampton 2000. Interim report and potential, Northamptonshire Archaeology report

Mays, S, Brickley, M, and Dodwell, N, 2004 Human Bones from Archaeological Sites: Guidelines for Producing Assessment Documents and Analytical Reports, Swindon, English Heritage

McSloy, E, Wallace, C, and Perrin, R, forthcoming, The Late Iron Age and Roman coarsewares, in V Crosby and D Neal

Monckton, A, 2006 Environmental Archaeology in the East Midlands in NJ Cooper (ed), 259-288

NA 2002 Fieldwalking Survey at Pineham West, Northampton, Northamptonshire Archaeology Report

NA 2005 Archaeological Evaluation at Pineham North, Upton, Northamptonshire, Northamptonshire Archaeology Report 05/81

NCC 1995 Policy and Guidance for Archaeological Fieldwork Projects in Northamptonshire, Northamptonshire Council

Payne, S, 1985 Morphological distinctions between the mandibular teeth of young sheep and goats, *Journal of Archaeological Science* **12**, 139-147

PCRG 1997 The Study of Later Prehistoric Pottery: General Policies and Guidelines for Analysis and Publication, Prehistoric Ceramics Research Group Occasional Papers 1 and 2

Price, J, and Cottam, S, 1998 *Romano-British Glass Vessels*: *a Handbook*, CBA Practical Handbook in Archaeology, **14**, York, Council for British Archaeology

Prummel, W, and Frisch, H, 1986 A guide for the distinction of species, sex and body side in bones of sheep and goat, *Journal of Archaeological Science* **13**, 567-577

Prummel, W, 1988 Distinguishing features on postcranial skeletal elements of cattle, Bos primigenius f. Taurus, and red deer, Cervus elaphus, *Schriften aus der Archaeologisch-zoologischen Arbeitsgruppe Schleswig-Kiel*, Heft 12:Keil

Rackham, O, 1986 History of the British Countryside, London

RFG & FRG 1993 Guidelines for the preparation of site archives and assessments for all finds other than fired clay vessels, AD 700-1700, Roman Find Group and Finds Research Group

Serjeantson, D, 1996 The animal bones, in S Needham and T Spence (eds), *Refuse and disposal at area 16 East Runnymede*, Runnymede Bridge Research Excavations, **2**

Schmidt, E, 1972 Atlas of Animal Bones, Elsevier

Schooch, W, Pawlik, B, and Schweingruber, F 1988 Botanical Macro-Remains

SGRP 1994 Guidelines for the Archiving of Roman Pottery, *MJ Darling (ed) Study* Group for Roman Pottery Guidelines Advisory Document 1

Silver, IA, 1969 The ageing of domestic animals, in DR Brothwell and ES Higgs (eds)

Swanton, MJ, 1974 *A Corpus of Pagan Anglo-Saxon Spear-Types*, British Archaeological Reports,**7**

Taylor, J, 2006 The Roman Period, in N J Cooper (ed), 137-160

Tomber, R, and Dore, J, 1998 *The National Roman Fabric Reference Collection: a handbook*, London, Museum of London Archaeology Service

UCA 2005 Pineham North, Upton, Northamptonshire Mitigation Strategy, Under Construction Archaeology document

von den Driesch, A, 1976 A guide to the measurement of animal bones from archaeological sites, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press

Ward, C, 1999 Iron Age and Roman Piddington: The Roman Ceramic and Stone Building Materials 1979-1998, Upper Nene Archaeological Society, Fasicule 4

Watkinson, D, and Neal, V, 1998 First Aid for Finds, 3rd Edition, RESCUE / UKIC

Watts, M, 2002 The Archaeology of Mills and Milling, Tempus

Willis, S, 2006 The Later Bronze Age and Iron Age, in NJ Cooper (ed) 89-136

Wilson, B, Grigson, C, and Payne, S, 1982 Ageing and Sexing Animal Bones from Archaeological Sites, British Archaeological Reports British Series, 109

Maps

BGS 1980 Solid and Drift Geology (England and Wales), Sheet 185, British Geological Survey 1:50,000

NRO ref. 358D Plan of the Rectorial Tythes & Glebe in Kislingbury East Field, both in the County of Northampton & the Estates of the Rev^d Mr Jn Jephcott, by Thomas Cross 1790

Ordnance Survey 1889 (1st edition) County Series, Northamptonshire:044/SE 1:10,560

SSEW 1983 *Soils of England and Wales*, Sheet 3, Soil Survey of England and Wales 1:250,000

Northamptonshire Archaeology A service of Northamptonshire County Council 24th January 2007

APPENDIX 1

Summary of features

Abbreviations

F flint; P pottery; T tile; Br brick; Fc fired clay; G glass; Sg slag; B bone; c coin;

sf small find (details in Comments column); r recut; u/s unstratified

Pottery dates: E early; M mid; L late; C century

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of feature
1	Topsoil				
2	Subsoil				
3	Natural substrate				
4	Droveway ditch	Six sections: [7], [42], [85], [100], [269]			
[5]r ?	(east)	and [1409]. Not clear which ditch is the			
6		recut in section [7]. [7] cuts 8.	Р	RB	
[7]					
8 [9]	Pit?	Edge of possible pit extending to S beyond L.o.E. 8 cut by [7].			
10	Buried soil	Extensive layer of dark soil covering [12], [14], [1255], [1257] and [1317].	РВ	MLC2	
11 [12]	Gully	Sealed by 10.			
13 [14]	Ditch	Sealed by 10. Two sections: [14] and [24]			
15	Furrow	[].	FP	C1	Medieval
17	Ditch	Two sections: [18] and [383].	РВ	LC3-C4	
19	Hollow	Silt-filled hollow at intersection between ditches [315] and [383]. Cut by [1874]	РВТ	LC3-EC4	
21	Furrow				Medieval
23	Ditch	Sealed by 10. See [14].	F P B c	LC1-MC2	
25	Furrow				Medieval
27 [28]	Ditch	Three sections: [28], [40] and [208].Intersects with [30] and [206], relationships uncertain.	РВ	LC1-C3	
29 [30]	Gully	Two sections: [30] and [165].Intersects with [28], relationship uncertain. Largely ploughed away.	Р	LC1-C2+	
31 [32]	Pit		Р	LC2-C4	
35 [36]r	Droveway ditch (north)	Six sections: [36], [83], [97], [125], [1321] and [1347]. Let object from 80	Т	LC3-C4	
33	()	[] []	РВТ	LC2-C3	
37 [38]	Ditch		Р	LC3-C4	
39 [40]	Ditch	See [28].			
41 [42]	Droveway ditch (east)	See [7]. [42] cuts 90.	РВ	LC2-C4	
43	Shallow pit	Two Fe objects.	P B sf	LC3-C4	
74	Ditch	Shallow curvilinear ditch, ploughed out at either end.			
76	Ditch		Р	LC3-C4	
78	Droveway ditch	Five sections: [79], [*], [169], [190] and			
[12] 80 [81]r	Droveway ditch	See [36]. Jet ?knife handle.	F P B sf	LC2-C4	
82	(norm)		РВ	LC2-C4	

Context	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of
[83]					leature
84 [85]	Droveway ditch (east)	See [7]. [85] cuts 90 (droveway ditch south).	FPB	C3+	
86	Ditch		РТ	LC1-C4	
[87]	Ditch	Two sections: [89] and [95]			
[89]	Diten	Two sections. [89] and [95].			
90	Droveway ditch	Six sections: [91], [130], [150], [154], [215] and [286] 00 mt hu [42]			
91	Ditch	Four sections: [93], [193], [257] and	Р	LC1-C2	
[93]		[307].			
94 [95]	Ditch	See [89].	РВ	LC1-C3	
96	Droveway ditch	See [36].			
[97]	(north)				
98 [99]	Ditch	Ditch runs parallel and between the droveway ditches [36] and [130]. Two	РВТ	LC2-***	
101		sections: [99] and [1874].			
101 [100]	Droveway ditch (east)	See [7]. [100] cuts 1876.	РВ	LC2-C3	
102	Cremation burial	Fe nails.	P G sf	LC1+	
119 [103]			HB1		
104	Ditch		РВ	C4	
[105]	Englogura ditah	Six partiance [107] [176] [206] [215]	DD	LC1 EC2	
109	Enclosure diten	[478] and [521]. [107] cuts 111.	P B	C1+	
[110]r			р		
[107]			Б		
111	Ditch	Two sections: [112] and [163]. 111 cut by	В		
112	Ditch	Three sections: [113], [172] and [235].	Р	MLC2	
[113]		[113] cuts 116 and 1284.			
116 [115]	Ditch	116 cut by [113].			
117	Ditch	Two sections: [118] and [267].	РВ	MLC4	
120	Enclosure ditch	Seven sections: [121], [240], [281], [352],	Р	LC1-C2	
[121]		[484], [1262] and [1268].			
122 [123]	Ditch	Two sections: [123] and [146].	РВ	C2	
124	Droveway ditch	See [36].	Р	C4	
[125]	(north) Droveway ditch	See [91]	PB	LC1-C2	
120	(south)	500 [71].	1.5	201 02	
[130]	Cramation burial		PG	LC1 EC2	
131	Cremation burnar		HB2	LCI-LC2	
[132]	Ditah	[125] outo 126	DD		
[135]	Ditti	[155] cuis 150.	гр	LC2-IVIC3	
136	Ditch	Two sections: [137] and [217]. 136 cut by			
138	Gully	[139] cuts 258.	РВ	LC1-C2	
[139]					
[140]	Ditch	re naii.	PBSI	C4	
144	Ditch		Р	LC1-C3	
142 [143]					
145	Ditch	See [123]	РВ	LC1-EC2	
[146] 147	Gully	Short length of gully neters out at either	Р	LC1-C2	
[148]	Suny	end.	1		
149	Droveway ditch	See [91].	В		
151	Furrow				
[152]	D	0 [01]			
153	Droveway ditch	See [91].	1		1

Context	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of
no. [154]	(south)				feature
155	Ditch	Two sections: [156] and [180].	Р	RB	
[156]					
158	Ditch	Sealed by 159	РВТ	LC1-C2	
159	Layer	Seals 158 and			
160	Furrow				Medieval
[161]	Ditab	See [112]			
[162]	Ditch	See [112].			
164	Gully	Intersects with [28], relationship	Р	C1+	
[165]		uncertain. Largely ploughed away.			
166	Ditch	Two sections: [167] and [515].			
[167]					
168	Droveway ditch	See [79].	Р	RB	
170	Ditch	See [113].	РВ	EMC1	
171			F B		
[172]	Enclosure ditch	See [107] [176] cuts 177	B Sa		
[176]r	terminal	See [107]. [170] euts 177.	DBg		
173			РВ	C1+	
[174]	Dit	Pit in base of ditch terminal [176] 177	DB	Cl	
[178]	110	cut by [176].	I D	CIT	
179	Ditch	See [156].	Р	RB	
[180]	Laver	Seals 186 Five Fe nails	PBTsf	C4	
181	Ditch	Sealed by 181.	PB	LC1-MC2	
187			РВ	LC1-MC2	
[188]r					
[185]r					
182			Р	LC2-C3	
[183]	Drovoway ditah	See [70]	D		
[190]	(west)	See [79].	Б		
194	Ditch	See [93]. 194 cut by [195].	Р	RB	
[193]	Ditch	[195] cuts 194	D	<u>C2</u>	
[195]	Ditei	[195] cuts 194.	1	C2+	
197	Ditch	Boundary ditch. Four sections: [198],			
[198]	Wall	[263], [277] and [322].	DD		
200	Shallow slot	Cuts 145 and 255.	P B	C2+	
201			Р	LC1-C2	
[202]	Ditah	See [107] Polationship with [207]	DD	LC1	
203	Ditei	uncertain.	P	LCI	
[1882]r					
205					
208	Ditch	See [28]. Relationship with [206]		MLC1	
[207]	D'	uncertain.			
209 [210]	Pit		В		
211	Ditch	211 cut by [215]	В		
[212]	D'-1				
213	Ditch	See [107]. [215] cuts 211.	P	LC1-C3	
[215]			1	102-03	
216	Ditch	See [137].			
[217]	Ditch	Two sections: [220] and [320] Not clear			
219	Ditti	which ditch is the recut. 221 cut by [222].	РВ	LC3-C4	
[220]					
221	Ditch	Two sections: [222] and [254]: [222] outs			
[222]	Diteil	221. 221.			
224	Pit?	225 cut by [242]; [226] cuts 227. Fe nail.	P B sf	LC3-C4	
225			РВ	LC1-C2	

Context	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of
no.					feature
227	Pit	227 cut by [226].			
[228]					
229	Pit		P	EMC1	
[231]			РD	ENICI	
232	Ditch	Two sections: [233] and [349].	В		
[233]					
234	Ditch	See [113], 234 cut by [238].	Р	LC1-MC2	
[235]					
239	Ditch	239 ?cut by [235]. [238] cuts 234. See	РВ	C2	
[240]r 236		[121].	Р	EMC2	
237			P	LC2-C4	
[238]	21.1				
241 [242]	Ditch	[242] cuts 225.	Р	LCI-C2	
243	Ditch	Short curvilinear ditch, W end ploughed			
[244]		away by furrow. Two sections: [244] and	F		
245	Ditch	[289]. Truncated base of ditch largely ploughed	DB		
[246]	Ditei	out.	I D	102-05+	
247	Ditch		P B	C1+	
248			В		
250	Pit				
[251]					
252	Ditch	See [222].	Р	MC3-C4	
255 [254]					
255	Ditch	See [93]. 255 cut by [202]. Cu alloy	Р	LC1-C2	
256		brooch.	P B sf	LC3-C4	
258	Ditch	Four sections: [260] [291] AP [1638]	PB	MLC2	
259	2	Relationship with [272] uncertain.	1.5		
[260]	D'. 1	a [100]	D		
261	Ditch	See [198].	В		
[263]					
264	Ditch	[265] cuts 268.	РВ	LC3-C4	
[265] 266	Ditch	See [118]	PB	C2-C4	
[267]	Diten		1 5	02 01	
268	Ditch	268 cut by [265].	РВ	C2-C4	
[269]	Ditch	Relationship with [260] uncertain	PB	LC1-MC2	
271	Ditti	renationship with [200] theortain.	1.5	Let mez	
[272]	-				
273	Layer	Layer over wall. Bone pin/stylus, two Fe nails. Fe object. Fe ring and Cu alloy	PBstc	LC3-MC4	
		bracelet.			
274	Ditch	274 cut by [277].			
276	Ditch	See [198] [277] cuts 274	В		
[277]	Diten	bee [196]. [277] euts 274.	Б		
278	Enclosure ditch	278 ?cut by 281.	F		
[279]	Enclosure ditch	See [121] [281] 2cuts 278 Cu allow	PBsf	EMC1	
[281]	Enclosure ditell	brooch fragment.	1 1 31	Linei	
283	Hollow	Fe object.	FB sf	RB	
[282]	Ditch	Large boundary ditch Four sections:	PB	FMC1	
285	Ditei	[286], [1311], [1333] and [1399].	10	LINICI	
[286]				_	
287	Ditch	287 cut by [320]. See [244].			
[289]					
292	Ditch		РВ	LC2-C4	
[293]	Ditch	Large ditch cutting through W side of	PB	1.03-04	
[291]r	Diteil	circular stone building. [296] cuts 1706.	1.12	105-04	

Context	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of
no.			PSg	C2-C4	feature
294			r Sg B	02-04	
1703			_		
1704					
1705					
[296]	Ditch	297 cut by [300]	D	LC1C2	
[298]	Ditei	297 cut by [500].	1	LCI-C2	
299	Ditch	[300] cuts 297.	Р	EMC1	
[300]					
301	Pit				
[302]	2				
[303]					
330	Pit				
[304]					
328	Ditch	[305] cuts 329.			
[335]r 327					
328					
[305]					
306	Ditch	See [93]. 306 cut by [310]			
[307]	Ditch	[310] cuts 306 and 311	DB	1 C3 C4	
309	Ditei	[510] cuts 500 and 511.	I D	103-04	
[310]					
311	Ditch	Two sections: [311] and [524]]. 311 cut	РВ	EMC1	
[312]	D I'd	by [310].		MICA	
313	Droveway ditch (south)	See [91]. Fe object.	PBSI PB	MLC4 MLC4	
[315]	(south)		I D	WILC+	
316	Posthole				
317					
[318]	Ditat	210	D.C.		
[320]	Ditch	519 cut by [522]	ЪС		
321	Ditch	See [198]. [322] cuts 319.	Р	EMC1	
[322]	Ditch	324 cut by [343]	DB	1 C2 C3	
[323]	Diten	524 cut by [545]	I D	LC2-C3	
326					
[325]					
328	Fill of [335]r	See [305].	D		
332	Ditch		D		
333	Ditch	[334] cuts 328. Fe object.	P B sf	LC3-MC4	
338	Ditch	[337] cuts 333. Fe nail.	РВТ	C3-C4	
340					
341			P B sf	LC3-MC4	
[339]r 336					
[337]					
342	Layer	See 181. Seals 341. Quern fragment and three Ee pails	PBcsf	LC3-MC4	
344	Posthole?	[343] cuts 324.	1	1	1
[343]		C J			
345	Layer	Whetstone.	PB sf	LC3-C4	
346	Pit	346 cut by [349].	РВ	LC1-C2	
348	Ditch	See [233] [349] cuts 346	PB	RB	
[349]		210 [200]. [0 17] outo 5 10.			
350	Enclosure ditch	See [121]. [352] cuts 353.	РВ	C2	
351			P B G	EMC2	
352	Ditch		Р	LC2-C4	
[354]	Ditti		1		
355	Ditch terminal	Two sections: [356] and [806].	РВ	LC2-C4	
[356]					
358	Pit		ЬВ	C2-C3	
360	Posthole		РВ	EMC1+	

Context	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of
10.					feature
361	Gully terminal	Short curvilinear gully. Two sections:	Р	C1+	
[362]	Dit/montholo	[362] and [388].			
[364]	Pit/postnoie				
365 [366]	Ditch	Three sections: [366], [408] and [*]	РВ	LC1-C2	
367	Ditch	Relationship with [370] uncertain.			
369 [370]	Ditch	Relationship with [368] uncertain.			
371 [372]	Ditch				
373 [374]	Ditch				
375 [376]	Ditch	Fe nail.	P B sf	LC1-C3	
378 [377] [379]	Wall	Section excavated through wall [377] and foundation trench [379].			
380	Ditch	380 same as 666; [381] same as [668].	Р	LC1-MC2	
382	Ditch	See [18]. 382 cut by [386].	РТ	C2-C4	
384	Droveway ditch	See [91]. [386] cuts 382. Fe object.	P B sf	C2+	
385 [386]	(south)		РВ	C3-C4	
387 [388]	Gully	See [362]. 387 cut by [391].			
389	Ditch		_		
390 [391]			Р	C1+	
392 [393]	Ditch		РВ	MC3-C4	
396 [397]r	Ditch	[397] a probable recut of [395]	РВ	C2-C3	
394 [395]			РВ	LC1-C2+	
398 [399]	Gully/slot		Р	LC3-C4	
400	Ditch				
[402]	Wall				
403	Cobbled surface				
404 [405]	Ditch	404 cut by [75]. Quern fragment.	P B Sg sf	MLC1	
406 407	Ditch		PB B	C1+	
[408]	Ditab		DDSg	MLC1	
[410]	Diteli		T D Sg	WILC1+	
411 [412]	Ditch	Cu alloy wire.	P B sf	LC1-C2	
413 [414]	Posthole	See [448].	Р	MLC1+	
415 [416]	Posthole	See [448].			
418 [417]	Ditch				
420 [419]	Ditch				
422 [421]	Ditch		FP	EMC1	
424 [423]	Ditch				
425	Ditch	425 cut by [428]	Р	LC1-C2	
427	Ditch	[428] cuts 425.	Р	LC1-C2	
429	Gully		Р	C1+	
[430]					

Context	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of
no. [431]	Wall	Corner of stone structure			feature
[432]	Ditch				
433					
434	Ditch	Two sections: [436] and [486].	P B P C	LC1-C2	
[436]			10	Lerez	
437	Ditch	437 cut by [440].	РВ	MLC1	
[438]	Ditah	[440] outs 427			
[440]	Ditch	[440] cuts 437.			
443	Ditch		Р	LC1-C2	
[444]r 441			P	LC1-C2	
[442]			1	Lerez	
445	Pit	Shallow rectangular pit in opening			
[446]	Drin gully	between terminals of drip gully [448].			
[448]	Drip guily	with an opening to SE. Six sections:			
		[448], [450], [466], [480], [*] and [*].			
		Possible internal postholes [414] and			
449	Drip gully	See [448].			
[450]	18.7				
451	Ditch	Large ditch associated with [157] and	P B sf	MC2-C3	
[432] r 453		[508]. Fe Object.			
[454]					
455	Ditch		В		
457	Ditch		P B Sg	LC1-EC2	
[458]					
459	Pit		Р	MLC1	
461	Gully				
[462]					
463	Ditch				
465	Drip gully	See [448].			
[466]	10.7				
467	Ditch		РВ	MLC1 or LC3-	
469	Ditch	Large enclosure ditch. Fe object.	РВ	MLC1	
470			В		
471			РВ	LC1	
472			P B sf	MLC1	
474			PB	MLC1	
475			РВ	MLCI	
477	Ditch	See [107]. Ceramic disc and Fe nails.	P B sf	LC1-C2 or	
[478]	D 1			MC3-C4	
479 [480]	Drip gully	See [448].			
483	Enclosure ditch	See [121]. Relationship with [486]	РВ	LC1-C2	
[484]	~ #	uncertain.			
485 [486]	Gully	See [436]. Relationship with [484]	РВ	LC1-C2	
487	Ditch	Series of roughly parallel, inter-	РВ	MLC1	
488		cutting/recut ditches, seemingly			
[489]	Ditch	associated with ditch [157] to the S			
[491]	Diten				
492	Ditch]	РВТ	LC2-C4	
[494] 	Ditch	4			
[508]	Dittil				
495	Ditch				
[496] 497	Ditch terminal		Р	LC1-C3	
[498]			<u> </u>		
499	Ditch				
500	1		1		1

Context	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of
no. [501]					feature
502	Gully	Three sections: [503], [6**] and [1547].	РВ	MLC2	
504	Ditch	Three sections: [505], [620] and [800].	В		
506	Pit	504 cut by [503].			
[507] 509	Ditch	Two sections: [513] and [1185] More			
[510]	Dist	than one cut in section [513].	- D D		
512 [513]r	Ditch		РВ	MLC1+	
511 [*]			Р	C1+	
514	Ditch	See [167]. [515] cuts 512.	РВ	MLC1	
516	Ditch				
518	Ditch				
[519] 520	Ditch	See [107] [521] cuts 526 Cu alloy	PBTGsf	C4	
525	Diten	object, Cu alloy ring and ceramic disc.	PB	MC3-C4	
522	Ditch terminal	See [311].	F		
523 [524]			РВ	Cl	
526 [527]	Gully	Two sections: {527] and [1794]. [527] cuts 528, 526 cut by [521]	РВ	LC1-C3	
528 [529]	Gully	528 cut by [527].	РВ	RB	
530	Ditch	530 and 531 probably in a posthole cut			
531		into 532.	P B Sg	C1	
[1883] 533	Ditch		Р	C1+	
[534]	Ditch	[537] cuts 538	PB	RB	
536 [537]	Diten	[557] cuis 550.	P B	LC3-C4	
538	Ditch	Shallow curvilinear ditch. 538 cut by			
540	Ditch	Boundary ditch, runs eastwards into	В		
[541] [542]		hollow [5/5].			
543 [544]	Gully	[544] cuts 545.			
545	Ditch	Two sections: [546] and [585]. 545 cut by [544]			
547	Pit	Associated with [552].			
549	Hearth/oven	Remnants of small hearth or oven.	fc		
550 551		contained burnt clay from possible lining.	Р	C1-C2	
[552]					
554 [553]	Ditch	554 cut by [555].	Р	C3-C4	
556	Ditch	[555] cuts 554 and 558. Fe nail.	P B sf	LC1-C2 or MC3-C4	
558	Pit?	558 cut by [555].			
559	Ditch	[560] cuts 561.	В		
561	Gully	561 cut by [560].	Р	EMC2	
[562] 563	Gully	[564] cuts 565.			
[564] 565	Gully	565 cut by [564].	РВ	LC1-C2	
566					
568	Ditch		РВ	LC1-C2+	
[569] 570	Gully terminal		РВ	RB	
[571]			1		1

Context	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of
no. 572	Ditch	Two sections: [573] and [684].	В		Ieature
[573]	Diten	1 we seenons. [575] and [661].	D		
574 [575]	Shallow hollow	Located to S of drip gully [448], 574 overlies pebbled surface 578.	РВ	C1+	
576 [577]	Ditch	Jet ?hairpin.	PB sf	C2	
578	Pebbled surface	Metalled surface on S side of hollow [575] to S of drip gully [448].	FP	C1+	
580 [579]	Ditch	Three sections: [579], [1381] and [1421].			
581 582	Gully		P B	C2-C3	
594 584	Ditch	See [546]. 594 cut by [587].	Р	C1+	
[585] 586	Ditch	[587] cuts 594.	Р	LC1-C3	
[587] 588 [589]	Ditch	Ditch forms N side of small rectangular enclosure. Two sections: [589] and [604]	FPB	C2-C3	
[505]		Relationship with [791] uncertain. Bi- facially knapped flint knife.			
590 [591]	Hollow	590 cut by [593]. Two Fe nails and quern fragment.	P B T sf	LC3-MC4	
592 [593]	Gully	[593] cuts 590.	РВТ	LC3-C4	
595 [596]	Ditch		РВ	LC1-C3	
597 [598]	Pit	Truncated base of pit. Contained part of single ceramic vessel SF 150	Р	LC1-C2	
599 [600]	Pit				
601 [602]	Ditch	[602] ?cuts 712.	Рс	C3	
603 [604]	Ditch	See [589].	РВ	C1+	
605 [606]	Ditch	605 cut by [609]			
607 608 [609]	Ditch	[609] cuts 605.			
610 611 [612]	Pit/hearth	Pit contained numerous small burnt cobbles and charcoal, suggesting a hearth			
613 [614]	Gully		Р	MLC1	
615 [616]	Ditch		Р	LC1-C2	
617 [618]	Ditch	Two sections: [618] and [627].	РВ	MC2	
619 [620]	Ditch	See [505].	Р	RB	
621 622 [623]	Ditch	Three sections: [623], [*] and [874]. N end ploughed away by furrow.	РВ	MLC1	
624 [625]	Pit	Two quern fragments.	P B sf	MC3-C4	
626 [627]	Ditch	See [618]. [627] cuts 628.	РВ	LC1-C2	
628 629 [630]	Ditch	628 cut by [627].	P B	LC1-C2	
631 [632]	Gully	[632] cuts 633.	РВ	C3-C4	
633 [634]	Ditch	633 cut by [632] and [636].			
635 [636]	Ditch	635 cut by [643]; [636] cuts 633 and 644.	РВТс	MLC3+	
637 [638]	Gully		Р	LC1-C2	
639 [640]	Gully	639 cut by [643].			

Context	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of
no.	Ditch	[643] cuts 635 and 639	D	MC3 C4	feature
642	Ditch	[045] cuts 055 and 059.	г РТ	C3-C4	
[643]				00 01	
644	Ditch	644 cut by [636].			
[645] 646	Ditch		рвт	LC3 C4	
640 647	Ditch		B	LC3-C4	
[648]			2		
649	Ditch		P B	C3-C4	
[650]			_		
651 [652]	Ditch		Р	MLC4	
653	Ditch terminal				
[654]					
655	Layer		В		
656	Cremation burial	Bone contained in urn buried in small pit.	P	LC1-C2	
1591			нвз		
658	Gully terminal		FPB	LC3-C4	
659	5				
[660]			Р		
661 662	Pit/ditch terminal	661 cut by [668].			
663					
664					
[665]					
666	Ditch	[668] cuts 661.	P B	LC1-EC2	
667 [668]			Р	CI+	
669	Pit		РВ	LC1-C2	
[670]					
671	Ditch	671 cut by [677].			
[6/2]	Ditah	673 out by [677]	D	MLC1	
[674]	Ditch	673 cut by [677].	r	MLCI	
675	Ditch	[677] cuts 671 and 673.	РВ	MC2-C3	
676			Р	MC1	
[677]	Caller		D	L C1 C2	
678 [679]	Gully		P	LCI-C2	
680	Pit		Р	C1+	
[681]					
682	Ditch	See [573].	PB	MLC1	
683 [684]			РВ	MLCI	
685	Ditch		РВ	LC1-C3	
686					
[687]	D 1.1				
688 [680]	Ditch		РВ	LCI-C2	
690	Ditch		РВ	LC1-C3	
[691]					
692	Ditch	Leaf-shaped arrowhead.	F P B Sg	LC1-C2	
[693]	Ditah		DD	DD	
[695]	Ditch		гD	KD	
696	Ditch		F P B T fc	C2	
[697]				<u> </u>	
698 [600]	Gully terminal	Two sections: [699] and [711]. Placed	ЬВ	C3-C4	
700	Gully	[701] cuts 704.			
[701]					
702	Gully	702 cut by [577].	Р	MLC1	
[703]	Hellow	704 out by [701]			
[705]	TOHOW	/0+ cut by [/01].			
706	Ditch		В		
[707]	Dital	[700]	DDT		
/08 [709]	Ditch	[/09] cuts /10.	КВТ	LCI-C2	
710	Gully	See [699]. 710 cut by [709].	РВ	C1+	
[711]					

Context	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of
712	Ditch	712 ?cut by [602]			leature
[713]					
714	Gully				
716	Ditch				
[717]	Dit	[710] outs 720 and 722	DB		
[719]	110	[719] cuts 720 and 722.	ID	LCI-C2+	
720	Gully	720 cut by [719].	РВ	MLC1+	
722	Ditch	722 cut by [719].	РВ	LC1-C3	
[723]	D'(1		DD		
[725]	Ditch		РБ	LCI-C2	
726	Gully		РВТ	LC3-C4	
728	Ditch		РВ	RB	
729					
[730] 731			РВ	MLC1+	
[732]			D	DD	
[733]			Р	KB	
735	Ditch		РВ	LC1-MC2	
975 [736]					
737	Pit		Р	C1+	
738 739					
[740]					
741	Ditch		РВ	EMC2	
[743]					
744 [745]	Ditch		Р	C1	
746	Ditch	Two sections: [748] and [756].	РВ	EMC1	
747 [748]			РВ	MLC1	
749	Ditch		РВ	MLIA	
[750]	Dit				
[752]	110				
753 754	Ditch	See [748]. 758 cut by [753].	Р	C1+ MLC1	
755			I D	WILCI	
[756]	Ditch	Three sections: [758] [837] and [1111]	PR	MLC1	
[758]	Diten	[758] cuts 753.	ID	WILC1	
759	Gully terminal		Р	MC1	
761	Gully	[762] cuts 763.	РВ	MLIA	
[762]	Ditah	Three soutions: [765] [925] and [1515]	DD		
764	Ditei	763 cut by [762].	P B	LC1-C2 LC1-C2	
[765]	Posthola		D		
[767]	Fostilole		D		
768	Pit		Р	EMC1	
770	Ditch	[771] cuts 772.	РВ	C3-C4	
[771]	Dital	770			
[773]	Ditch	//2 cut by [//1].			
774	Ditch				
776	Ditch	[777] cuts 778.			
[777]	D'ul				
[778]	Ditch	//8 cut by [777].			
780	Ditch		РВ	LC3-C4	
[781]	Ditch	782 cut by [789].	РВ	LC2-C3+	
		in the contract	1		1

mo.controlpermittedperm	Context	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of
Pain [785] LCLC2 786 [787] Ditch [789] cuts 782. PB PB B LC2C3+ C3C4 787 [789] Ditch Relationship with [59] unceruin. B LC2C3+ C3C4 790 Ditch Relationship with [59] unceruin. B EMC1 792 Ditch 792 cut by [795]. P B EMC1 793 Oully (795] cuts 792. relationship with 793 P B EMC1 794 Ditch Relationship with [793] unceruin. P B EMC1 796 Ditp gully Three sections: [799], [800] and [804]. P G LC3-C4 796 Ditch See [551]; [800] cuts 803. Fe nail. P G LC3-C4 787 B Ditch See [556]. P T LC3-C4 7880 Ouldy EAC3 EAC3 EAC3 7891 Ditch See [356]. P T LC3-C4 EAC3 7891 Ouldy EAC1 EAC3 EAC3 7893 Ouldy Relatonship with [817] unceruin. P B	no.					feature
1/35 Ditch [789] [780] P B LC2-C3: 780 PB C3-C4 C3-C4 C3-C4 781 PB C3-C4 C3-C4 C3-C4 789 PB C3-C4 C3-C4 C3-C4 789 PB EMC1 C3-C4 C3-C4 789 PB EMC1 C3-C4 C3-C4 790 Ditch 792 cut by (795). PB EMC1 PB 794 Gulty [755] cutors 72; relationship with 797 PB EMC1 PD 7951 Ditch Relationship with [795] nucertain. P B EMC1 PD 796 Ditch See [505]; [800] cuts 803. Fe nail. P ff LC3-C4 PD 8001 Ditch 803 cut by (800] and [804]. P LC3-C4 PD 8007 Ditch See [356]. PT LC3-C4 PD 8007 Ditch See [356]. PT LC3-C4 PD 8009 Gulty Relationship with [817] uncertain. P B LC1-C2 PD 8100 </td <td>783</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Р</td> <td>LC1-C2</td> <td></td>	783			Р	LC1-C2	
783 100 [000 50.] P B B C3.C4 P B B C3.C4 788 P B C3.C4 B 790 Ditch Relationship with [589] uncertain. P B EMC1 792 Ditch 792 cub by [795]. P B EMC1 794 Gully [795] cub 792; relationship with 797 P B EMC1 796 Ditch Relationship with [795] uncertain. P B EMC1 797 Dirb Relationship with [795] uncertain. P B EMC1 797 Dirb Relationship with [801] cuts 803. Fe nail. P st LC3-C4 801 Dirch See [505]; [800] cuts 803. Fe nail. P ft LC3-C4 8021 Dirch See [356]. P T LC3-C4 8031 Dirch See [356]. P T LC3-C4 8041 Dirth See [356]. P T LC3-C2 8051 Dirth See [356]. P B EMC1 8101 Pit Relationship with [817] uncertain.	[785] 786	Ditch	[789] cuts 782	PB	LC2-C3+	
788	787	Diten	[709] cuts 702.	PB	C3-C4	
[780] Ditch Relationship with [589] uncertain. B Fill [791] Ditch 792 Utb (795]. P B EMC1 [794] Gully [795] Cuts 792; relationship with 797 P B EMC1 [795] Ditch Relationship with (793] uncertain. P B EMC1 [796] Ditch Relationship with (793] uncertain. P B EMC1 [797] Ditch Relationship with (793] uncertain. P B C1 + [790] Ditch See [505]; [800] cuts 803. Fe nail. P sf LC3-C4 [800] Ditch See [556]. P T LC3-C4 [800] See [556]. P T LC3-C4 [800] See [356]. P T LC3-C4 [800] Pith See [356]. P B C1 [800] Pith Relationship with [817] uncertain. P B C1 [811] Ditch [819] cuts 824. B See [36]. See [36]. [811] Ditch 820 cut by [823]. See [36	788			В		
700 Dich Relationship vith [389] uncertain. B FMC1 792 Dich 792 cut by [795]. P B EMC1 794 Guily [795] cuts 792; relationship with 797 P B EMC1 7951 Dirch Relationship with [795] uncertain. P B EMC1 7950 Dirch Relationship with [795] uncertain. P B EMC1 7951 Dirch Relationship with [795] uncertain. P B EMC1 7951 Dirch See [505] [800] cuts 803. Fe nail. P sf LC3-C4 Image: Constant Cons	[789]	D'. 1		D		
15.0 Dich 792 cut by (795). P B EMC1 1733 Oich (795) cuts 792; relationship with 797 P B EMC1 1795 Dich Relationship with (795) uncertain. P B EMC1 1796 Dich Relationship with (795) uncertain. P B EMC1 1791 Dich Relationship with (795) uncertain. P B C1+ 1791 Dich See [505]; [800] cuts 803. Fe nail. P sf LC3-C4 1801 Dich See [356]. P T LC3-C4 1803 Dich See [356]. P T LC3-C4 1804 Dich See [356]. P T LC3-C4 1814 Dich See [356]. P T LC3-C4 1814 <td>790</td> <td>Ditch</td> <td>Relationship with [589] uncertain.</td> <td>в</td> <td></td> <td></td>	790	Ditch	Relationship with [589] uncertain.	в		
1794 Gully 1795 user tail. PB EMC1 795 Ditch Relationship with [795] uncertain. P B EMC1 796 Ditch Relationship with [795] uncertain. P B C1+ 797 Ditch Relationship with [795] uncertain. P B C1+ 798 Dirp gully Three sections: [799]. [840] and [844]. P B C1+ 801 Ditch See [505]: [800] cuts 803. Fe nail. P sf LC3-C4 803 Ditch 803 cut by [800] and [804]. P LC3-C4 804 Bitch [804] cuts 803. P B G EMC3 805 Ditch See [356]. P T LC3-C4 806 Gully Relationship with [817] uncertain. P B C1 810 Pit P LC1-C2 P 814 Drip gully Relationship with [815] uncertain. P B EMC1 815 Ditch 820 cut by [823]. E P P 817 Ditch 820 cut by [825]. B P P 820 Ditc	792	Ditch	792 cut by [795].	РВ	EMC1	
794 Gally [795] EMC1 [795] Ditch Relationship with [795] uncertain. P B EMC1 [797] Ditp gully Three sections: [799]. [840] and [844]. P B C1+ [799] Ditp gully Three sections: [799]. [840] and [844]. P B C1+ [800] Ditch Sec [505]: [800] cuts 803. Fe nail. P sf LC3-C4 [801] Ditch Sec [505]: [800] cuts 803. Fe nail. P sf LC3-C4 [802] Ditch Sec [556]. P T LC3-C4 [804] Sec [556]. P T LC3-C4 [806] Sec [356]. P T LC3-C4 [806] Sec [356]. P T LC3-C4 [807] Ditch Sec [356]. P T LC1-C2 [818] Ditch [819] cuts 824. B C1 Sec [356]. [811] Ditch [819] cuts 824. B Sec [356]. Sec [356]. [812] Ditch [819] cuts 824. B Sec [356]. Sec	[793]					
796 Ditch Relationship with [795] uncertain. P B EMC1 798 Drip gully Three sections: [799], [840] and [844]. P B C1+ 801 Ditch Sec [505]; [800] outs 803. Fe nail. P sf LC3-C4 803 Ditch 803 cut by [800] and [804]. P LC3-C4 805 Ditch 804] cuts 803. P B G EMC3 806 Buch Sec [356]. P T LC3-C4 807 Ditch Sec [356]. P T LC3-C4 808 Gully - - - 810 Pit Sec [356]. P B C1 814 Drip gully Relationship with [817] uncertain. P B C1 815 Ditch [819] cuts 824. B - - 819 Ditch [819] cuts 824. B - - 822 Ditch 820 cut by [825]. B - - 823 Ditch 825 cut by [827]. B - <td>794 [795]</td> <td>Gully</td> <td>[795] cuts 792; relationship with 797 uncertain.</td> <td>РВ</td> <td>EMC1</td> <td></td>	794 [795]	Gully	[795] cuts 792; relationship with 797 uncertain.	РВ	EMC1	
798 (799) Drip gully Three sections: (799), [840] and [844]. P B C1+ 801 (800) Ditch Sec [505]; [800] cuts 803. Fe nail. P sf LC3-C4 803 (804) Ditch 803 cut by [800] and [804]. P LC3-C4 805 (804) Ditch [804] cuts 803. P B G EMC3 806 (806) Oilch Sec [356]. P T LC3-C4 807 (806) Ditch Sec [356]. P T LC3-C4 808 (806) Oilly - - - 810 (811) Pit P LC1-C2 - 811 (811) Dirp gully Relationship with [817] uncertain. P B EMC1 - 811 (817) Dirch S20 cut by [823]. B - - - 818 (819) Ditch [819] cuts 824. B - - - - 820 (821) Ditch [822 cut by [825]. B - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - <td>796 [797]</td> <td>Ditch</td> <td>Relationship with [795] uncertain.</td> <td>РВ</td> <td>EMC1</td> <td></td>	796 [797]	Ditch	Relationship with [795] uncertain.	РВ	EMC1	
801 Ditch See [505]; [800] cuts 803. Fe nail. P sf LC3-C4 8001 Ditch 803 cut by [800] and [804]. P LC3-C4 8005 Ditch [804] cuts 803. P B G EMC3 8007 Ditch See [356]. P T LC3-C4 8009 Gully 810 Pit LC1-C2 8111 Pit P LC1-C2 8114 Drip gully Relationship with [817] uncertain. P B C1 8115 Drip gully Relationship with [815] uncertain. P B EMC1 816 Drip gully Relationship with [815] uncertain. P B EMC1 817 Ditch [820 cut by [823]. B 820 Ditch 820 cut by [825]. B 821 Ditch [825] cut se [22] and [905]. [829] cuts 821 Ditch 826 cut by [821]. B <t< td=""><td>798 [799]</td><td>Drip gully</td><td>Three sections: [799], [840] and [844].</td><td>РВ</td><td>C1+</td><td></td></t<>	798 [799]	Drip gully	Three sections: [799], [840] and [844].	РВ	C1+	
803 Ditch 803 cut by [800] and [804]. P LC3-C4 [802] Ditch [804] cuts 803. P B G EMC3 [807] Ditch See [356]. P T LC3-C4 [809] Boy Gully P LC3-C4 [809] Gully P LC1-C2 [811] Pit P LC1-C2 [814] Drip gully Relationship with [817] uncertain. P B EMC1 [817] Drip gully Relationship with [815] uncertain. P B EMC1 [819] Ditch [819] cuts 824. B	801 [800]	Ditch	See [505]; [800] cuts 803. Fe nail.	P sf	LC3-C4	
803 Ditch [804] cuts 803. P B G EMC3 807 Ditch See [356]. P T LC3-C4 809 Gully P T LC3-C4 809 Gully P T LC3-C4 809 Gully P T LC1-C2 810 Pit P LC1-C2 811 Drip gully Relationship with [817] uncertain. P B EMC1 [817] Drip gully Relationship with [815] uncertain. P B EMC1 [818] Ditch [819] cuts 824. B	803 [802]	Ditch	803 cut by [800] and [804].	Р	LC3-C4	
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	805 [804]	Ditch	[804] cuts 803.	P B G	EMC3	
Lickey Gully Gully Gully Gully Gully Gully Relationship with [817] uncertain. P LC1-C2 814 Drip gully Relationship with [817] uncertain. P B C1 Image: Constraint of the second of t	807	Ditch	See [356].	РТ	LC3-C4	
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	809	Gully				
	810	Pit		Р	LC1-C2	
	[811] 814	Drip gully	Relationship with [817] uncertain.	РВ	C1	
$ \begin{bmatrix} 817 & & & & & & & & & &$	[815] 816	Drip gully	Relationship with [815] uncertain.	РВ	EMC1	
	[817] 818	Ditch	[819] cuts 824.	В		
	[819] 820	Ditch	820 cut by [823].			
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	[821] 822	Ditch	822 cut by [825].			
[825] Image: constraint of the section of the sectin of the sectin of the section of the section of the section of t	[823] 824	Ditch	[825] cuts 822 and 826.	В		
[827]	[825] 826	Ditch	826 cut by [825].	В		
[829] 830. 831. 833. 841. 98. 1.01. <td>[827] 828</td> <td>Ditch</td> <td>Two sections: [829] and [905]. [829] cuts</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	[827] 828	Ditch	Two sections: [829] and [905]. [829] cuts			
[831] Image: Construct of the section of	[829] 830	Ditch	830. 830 cut by [829].			
832 Posthole	[831]		-			
834 [835] Ditch See [765]. 834 cut by [837]. P B LC1-C2 836 [837] Ditch See [758]. [837] cuts 834. P B C3-C4 837 Drip gully See [799]. 838 cut by [842]. P B C1 839 Base (765]. 837] cuts 834. P B C1 839 Drip gully See [799]. 838 cut by [842]. P B C1 840 Drip gully spur See [799]. 838 cut by [854]. P LC1-C2 841 Pit [842] cuts 838, 841 cut by [854]. P LC1-C2 844 Drip gully spur See [840]. Fe object. P B sf EMC1 844 Drip gully spur See [840]. Fe object. P B C2 845 Ditch [849] cuts 850. P B LC1-C2 + P 848 So Ditch 850 cut by [849]. P B LC1-C2 851 So Ditch 850 cut by [849]. P B LC1-C2 851 So Gully [854] cuts 841. P LC2-C4 855	832 [833]	Posthole				
836 Ditch See [758]. [837] cuts 834. P B C3-C4 837 Drip gully See [799]. 838 cut by [842]. P B C1 838 Drip gully See [799]. 838 cut by [842]. P B C1 840 Pit [842] cuts 838, 841 cut by [854]. P LC1-C2 841 Pit [842] cuts 838, 841 cut by [854]. P B C1 844 Drip gully spur See [840]. Fe object. P B Sf EMC1 844 Ditch [849] cuts 850. P B C2 P 847 Ditch [849] cuts 850. P B LC1-C2 + P 848 S50 Ditch 850 cut by [849]. P B LC1-C2 + P 851 Gully [854] cuts 841. P IC2-C4 IC2-C4 IC2-C4 853 Gully [854] cuts 841. IC2-C4 IC2-C4<	834 [835]	Ditch	See [765]. 834 cut by [837].	РВ	LC1-C2	
1000000000000000000000000000000000000	836 [837]	Ditch	See [758]. [837] cuts 834.	РВ	C3-C4	
359 [840] Pit [842] cuts 838, 841 cut by [854]. P LC1-C2 [842] Pit [842] cuts 838, 841 cut by [854]. P LC1-C2 [842] Pit [842] cuts 838, 841 cut by [854]. P B sf EMC1 843 Drip gully spur See [840]. Fe object. P B sf EMC1 844 Pitch [849] P B C2 845 Ditch [849] cuts 850. P B LC1-C2+ 848 P P LC1-C2 P 847 Ditch [849] cuts 850. P B LC1-C2+ 848 P P LC1-C2+ P 850 Ditch 850 cut by [849]. P B LC1-C2 851 P P LC2-C4 P 853 Gully [854] cuts 841. P IC2-C4 853 Fosthole P P IC1-C2	838	Drip gully	See [799]. 838 cut by [842].	P B	C1 C1	
841 Pit [842] cuts 838, 841 cut by [854]. P LC1-C2 [842] Drip gully spur See [840]. Fe object. P B sf EMC1 [844] Ditch P B C2 [846] P B C2 [846] P B LC1-C2+ 847 Ditch [849] cuts 850. P B [849] EMC1 EMC1 850 Ditch 850 cut by [849]. P B [851] EMC1 LC1-C2 853 Gully [854] cuts 841. P 855 Posthole EMC1 EMC1	[840]			РВ	CI	
843 Drip gully spur See [840]. Fe object. P B sf EMC1 [844] PB C2 845 Ditch P B C2 [846] PB LC1-C2+ 847 Ditch [849] cuts 850. P B [849] P LC1-C2+ 848 P LC1-C2 [849] PB LC1-C2 850 Ditch 850 cut by [849]. P B [852] P LC1-C2 853 Gully [854] cuts 841. P 855 Posthole Image: Set of the set of t	841 [842]	Pit	[842] cuts 838, 841 cut by [854].	Р	LC1-C2	
845 [846] Ditch P B C2 847 [849] Ditch [849] cuts 850. P B P LC1-C2+ P 848 [849] Ditch 850 cut by [849]. P B P LC1-C2 P 850 Ditch 850 cut by [849]. P B P LC1-C2 P 851 [852] Image: Comparison of the point of	843 [844]	Drip gully spur	See [840]. Fe object.	P B sf	EMC1	
847 Ditch [849] cuts 850. P B LC1-C2+ 848 [849] P P P 850 Ditch 850 cut by [849]. P B LC1-C2 851 [852] P LC2-C4 P 853 Gully [854] cuts 841. P Image: Constraint of the second secon	845 [846]	Ditch		РВ	C2	
10721 PB LC1-C2 850 Ditch 850 cut by [849]. P LC2-C4 851 P LC2-C4 P 853 Gully [854] P LC2-C4 855 Posthole P LC2-C4 P	847 848 [8/9]	Ditch	[849] cuts 850.	P B P	LC1-C2+	
[852] [854] 853 Gully [854] cuts 841. [854] [855] 855 Posthole	850 851	Ditch	850 cut by [849].	P B P	LC1-C2 LC2-C4	
[854]	[852] 853	Gully	[854] cuts 841.			
	[854] 855	Posthole				

Context	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of
no.					feature
857	Pit	Circular pit joined to ditch [*] by gully			
858		[861].			
[859]	Certher	C [050]			
860 [861]	Gully	See [859].			
862	Ditch	[863] cuts 864.	PBG	LC1-MC2 or	
[863]				C3-C4	
864	Ditch	864 cut by [863].	РВ	C3-C4	
866	Ditch		В		
[867]	Ditti		2		
868	Ditch		РВ	MC1+	
[869]	Dital		DD	<u>C1</u>	
870	Ditch		РD	CI	
[872]					
873	Ditch	See [623]. 873 cut by [876].	В		
[874] 875	Ditch terminal	Squarad terminal Ditch forms W side of	DD		
[876]	Ditch terminal	a small rectangular enclosure. [876] cuts	гБ	LCI-C2	
[· · · ·]		873.			
877	Ditch	[880] cuts 883. Quern fragment.	Р	EMC1+	
878 879			F P B	CI	
[880]			51		
881	Tree throw		F		
[882]	D' I	002 (1 [000]			
883 [884]	Ditch	883 cut by [880]			
885	Ditch terminal		В		
886			РВ	C1	
[887]	D' I		EDD	1.01.02	
888 [889]	Ditch	[889] cuts "; 888 cut by [945].	ГРВ	LCI-C2	
890	Drip gully		РВ	MLC1	
[891]			_	~	
892	Ditch terminal	Two sections: $[893]$ and *. 892 cut by	Р	C1+	
894	Ditch	Two sections: [895] and *. [895] cuts	РВ	LC1-C2	
[895]		892.			
896	Ditch	Three sections: [897], [899] and [1022]	P B	RB	
[897]	Ditch	See [807] Pelationship with [0/1]			
[899]	Diten	uncertain.			
900	Ditch		Р	C1	
[901]	Dital		DD	C1	
902 [903]	Ditch		РВ	CI	
904	Ditch	See [829].			
[905]					
906 [007]	Gully		РВ	RB	
908	Ditch	908 cut by [912].	РВ	LC1-C2	
909					
[910]				~ ~ ~ ~	
911 [912]	Ditch	[912] cuts 908.	РВ	C3-C4	
913	Ditch		РВ	EMC1	
914			РВ	C1	
[915]	Ditah		D		
916 [917]	Diten		D		
918	Pit		Р	MLC1+	
[919]					
920	Ditch terminal	Two sections: [924] and [985].	Р	C1	
922					
923			Р	EMC1	
[924]	Dital	[027]			
925 926	Ditch	[927] cuis 926.	Р	C1+	

Context	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of pottery	Date of
no.					feature
[927]					
928	Ditch	928 cut by [927].			
929			Р	MLIA	
930					
[931]					
933	Gully	Relationship with [934] uncertain.			
[932]					
935	Gully	Relationship with [932] uncertain.			
[934]					
936	Gully				
[937]					
938	Gully terminal	[939] cuts 940.			
[939]					
940	Gully	940 cut by [939]. Relationship with [899]			
[941]		uncertain.			
942	Ditch	[943] cuts 888.			
[943]					
944	Ditch		Р	MLC1	
945			P B	EMC1	
[946]					
947	Ditch terminal	Two sections: [948] and [1035]. Metal			
968		object.	P B sf	MLC1	
969			P B	LC1-C2	
[948]					
949	Posthole		P B	C1+	
[950]					

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of
951	Posthole			pottery	leature
[952]					
953 [954]	Posthole				
955	Ditch		FB		
956			Р	MLC1	
959	Ditch	959 cut by [960].			
[958]					
961 [060]	Ditch	[960] cuts 959.			
962	Posthole		Р	C1	
[963]					
964 [965]	Gully	Three sections: [965], [1532] and [1534]. Relationship with [967] uncertain.	fc		
966 [967]	Ditch	Relationship with [965] uncertain.			
968 969	Fills of [948]	See [948]			
970 [971]	Ditch	970 cut by [974].			
972	Ditch	[974] cuts 970.			
973 [974]			РВ	C1	
976 [977]	Ditch	Four sections: [977], [1062], [1570] and [1674]. [977] cuts 978.	FP	MC1	
978	Gully	978 cut by [977].	Р	IA-C1	
[979] 980	Ditch terminal	See [924]	PB	LIA-C1	
981	Ditenterninar	566 [724].	B	LINCI	
982					
983					
[985]					
986 [987]	Shallow pit	Contained a number of small to medium cobbles	Р	LIA	
988	Pit		РВ	LIA	
989	Posthole	Group of postholes near N edge of site.	Р	C1	
[990]	Dootholo	-	D	EMC1	
[993]	Postnoie		P	EMCI	
995	Posthole	1			
[994] 997	Posthole	-			
[996]	rosuloie				
999	Posthole				
[1000]	Posthole	1			
1001					
1002 [1003]	Posthole	1002 cut by [1008].			
1004	Pit/posthole	[1006] cuts 1007.			
1005					
1007	Gully	1007 cut by [1006]; [1008] cuts 1002.			
[1008]					
1009 [1010]	Posthole				
1011	Gully	1011 cut by [1429].			
1013	Gully terminal	[1014] cuts 1015.			
1014	Gully	Three sections: [1016]. [1060] and			
[1016]		[1395]. 1015 cut by [1014].			
1017 [1018]	Gully	Two sections: [1018] and [1676].	Р	LC1-C3	

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of
1019	Ditch-	See [897]. [1022] cuts 1023.	Р	LC1-C3	leature
1020					
[1021					
1023	Ditch	Two sections: [1025] and [1477]. 1023	Р	C1	
1024		cut by [1022].			
1025	Ditch		Р	LIA-C1	
[1027]	D': 1		D	L C1 C2	
[1028	Ditch		Р	LCI-C2	
1030	Pit				
1032	Posthole				
1033	Ditch	See [948]. [1035] cuts 1036.	Р	MLC1	
[1035]				-	
1036 [1037]	Ditch	Three sections: [1037], [1500] and [1623]. 1036 cut by [1035].			
1039	Ditch	Short curvilinear gully, both ends			
1040	Ditch	[1041] cuts 1042.	Р	LC1-C2	
1041	Gully	Not clear which cut is the recut. Both			
[1043]r?		cut by [1041].			
1044 [1045]					
1046	Ditch		Р	LC1-C3	
[1047]	2		PB	1.03-04	
[1049]	÷		1.0	103-04	
1050 [1051]	Posthole				
1052	Ditch		Р	C1	
1053 [1054]			Р	C2+	
1055	Posthole				
1056	Posthole		Р	RB	
[1058]	Ditah	See [1016]	DD		
[1060]	Dien			Let-ez	
1061 [1062]	Ditch	See [977]. 1061 cut by [1065].	Р	LC1-C2	
1063	Ditch	Two sections: [1065] and [1078]. [1065]	Р	C1	
[1064		cuts 1061.			
1066	Posthole		Р	C1	
1067	Pit	1068 cut by [1071]	Р	LC1-C2	
[1069]	Ditch	[1071] cuts 1068. Fe nail	P B Fc sf	MLC2	
[1071]	E E		D D D		
[1072]	Furrow		РВСр	C2+	Medieval
1075 [1074]	Wall	Fe nail.	P G sf	LC2-C3+	
[1076]	Foundation trench				
1077 [1078]	Ditch	See [1065]. [1078] cuts 1079.	P B fc	LC1-C2	
1079	Ditch terminal	1079 cut by [1078].	Р	C1+	
1080	Gully	[1082] cuts 1083.			
1082	Ditch	Two sections: [1085] and [1393]. 1083	Р	EMC1	
1084		cut by [1082]	Р	LC1-C2	
1085	Gully	Two sections: [1087] and [1123]. 1086	Р	LC1-C2	
1087	Ditch	cut by [1089] [1089] cuts 1086.	P B	MLC4	
[1089]	Dital	Describer many L. L. S. L. S.	DT (MC2 MC4	
1091	Ditch	Possibly recut. Lead waste and Fe	PIST	MC3-MC4	

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of
[1090]		object.		pottery	Ieature
1092	Ditch terminal		FP	MLC1	
[1093]	Posthola		D		
1094	1 Ostilole		1	LCI-C2	
[1096]	D 11		D		
1097 [1098]	Posthole		Р	CI+	
1099	Gully terminal	Two sections: [1100] and [1335].			
[1100]	Ditch		PBSg	MC3 MC4	
1101	Diten		P B	C3	
[1103]	Dital		DD	1.01.02	
[1104	Ditch		РБ	LCI-CS	
1106	Pit	[1108] cuts 1109.	P B fc	C2	
[1107			РВ РВ	LC1-MC2 LC1-C2+	
1109	Ditch	See [758]. 1109 cut by [1108].	12	201 021	
1110 [1111]			РВ	LC1-C3	
1112	Pit				
[1113]	D '/		D		
[1114	Pit		P	IA	
1116	Gully terminal	Two sections: [1117] and [1119].	P B fc	MLIA	
[1117]	Gully	See [1117] Relationship with [1121]			
[1119]	Guily	uncertain.			
1120	Gully	Relationship with [1119] uncertain.	P B	MLIA	
1121	Gully	See [1087].	PG	LC1-C2	
[1123]	E:11 - £[1000]				
1124	Ditch	Ditch runs S into hollow [1228].	P B fc	MLC1	
[1126]	D'1		D		
[1127	Ditch terminal	1 wo sections: [1128] and [1142].	Р	CI+	
1129	Ditch	1129 cut by [1132].			
1130	Ditch	[1132] cuts 1129.	P Sg	LC1-C3	
[1132]	Dital	Deletionship with [1120] and entries	-		
[1135]	Ditch	Relationship with [1130] uncertain.			
1136	Pit	Relationship with [1137] uncertain.			
1138	Ditch	Relationship with [1135] uncertain.			
[1137]	Ditch	1130 cut by [1142]	B		
[1140]	Ditti	1139 cut by [1142].	B		
1141	Ditch	See [1128]. [1142] cuts 1139.	Р	C1	
1143	Pit/posthole		В		
[1144]	Gully	[1146] cuts 1147	BSg		
[1145]	Suny		L Sg		
1147	Posthole	1147 cut by [1146].			
1148	Gully	1149 cut by [1152]. Fe nail and	P B sf	LC1-C3	
[1150]		whetstone.	D.D.		
[1151]	Ditch	[1152] cuts 1149.	РВ	MLC1-C2	
1153	Ditch	[1154] cuts 1155.			
1154	Ditch	1155 cut by [1154].	РВ	C1	
[1156]	Ditch	1157 out by [11(0]	D		
[1157]	Ditch	1137 cut by [1160]	r	LC1-IVIC2	
1159	Pit	[1160] cuts 1157.			
1160	Ditch	Large boundary ditch	P B	MLC1	

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of
1162			PB	MLC1	feature
1163			1.0	MECT	
1164					
1165	Ditch	Two sections: [1169] and [1326] 1166	P B fc	1.03-04	
1167	Diten	cut by [1187], [1169] cuts 1172.	PB	LC3-C4	
1168			РВ	LC3-C4	
[1169]	Pit				
[1171]	111				
1172 [1173]	Pit	Pit in base of ditch [1169]. 1172 cut by [1169].	РВ	LC1-C2	
1175	Ditch	1175 probably cut by [1176].	РВ	C2	
1177	Ditch	[1176] probably cuts 1175.			
1178	Slot	1178 cut by [1181]	P B fc	C1	
1180	Ditch	[1181] cuts 1178.	РВ	MLC4	
1181	Ditch	Fe object.	P B sf	LC1-EC2	
1183	Ditch	See [513].	Р	MLIA	
[1185]	Gully	[1187] cuts 1166 Mostly ploughed out	P	MLIA	
[1187]	Dut	by furrow.	1		
[1188	Posthole	A cluster of postholes to S of multiple drip gullies. See also [1275] and [1313].			
1190 [1191]	Posthole				
1192 [1193]	Posthole				
1194 [1195]	Posthole				
1196 [1197]	Posthole				
1198 [1199]	Ditch	Cu alloy pin.	PB sf	EMC2+	
1201 [1200]	Ditch	Ditch runs W into hollow [1228].	РВ	LC1-C2	
1202 [1203]	Gully				
1204	Pit				
1205	Ditch	[1208] cuts 1211. Fe object.	P sf	C2	
1207 [1208]			Р	C2+	
1209	Ditch		FPB	C1+	
1210	Gully	1211 cut by [1208].			
1212]	Pit				
[1214]	Ditch		Р	C2+	
[1216]	Ditch	Relationship with [1220] uncertain	F		
[1217	Dich	Relationship with [1220] uncertain.	г		
[1219	Ditch	Relationship with [1218] uncertain.			
1222 [1221]	Pit		РВ	C1	
1224 [1223]	Pit		РВ	LC1-C2	
1225 [1226)	Ditch		РВ	MLC1	
1227 [1228]	Irregular hollow	Bracelet fragment.	P B sf	C3-C4	
1291 [1229]	Ditch	[1229] cuts 1289.	Р	LC1-C2	
1289	Ditch	1289 cut by [1229] and [1288].			
1290	1			1	1

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of
[1230]				pottery	feature
1230	Pit	Line of three inter-cutting pits. 1236 cut	РВ	C3	
1232		by [1233] and [1235].			
[1233]	Dit	-	D fc	C1 C2	
[1234	гц		r ic	C1-C2	
1236	Pit		Р	RB	
[1237]	Eill of 9		DD	LC1 EC2	
1238	Ditch	1239 cut by [1244]	P B P B	C1	
1240	Ditti		PB	C1	
[1241]	D 1 1	1000			
1242	Ditch	[1244] cuts 1239.	FPBT	MLC1/2 C1	
[1244]			•••	01	
1245	Pit	Polished bone object.	P sf	LC1-C2	
[1246]	Ditch		Sa		
[1247]	Ditei		Sg		
1249	Ditch				
[1250]	Ditah		DD		
[1252]	Ditch		РD	LCI-C2	
1254	Ditch		P B fc	C3	
[1253]	D: 1				
[1256	Ditch	two sections: [1255] and [1257]. Sealed by 10. Possibly turns to N to join [163].			
[1200]		but junction ploughed out by furrow			
		[161].			
1258	Ditch	See [1255]. Sealed by 10.			
1259	Ditch	Modern field boundary ditch, recently	Р	LC1-C3	Modern
[1260]		backfilled and ploughed over.			
1261	Enclosure ditch	See [121]. 1261 cut by [1260].	РВ	C2+	
1263	Ditch?	1263 cut by [1268]. Possible earlier cut	В		
[1264]		of [1268].			
1265	Slot/gully?	1265 cut by [1268].	В		
1267	Enclosure ditch	See [121]. 1284 cut by [113].	РВ	MLC2	
[1268]	terminal				
1269	Fill of [1248]		D	C1	
[1270]	Postilole		r	CI	
1272	Gully terminal	Cut by [785].	B Sg		
[1273]	D 1 1				
1274	Posthole	A cluster of postholes to S of multiple drip gullies. See also [1189] and [1313]	Р	LCI-C3	
1276	Posthole				
[1277]		4			
1278 [1279]	Posthole				
1280	Ditch		РВ	C2	
[1281]	~ "				
1282	Gully		Р	LC1-C2	
1284	Fill of [1268]			1	
1285	Ditch	[1288] cuts 1289.			
1286			РВ	C2-C3	
[1287]					
1289	Fill of [1230]	See [1230].	1		
1290	Ell -6 (1000)				
1291	Fill OF [1229] Posthole			+	
1294	1 0501010		РВ	C1+	
[1293]	<u> </u>				
1295	Spread Ditch	Seals 1307. Fe nail.	P B sf	C2 or LC3-C4	
[1290]	Ditti	[1277] cuts 1270.			
1298	Ditch	1298 cut by [1297].			

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of
1299			РВ	MLIA	leature
[1300]					
1309	Ditch		PB	LC1-C2	
[1304]			1.5	Let ez	
1305	Pit		Р	LC1-C2	
1307	Gully	Sealed by 1295.			
[1308]	Eill of [1204]	Sec [1204]			
1309	Ditch	See [1504].	P B	C1+	
[1311]					
1312	Posthole	Among a cluster of postholes to S of multiple drip gullies. See also [1189]			
1314	Posthole	and [1275].			
[1315]	Pit	Sealed by 10	PR	MLC2	
[1317]	I.I.		1.5	MEC2	
1318	Layer/colluvium	True	с	1.02.04	
[1319]	Ditch	cuts 1322.	гD	LC3-C4	
1322	Droveway ditch	See [36]. Cut by [1319].			
1321	(north) Terminal		В		
[1323]			_		
1325	Ditch	See [1169]. [1326] cuts 1327. Cu alloy brooch fragment	B sf		
1327	Ditch	1327 cut by [1326]			
[1328]	Ell -6[1211]				
1329	Ditch	See [286].			
1331			В		
[1332]			В		
1334	Gully	See [1100]. Relationship with [1337]	Р	MC2-EC3	
[1335] 1336	Gully	uncertain. Relationship with [1335] uncertain.			
[1337]	Ditch		P B fc	1 C3-C4	
[1339]	Diten		1 D IC	105 04	
1340 [1341]	Ditch		Р	RB	
1342	Ditch		Р	LC1-C2	
1344	Ditch	[1345] cuts 1346. Possibly recut. Cu	P B sf	LC3-C4	
1346	Droveway ditch	See [36]. 1346 cut by [1345]. Fe nail.	P B sf	MLC4	
[1347]	(north)				
[1349	Ditch	1349 cut by [1350].			
1351 [1350]	Ditch	Two sections [1350] and [1429]. [1350] cuts 1349.	Sg		
1352	Ditch		D.D.	G1	
1353			РВ	CI	
[1355]					
1356 1357	Ditch		B		
[1358]			D		
1359	?				
1361			РВ	C3-C4	
1362 1363			PBTSafe	MLC1	
1364			I D I SEIC	MILCI	
1365			РВ	EMC1	
1367	Ditch				
1368					
1369					
[1370]					

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of feature
1372	Ditch			pottery	icature
1373	Ditch				
1375			Р	MLC1	
[1376]					
1378 [1379]	Ditch	Two sections: [1379] and [1413]. 1378 cut by [1381].	Р	C1	
1380	Ditch	See [579]. [1381] cuts 1378.			
1381	Posthole				
[1383]	Gully terminal		Р	C1	
[1385]			-		
[1386	Ditch terminal				
1388 [1389]	Pit				
1390	Pit				
1392	Ditch	See [1085]. [1393] cuts 1394.	Р	LC1-MC2	
1393	Ditch	See [1016]. 1394 cut by [1393].	Р	LC1-C2	
[1395]	Ditch	See [265]	B		
[1397]	Divit		2		
[1398	Ditch	See [286]. Cut by [1433] and [1/82].			
1400 1401	Ditch	1400 cut by [1433].	Р	IA-C1	
1402			В		
1403 1404					
[1405]	Terminal		B		
[1407]	Terminar		В		
1408 [1409]	Droveway ditch (east)	See [7].	Р	C3+	
1410 [1411]	Furrow				
1412	Gully	[1413] cuts 1416 and 1418.	РВ	MLC1	
1414	Pit/postholes	Small group of three oval pits/postholes.	Р	IA-C1	
1416	Pit/postholes	1410 cut by [1415] and [1416].	Р	C1	
1417]	Pit/postholes				
[1419] 1420	Ditch	See [579]. Relationship with [1423]	Р	EMC1	
[1421]	Dit	uncertain. Belationship with [1421] uncertain			
[1422]	rπ	Relationship with [1421] uncertain.			
1424 [1425]	Ditch	Two sections: [1425] and [1460]. [1425] cuts 1426. Cu alloy brooch pin.	P B sf	MC1	
1426	Pit?	Two sections: [1427] and [1493]. 1426	РВ	EMC2	
1428	Ditch	See [1350]. [1429] cuts 1011.			
1429	Ditch	Quern stone.	PBcsf	MLC1	
[1430] 1432	Shallow ditch	[1433] cuts 1400.	Р	LC1-C3	
[1433]	Ditch	1434 cut by [1443] [1435] cuts 1440	р	C1	
[1435]		1405 cut by [1440].	1		
1436 [1437]	Tree throw	1436 cut by [1733].	РВ	LC1-C2	
1438 [1439]	Ditch	1438 cut by [1441].	Р	IA-C1	
1440	Ditch	1440 cut by [1435]. [1441] cuts 1438.			
1441	Ditch	Relationship with [1447] uncertain.	РВ	LC1-C2+	

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of
[1443]		[1443] cuts 1434.		pottery	leature
1444	Ditch	Relationship with [1443] uncertain.	PB sf	MLC1-EC2	
1445		Quern stone fragment.	РВ	C1	
1446			Р	C1	
[1447]	D 11			1 00 01	
1448	Ditch		Р	LC3-C4	
1450	Posthole		Р	RB	
[1451]					
1452 [1453]	Ditch		P B	LC2-MC3	
1454	Pit	[1455] cuts 1458.	Р	LC1-C2	
1456	Posthole	[1457] cuts 1458.	Р	C1	
[1457]	-		D		
1458	Layer	Cut by [1455] and [1457].	P DD-f	LCI-MC2	
1459 [1460]	Ditch	See [1425]. Relationship with [1462] uncertain Fe nail	PBSI	MLC1-MC2	
1461	Gully	Two sections: [1462] and [1648], [1462]			
[1462]		cuts 1463, relationship with [1460] uncertain.			
1463	Gully	1463 cut by [1462].	РВ	LIA-C1	
[1464]	Ditch	[1468] cuts 1469	DB	1 C3 C4	
1405	Ditch	[1408] cuts 1409.	гБ	LC3-C4	
1467					
[1468]					
1469	Ditch	1469 cut by [1468] and [1473].	P B	LC3-C4	
1470					
[1471]	D' 1	[1470] + 1460	D D	ML C2	
[1473]	Diten	[1472] cuts 1469.	РБ	MLC3	
1474	Posthole				
[1475]	D' I	G [1025]		<u></u>	
1476 [1477]	Ditch	See [1025].	Р	CI	
1478	Pit				
1480	Ditch		РВ	LC1-EC2	
[1481]					
1482 [1483]	Posthole		Sg		
1485	Droveway ditch	See [79].			
1484	(west) Ditch	Boundary ditch. See [265].	FPB	LC3-C4	
[1486]					
1488 [1489]	Ditch	Fe nail.	P B sf	MLC4	
1238	Large pit	[1490] cuts 1494.			
1491			РВ	LC1-MC2	
1492			P B	C2-C3	
[1490]	D'-0				
1494 [1493]	Pit?	See [1427]. 1494 cut by [1490].			
1495	Furrow		P G	LC1-C2	
[1496]	Gully				
[1498]	Jully				
1499	Ditch	See [1037]. 1499 cut by [1503].			1
[1500]	Dital	[1502]	DD		
1501	Ditch	[1503] cuts 1499.	ЧВ	LCI-C2	
[1503]					
1504	Ditch	See [476].	РВ	LC1-C2	l
1505			РВ	LC1-C2	
1506			PR	RB	
1507			гD	KD	
1509			P B Sg	IA	
1510			Ũ		
[1511]					
1512	Ditch	Three sections: [1513], [1531] and *	В		

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of
[1513]				pottery	feature
1514	Ditch	See [765]. 1514 cut by [1517].	Р	LC1-C2	
[1515]	D: 11	[1517]	D		
[1517]	Drip gully	[1517] cuts 1514.	Р	IA	
1518	Ditch	[1520] cuts 1521.			
1519					
1520	Gully	1521 cut by [1520].			
[1522]					
1523	Posthole	SF217, Cu alloy hairpin terminal?	sf		
1525	Ditch	1525 cut by [1531]			
1526					
[1527]	Ditch	See [1513] [1531] cuts 1525	F		
1520	Diten	566 [1515]. [1551] cuts 1525.	1		
1530					
1533	Gully	See [965].			
[1532]					
1535 [1534]	Gully	See [965].			
1536	Posthole				
[1537]	D. d. l				
[1538]	Postnole				
1540	Posthole				
[1541]	Postholo				
[1543]	Fostilole				
1544	Gully	1544 cut by [505], relationship with	Р	LC1-C2	
[1545]	Gully	[654] and [1801] uncertain.			
[1547]	Guny	566 [505].			
1548	Gully	1548 cut by [654]. Probably a	В		
1550	Ditch	continuation of 655".	Р	LC1-C2	
[1551]			_		
1552 [1553]	Pit		Р	IA or RB	
1554	Ditch				
[1555]	Dital			_	
[1557]	Ditch				
1558	Ditch		РВ	LC3-C4	
[1559]	Ditch		PB	1 C3-C4	
[1561]	Diten		1 5	Ees et	
1562	Ditch		Р	C1	
1564			РВ	C3+	
1565					
1566 [1567]					
1569	Gully	1569 cut by [1570]	Р	MLC1	
[1568]	Ditab	See [077] [1570] and 1560 and 1570	Dof	MC1	
[1570]	Ditch	Fe object.	r SI	IVIC I	
1573	Ditch	1573 cut by [1570].	В		
[1572] 1574	Small nit		B		
[1575]	Sinai pit				
1576	Curvilinear ditch	Cuts 1592.	РВ	MLIA	
1578	Posthole				
[1579]					
1581 [1580]	Pit	1581 cut by [1582]	ЬВ	EMC1	
1663	Pit	[1582] cut 1581.	Р	C1	
1664			РВ	C1	
[1562]					

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of
1583	Pit	1583 cut by [1586].	Р	LC2-C3	leature
[1584]	Ditah	[1596] outs 1592 and 1597	D		
[1586]	Diteii	[1380] cuts 1383 and 1387.	Б		
1587	Ditch	1587 cut by [1586].	Р	LC2-C3	
1588			РВ	LC1-C2	
[1590]					
1591	Ditch	Cut by [1577]: [1593] cuts 1594	РВ	C1	
[1593]				-	
1594	Spread Ditch	1594 cut by [1593].			
1596	Diten		F P B	C3+	
[1597]	Furrow		B		
[1599]	Fullow		Б		
1600 1601	Ditch		в		
[1602]			Б		
1603	Ditch	1603 cut by [1608].	РВ	LC1-MC2+	
1605	Posthole				
[1606]	D '	[1(0)] + 1(0) - 11745	DD	1.02.02	
[1607	Pit	[1608] cuts 1603 and 1745.	РВ	LC2-C3+	
1609	Posthole				
1610	Beam slot?				
[1612]					
1613 [1614]	Shallow ditch				
1615	Ditch				
[1616]	Posthole	[1618] cuts 1619	B		
[1618]	Toshiole		Ъ		
1619 [1620]r	Ditch	See [1037]. 1619 cut by [1618].			
1621			РВ	RB	
1622			Р	IA	
1624	Ditch	1624 cut by [1627].			
[1625]	Ditah	[1627] outo 1624			
[1627]	Diteir	[1027] cuts 1024.			
1628	Ditch	[1629] cuts 1632.	Р	C1+	
1630	Pit				
[1631]	Dital	1622 and her [1620]			
[1633]	Ditch	1032 cut by [1029].			
1634	Ditch		РВ	LC1-C2	
1636	Ditch				
1637			F B		
1639	Ditch				
[1640]					
1641 [1642]	Posthole	Truncated bases of two associated postholes.			
1643	Posthole	1			T
[1644] 1645	Pit				+
[1646]					
1647 [1648]	Gully terminal	See [1462]. 1647 cut by [1650].			
1649	Gully	[1650] cuts 1647, 1649 cut by [1652].	РВ	C1	
[1650]	Ditch	[1652] cuts 1649			
[1652]	Ditti				
1653	Posthole		Р	C1	

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of
[1654]				pottery	Ieature
1655	Ditch	[1660] cuts 1661.			
1656					
1657					
1659					
[1660]					
1661	Ditch	1661 cut by [1660].			
[1662]	Fills of [1582]	See [1582]			-
1664	1 ms of [1502]	566 [1502].			
1666 [1665]	Ditch	Two sections: [1665] and *.	РВ	LC3-C4	
1668	Drip gully	Three sections in partial remains of drip gully truncated by later features 1668			
1670	Drip gully	cut by [1665], 1672 cut by furrow. Two			
1672	Drip gully	re nans.	P B Sg sf	C1	
[1671]	Ditch	See [977] [1674] cuts 1675	Р	C1	
[1674]	Diten		1	01	
1675 [1676]	Ditch	See [1018]. 1675 cut by [1674].	Р	LC1-C2+	
1677 [1678]	Gully	Two sections: [1678] and [1836]. 1677 cut by [1680].	Р	C3-C4	
1717	Ditch	[1680] cuts 1677.	РВ	LC3-C4	
[1679					
1697	Ditch	1697 cut by [1684] and [1686]; [1682]	PBG	C3-C4	
1681		cuts 1695.	PBG	LC3-C4	
1683	Ditch	[1684] cuts 1685 and 1697.	Р	MLC4	
1685	Ditch	[1686] cuts 1697; 1685 cut by [1684].	РВ	MLC4	
1686	Construction				
[1688]	trench				
1689 [1690]	Ditch		РВ	LC1-C2	
1691 [1692]	Ditch		РВ	LC3-C4	
1693	Ditch		Р	C2+	
1695	Pit	1695 cut by [1682].			
[1696]	Fill of [1682]				
1698	Gully terminal	Cuts 1702.	РВ	C1+	
1700	Posthole	Cuts 1702			
[1701]	T		D	61	
1702	Layer Fills of [291]	Cut by [1699] and [1/01].	Р	CI+	
1703	1 113 01 [291]	500 [271].			
1705	Pit	1706 cut by [296].	Р	C1	
[1707] 1708	Pit		P B	MC3-C4	
1709 [1710]					
1711	Posthole				
1713	Ditch?	Remnant of a possible ditch almost			
1715	Ditch	[1716] cuts 1713.	РВ	LC1-C2	
[1716] 1717	Fill of [1680]	See [1680].			
1718	Ditch		В		
1720	Layer	Overlies 1721. Fe nail.	P B sf	MLC4	1
1721	Ditch	See [1319]. Sealed by 1720.	РВ	LC2-C3	
[1722]r					

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of
1723				pottery	leature
[1724]					
1725	Fill of [1719]		DD		
[1727]	Diteii		гБ	103-04	
1728 [1729]	Ditch		РВ	LC1-C3	
1732	Ditch		РВ	MLC1	
[1733]r 1730			PB	LC1-C2	
[1731]					
1734 [1735]	Ditch	1734 cut by [1741] and [1744].	Р	LC1-C2	
1736	Ditch	1736 cut by [1741].			
[1738]					
1739	Ditch	[1741] cuts 1734 and 1736.	В		
1740 [1741]			Р	CI+	
1742	Ditch	[1744] cuts 1734.	В		
1743			Р	LC1-C3	
1745	Ditch	1745 cut by [1608].			
[1746]			-	~~ ~ (
[1747]	Posthole		Р	C3-C4	
1749	Ditch	1749 cut by [1753]	В		
1751	Ditch	[1753] cuts 1749.			
1752					
1754	Gully		В		
[1755]					
1756 [1757]	Ditch	Spindle whorl.	B sf		
1758	Ditch		РВ	LC1-C2	
1760	Fill of [1794]	See [1794].			
1761	E11 - £ [1705]	Sec [1705]			
1762	Ditch/pit?	1763 cut by [1831]	РВ	MLC1	
1764	·····I		РВ	C1-C2	
1765			РВ	IA	
1767	Gully		РВ	C3-C4	
1769	Ditch	Large enclosure ditch, probably a N	Р	LC1+	
1770		return of [476]. Two sections [1787]	P B	LC1-MC2	
1771		and [1811].	РВ	LC1-MC2	
1773					
1774			ЬВ	LCI-MC2	
1776			В		
1777 1778					
1779			Р	C2	
[1780]	Dit	Cute 1209			
[1782]	r II	Cuts 1370.			
1761	Gully	See [527]. [1794] cuts 1762.	D D	DD	
1760			РВ РВ	кв LC1-C2	
[1794]	0.11		D.D.	DD	
[1762	Gully	1/62 cut by [1/94].	ЬВ	кв	
1796	Ditch		D		
[1798]			D		
1799	Ditch		P B	LC2-C4	
[1800]					

Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of
1802	Ditch		PB	C2	feature
1803	Diten		P	LC2-C4	
[1804]					
1806	Ditch terminal	See [1780].			
1807 [1805]r					
1808			В		
1809			В		
1810			В		
1812	Ditch terminal	Terminal at N end, S end ploughed	РВ	LC3-C4	
[1813]		away			
1814	Fill/dark spread	Fe nail.	PBcsf	MLC4	
1815	?				
1810	Pit		В		
[1818]					
1819	Ditch		РВ	LC3-C4	
[1820]	Fill on stones		D	C4	
1821	Pit	Hollowed stone.	P B sf	LC1-C2	
[1823]					
1824	Gully	Quern stone fragment.	P sf	C2	
[1825] 1826	Gully				
[1827]	cuity				
1828	Ditch				
[1829]	Ditab	[1021] auto 1762	DD	LC1 MC2	
[1831]	Ditch	[1851] cuts 1765.	РВ	LCI-MC2	
1832	Slot		РВ	RB	
[1833]					
1834	Patch of stones	See [1679] [1926] outs 1927	D		
[1836]	Gully	See [10/8]. [1850] cuts 1857.	D		
1837	Posthole	1837 cut by [1836].	Р	C3-C4	
1838					
1839	Ditch	Fe knife	PBsf	1.02-03	
[1841]	Diten		1 0 51	102 05	
1842	Ditch			EMC1	
[1843]r					
[1845]r					
1846					
[1847]	Dital	C _{2,2} [1210] 1040 and her [1051] Color dia	-£		
1848 [1849]	Ditch	whorl	SI		
1850	Ditch	[1851] cuts 1848 and 1852.	РВ	MLC1	
[1851]	D': 1				
1852 [1853]	Ditch	1852 cut by [1851].	Р	CI	
1854	Ditch	Large ditch comprising two inter-			
1860		cutting, parallel cuts, relationship			
[1855]	Ditab	uncertain.			
1856	Ditch				
1857					
1858			Р	RB	
[1859] 1860	Fill of [1855]	See [1855]			
1861	Fill of [1859]	See [1859].			
1863	Gully		P B	LC1-C3	
[1862]	C.				
1865	Stone area				
1866	Ditch				
[1867]					
1868 [*1	Pit?				
1869	Ditch		Р	LC1-C2	
[1870]	Diteii		•	201 02	
Context no.	Feature type	Comments	Finds	Date of	Date of
-------------	--------------	----------------------------------	-------	---------	---------
				pottery	feature
1871	Pit				
[1872]					
1873	Gully	See [99]. Cuts 19.			
[1874]					
[1875]	Pit	See 43.			
1876	Ditch	See [143]. 1876 cut by [100].			
[1877]		-			
1878	Ditch	Two sections: [1879] and [1881].			
[1879]					
1880	Ditch	See [1879]. [1881] cuts 159.			
[1881]					

APPENDIX 2

Pottery fabrics summary

Class	Code*	NRF Code†	Description	Frequency
Iron Age Fabrics	IA grog	-	Handmade, coarse/medium grog	Rare
	IA sh	-	Handmade, coarse fossil shell inclusions	Rare
	IA qz	-	Handmade, sandy fabric	Rare
	IA org	-	Handmade. Voids from organic inclusions	Rare
'Belgic' Grog	Α	-	Standard grogged	V. common
	A/B	-	Grog with shell	Rare
	AC	-	Grog with quartz	Rare
'Romanised'	A1	-	Hard Cream grogged	Common
Grog	A3	-	Hard Buff/Pink grogged	V. common
_	A2	PNK GT	Soft pink grogged	Common
Shell-tempered	В	-	General shell-tempered	Common
-	B4	HAR SH	Late Roman Harrold-type shelly	Common
Reduced wares	C6	-	Soft grey with burnished surfaces (commonly with	Rare
			London Type ware decoration). ?Lower Nene	
	С	-	Unclassified, prob. local	Common
	C1	-	Lower Nene Valley grey	Rare
	C4	-	Grey with paler core. (Local: Upper Nene valley grey)	V. common
	C8	DOR BB1	Dorset Black-burnished ware	Rare
	C10	-	Coarse, hard grey. ?Local	Rare
	C11	-	Dark grey/black with paler core. (Local: Upper Nene	Common
			Valley?)	
	C13	GAB TN	Terra Nigra (North Gaul)	Rare
	C13eg	-	Terra Nigra eggshell (North Gaul)	
	C20	-	Grey, self-coloured (?East Midlands/Oxford)	Common
	C21	-	Coarse, hard dark grey imitating BB1. (Local)	Common
Oxidised	D	-	Unclassified oxidised	Rare
(orange-firing)	D5	HAD OX	Hadham oxidised	Rare
	D16	-	Upper Nene valley reddish-yellow	Rare
	D46	-	'Silty wares' (source uncertain poss. Rushden)	Rare
White/cream	D2	-	LNV/midlands cream self-coloured	Rare
wares				
	D6	VER WH	Verulamium region white-ware	Rare
	D6/9	-	Upper Nene buff gritty	Common
	D27	OXF PA	Oxfordshire white/cream	Rare
Colour-	D1	LNV CC	Lower Nene Valley colour-coated ware, cream/pink	Common
coated/slipped			fabric	
wares				
	D4	OXF RS	Oxfordshire red/brown colour-coated ware	Common
	D24	-	Lower Nene Valley colour-coated ware, orange fabric	Rare
	-	-	Central Gaulish colour-coated ware	Rare
Samian	D40	-	Unclassified samian	Rare
	D41	LGF SA	South Gaulish La Graufeseque type	Common
	D42b	LEZ SA	Central Gaulish Lezoux type	Common
Mortaria	LNV	LNV WH	Lower Nene Valley mortaria	Rare
	M/H	MAH WH	Mancetter/Hartshill mortaria	Common
	OXF	OXF WH	Oxfordshire mortaria	Common
	OXF-cc	OXF RS	Oxfordshire colour-coated mortaria	Kare
	OXF-wc	OXF WS	Oxfordshire white-coated mortaria	Kare
A 1	VER D51	VEK WH	veruiamium region mortaria	Kare
Ampnora	1051	BALAM	Soumern-Spanish amphoras (Dressei 20)	Kare

* Fabric codes adapted from type series utilised for analysis of Stanwick, Northants assemblage (McSloy et al. forthcoming)

† National Roman Fabric Reference Collection (Tomber and Dore 1998)

Large, discrete groups

Context	Date	CP*	Count	Weight	Fabrics	Comments
404	MLC1	2.2	347	6697	AC, B, A, AB, C, A3, C19	carin cord bowl + jncor
1182	LC1-EC2	3.1	508	7619	C4, A3, C19, B, D69, A,	Good Flav-Traj. Group.
					SGS	Sam x 2 (Dr 27); gw
						rustic jar
109	LC1-EC2	3.1	189	1997	C4, C19,CGCC	CGCC hairpin-dec
						beaker -FlavTraj.C21
						BCAR
735	LC1-MC2	3.1	168	3706	C4, A3, A, C19, D69, SGS	SGS Dr33 + Dr 18/31r
10	MLC2	3.2	158	2774	A2, A, C, C19, D69, B,	?MHM HH intrus?;
					SAM, MHM	unus. Strainer
520	C4	5	200	4310	C, D1, D4, B4, A2, C20, C,	CGS x 1; A2 BWM; D1
					OXFWSM, C8, A, CGS,	J + DPR(resid. VRW
					D6, MHM	mort)
273	LC3-MC4	5.1	214	2689	B4, C20, C, C8, D1, D4	MHM hammer; D1
					CGS, A2, MHM,	DPR, CGS Dr 33 (CGS
					OXFCCM	X 2)
1088	MLC4	5.2	204	2106	B4, A, A1, A3, C, CGS, D4	B4 JNUR; Sam x 1

* CP = Ceramic Phase

APPENDIX 3

Catalogue of coins and brooches

Coins

SF 1 [1] An AE3 of GLORIA ROMANORUM kneeling captive type reverse (Third quarter 4th century). Both obverse and mint mark were illegible.

SF2 [1] An AE3 House of Constantine coin with an advancing victory on the reverse. The flan is in poor condition.

SF3 [1] An AE3 barbarous copy of a falling horseman FEL TEMP REPARATIO type coin with a Lyon mint mark (PLG). The prototype would date to the third quarter of the 4th century.

SF5 [1] An AE4 GLORIA EXERCITUS 2 soldiers 2 standards type coin of Constantine II minted in Lugdunum 330-35. The mintmark is *inverted dotted eyebrow* PLG.

SF7 [1] An AE4 of Constans VICTORIAEDDAVGGQNN rev with two facing victories holding wreaths. Mintmark TRP with M in centre field. Minted 341-46.

SF10 [1] An AE4 of the House of Constantine. GLORIA EXERCITVS two soldiers and 2 standards reverse, mintmark missing. Minted 330-35.

SF11 [] An AE3 in poor condition, no obverse legend is visible. The standing victory on the reverse indicates one of the Victoriae Avg type issues of the 340s.

SF12 [] An AE4 GLORIA EXERCITVS 2 soldiers and 2 standards issue. Obverse legend and mint mark illegible. 330-35.

SF14 [] An AE3 in poor condition, no obverse or reverse legend legible. Reverse is a standing victory of the Victoriae Avg type coins of the 340s.

SF15 [] An AE3 kneeling captive FEL Temp type issue but otherwise not legible. Issued latter end of the period 346-61.

SF16 [] An AE3 kneeling captive FEL Temp type issue but otherwise not legible. Issued latter end of the period 346-61.

SF17 [] An AE3 Victoriae Avg type coin of the 340s. Very little surface detail survives.

SF18 [] An AE4 based upon a Trier Victoriaeddavggqnn issue so post 340.

SF21 [] An AE3 of a Victoriae Avg type issue from the 340s

SF 22 [] An AE4 Gloria Exercitus 2 soldiers 2 standards type dating probable to 330s

SF23 [] An AE 4 Standing victory on reverse. N in field to L but rest of both obv and rev legend is missing.

SF25 [1] AE3/4 contemporary copy of a Fel temp Rep falling horseman type issue.

SF26 [] AE4 obverse illegible, reverse two victories issue Victoriaedd etc 341-6.

SF 27 [] An AE3/4 GLORIAROMANORUM type emperor with captive reverse issued by Valentinian I 364-75.

SF28 [2] An AE3 Kneeling captive reverse GLORIAROMANORUM legend Of II in field might indicate Lyons for the mint 364-75.

SF29 [2] AE3/4 Standing victory reverse, probably mid 4th century type.

SF30 [2] An AE3 GLORIA ROMANORVM rev with kneeling captive. A single V of the mintmark was legible. The piece was produced at officina II that would suggest the coin is of either Valentinian I, Gratian or Valens and was produced at Lyon between 364-375.

SF31 [2] An AE3 of Valens . The SECURITAS REIPVBLICAE issue minted in Siscia, a partial mintmark can be read and additional letter can be identified in the field. This type was produced from 367-378.

SF32 [2] An AE3 mid 4th century type, kneeling captive reverse.

SF34 [2] An AE4 flan, too weathered to identify beyond 4th century.

SF35 [2] A post-medieval half penny flan, very weathered and worn.

SF37 [2] An AE3 Crispus issue, reverse is BEATA TRANQUILITAS around an altar inscribed VOTIS XX mint mark PLG Lugdunum. 317-326

SF38 [2] An AE3/4 Gloria Exercitus with 2 soldiers and 2 standards contemporary copy. c 330 or later.

SF42 [2] An AE3 CONSTANTINOPOLIS type, no mint mark legible 330-46

SF43 [1] An AE3/4 Securitas Reipublicae type contemporary copy probably of third quarter 4th century date.

SF44 [1] An AE4 flan preserving no surface detail, probably 3rd to 4th century in date.

SF45 [1] An irregular weathered AE4 flan probably 3rd to 4th century.

SF46 [1] An AE3 of Decentius 351-3 with a Victoriae type reverse. No mintmark or legend could easily be discerned.

SF65 [2] An AE4 4th century flan, probably a two facing victories Victoriae type issue produced at Arles as mint mark PARL can tentatively be made out in the exergue, 341-46.

SF71 [2] An AE4 of Constans two facing victories VICTORIAEDDAVGGQNN type 341-46. Mints mark PLG Lugdunum.

SF72 [2] An AE 3 Two soldiers two standard Gloria Exercitvs type of Constantine II. The mintmark RFP denotes Rome 330-5.

SF86 [1] part of a SECURITAS type coin of Valentinianic house. The first 2 letters of the mintmark are SM with a letter B in the left field suggesting a date for its production in the 360's at one of the eastern mints.

SF91 [1] A heavily clipped sixpence of James I dated 1606. The clipping has removed both obverse and reverse legend.

SF95 [1] A small slightly dished flan with elements of surviving detail but it was not possible to readily identify or characterise them. The irregular slightly dished form of the flan might suggest this is an Iron Age unit although it might equally be a barbarous radiate. No radiate element could be discerned and the former suggestion is perhaps to be preferred.

SF96 [1] An illegible AE3/4 flan probably originally a C3/4 coin now lacking any original surface.

SF97 [273] An AE3/4 of Contantius with a two soldiers one standard reverse Gloria Exercitus type. No mintmark legible 337-41

SF98 [273] An AE4 barbarous copy of a Gloria Exercitus 2 soldiers 1 standard type coin. Mid C4.

SF113 [1] An AE3 of Valens Securitas Reipublicae advancing victory reverse. Although the Mintmark is illegible the coin was produced at Officina I suggesting Lyon 364-78

SF114 [1] An AE4 Gloria Exercitus issue 2 soldiers 2 standards too worn for closer identification 330-35.

SF118 [1] An AE2 of Magnentius with two victories holding a wreath on the reverse with a VICTORIAEDDNNAVGETCAE legend. The mintmark of AMB shows it to have been minted in Amiens 351-3

SF134 [1] Illegible AE3/4 of fourth century date.

SF137 [u/s] A Valentinianic kneeling captive issue in poor condition dating to 364-378

SF 152 [601] A Flavian sestertius, with no surviving legible legend on either face. The beardless laureate head on the obverse is either Domitian (81-96) or Trajan (97-117). The reverse bears the image of a standing figure.

SF162 [635] An AE3 of Valens. The reverse has the kneeling captive Gloria Romanorum. The coin was produced at Officina II of Lyon. The mintmark is only partially legible LVG... 364-78.

SF214 [1431] An irregular AE3/4 with little visible detail probably late C3 or C4 in date.

SF215 [1431] A radiate issue AE3/4 probably dating to c 275. The obverse legend is just off the edge of the flan and the reverse shows a standing figure but the partial surviving legend could not be read.

SF216 [1431] An AE3/4 of fourth century date. The obverse is too worn for detailed identification and the reverse with its single standing figure might indicate it was one of the SECURITAS REIPUBLICAE issues of the early Fourth century, such an identification is supported by the letters of the obverse legend that can be read.

SF234 [1814] A barbarous AE4 copy of a Gloria Exercitus 2 soldiers 2 standards issue. Fourth century in date.

Brooches

SF20 Silver Cross Bow brooch

SF 24 The hinge of a Colchester derivative brooch of an unclassified type dating from late 1st /early 2nd century.

SF 75 A Colchester type brooch with and octagonal section bow dating to pre- 40/45AD and perhaps from 15AD.

SF85 A Harlow type brooch dating from 40-75/80AD. This example is a good example of the type.

SF101 [256] A corroded example of a Colchester type brooch with a thin hexagonal section bow. The hook is not long. 5/10-25AD.

SF117 [1] An early Birdlip variety brooch (lacking the bow and head) 30-55AD.

SF133 [1] A rear hook type brooch, generally a Norfolk centred distribution. 40-60/65AD none made after 61-62AD.

SF184 [1161] A Colchester derivative of a type with distribution area of the upper Nene and surroundings. It has a Harlow type spring. 60/65-120/125AD.

SF210 [1325] A Colchester brooch in poor condition 25-45/50AD.

SF211 [1424] Fragments of a pin and spring.

Context/feature	No	Weight (g)	Fabric	Description, measurements in mm	
4/5	1	26	FI C 1		
19/20	1	6/	overfired	<i>Tegula</i> , flange 38 high and 20 wide, chamfered	
33/34	З	105	F2 E1	Imbrex	
86/87	1	173	F1 F3	4 joining and 1 from (181). <i>Tegula</i> 20 thick, 3 broad	
				shallow curving grooves	
98/99	4	70	F5		
158/157	1	60	F5		
164/165	1	15	F5		
181	4	385	F5 F4	Imbrex 1 join above	
182/183	2	180	F4		
102/100	-	100	F6	<i>Box flue</i> 18 thick, straight deep comb	
199	1	55	F3		
230/231	10	262	F7	1 tile joining sherds, 40 thick	
232/233	1	107	F1	<i>Tegula</i> , 20 thick, flange 45 high 20 wide squared off maroon wash	
261/263	1	161	F5		
308/310	1	90	F5		
313/315	1	152	F6	<i>Tegula</i> , 25 thick, lost flange,	
314/315	1	56	F6		
324323	2	102	F5		
338/339	3	336	F6, F5	<i>Tegula</i> 25 thick, flange 50 by 25, slight chamfer <i>Tegula</i> maroon traces	
341/339	2	158	F8		
342	3	194	F6 F0	2 joining <i>tegula</i> 15 thick, flange 40 by 25	
171/176	1	27	Г9 Е6		
4/4/4/0	1	51	F0 E2		
492/494 520/521	2	302	Γ2 E2	Tagula 25 thick flange 50 by 20 flat top:	
520/521	2	303	F3 F10	<i>Tegula 25</i> thick, hange 50 by 50, hat top,	
590/591	8	585	F6	<i>Tegula</i> , 15 thick, flange 40 by 18, rounded top; <i>Tegula</i> flange narrow; <i>Tegula</i> flange, 45 high; <i>Box flue</i> , 17 thick narrow shallow comb; 3 body one with curved groove	
635/636	1	37	F8	Interes, 15 thek,	
646/648	1	162	F10	Tagula	
696/697	1	164	F10	A0 thick	
726/727	1	24		40 unick	
805/804	1	154	F4		
807/806	1	370	F7		
913/915	1	38	F3	Boxflue	
1077/1078	3	164	F4		
1091/1090	1	568	F4/5	Tegula 20 thick flange 40 by 20 flange outaway	
1166/1169	1	685	F10	40 thick	
1198/1199	1	38	F6	Tegula 35 high	
1242/1244	1	154	F3		
1254/1253	1	2140	F6	<i>Bessalis</i> 1 corner fragmented 195 so 35 thick	
1363/1366	11	975	F4: F5: F8	43 thick 2 joining: 54 thick: 60 thick	
1465/1468	1	511	F10	40 thick smooth top	
1576/1577	1	64	F4		
1587/1590	1	106	F4		
1720	4	652	F3 F8; F2	<i>Tegula</i> , 24 thick, flange 47 by 30	
			F6	Box flue 14 thick, curved shallow comb	
1726/1727	1	116	F6	Box flue, deep comb	
1814	1	64	F5	very hard	
1819/1820	2	223	F6 F1	Imbrex 16 thick 17 thick grey core	
				1, mon 510, 0010	

APPENDIX 4 Quantification of ceramic tile



