Land at Clapton Farm, Tinkers Lane, Wincanton, Somerset, BA9 8LH

Archaeological Evaluation Report

NGR:ST 75707 28700Planning Authority:South Somerset District CouncilPlanning Application:Pre-ApplicationHER Event No:32840PCAS Site code:CFWE15PCAS Job No.:1382Acc. No.TTNCM 40/2015OASIS ID:preconst3-248929

Prepared for

British Solar Renewables

by J. Sleap & A. Lane

April 2016



Pre-Construct Archaeological Services Ltd 47, Manor Road Saxilby Lincoln LN1 2HX Tel. 01522 703800 e-mail info@pre-construct.co.uk ©Pre-Construct Archaeological Services Ltd

Contents

Non-technical Summary	
Introduction	2
Site location and description	2
Geology and topography	4
Planning background	4
Archaeological and historical background	4
Methodology	5
Results	5
Discussion & Conclusion	11
Effectiveness of Methodology	13
Project Archive	13
Acknowledgements	14
References	14
	Non-technical Summary Introduction Site location and description Geology and topography Planning background Archaeological and historical background Methodology Results Discussion & Conclusion Effectiveness of Methodology Project Archive Acknowledgements

Appendices

- Appendix 1: Colour Plates
- Appendix 2: Context Summary
- Appendix 3: Prehistoric and Roman pottery I. Rowlandson
- Appendix 4: Animal bone J. Wood
- **Appendix 5:** Slag assessment M. Wood
- Appendix 6: Flint T. Lane
- **Appendix 7:** The Other Finds G. Taylor
- Appendix 8: Palaeoenvironmental Assessment Archaeological Services DU
- Appendix 9: Trench locations (GIS)
- Appendix 10: Oasis form

Figures

- Fig. 1: Site location map at scale 1:25,000. Site location in red. (OS mapping © Crown copyright. All rights reserved. PCAS licence no. 100049278).
- Fig. 2: Trench location plan at scale 1:2500
- Fig. 3: Trench 1 & 3 plans & sections at scale 1:100, 1:50 & 1:20
- Fig. 4: Trench 4 plan & sections at scale 1:100 & 1:20
- Fig. 5: Trench 5 plan & sections at scale 1:100, 1:50 & 1:20
- Fig. 6: Trench 6 plan & sections at scale 1:100, 1:50 & 1:20
- Fig. 7: Trench 7 & 8 plan & sections at scale 1:100 & 1:20
- Fig. 8: Trench 10 plan & sections at scale 1:100 & 1:20
- Fig. 9: Trench 2, 9, 11 & 12 plan & sections at scale 1:100 & 1:20

Non-Technical Summary

This document is a scheme for archaeological trial trenching on Land at Clapton Farm, off Tinkers Lane, Wincanton in the parish of Cucklington, Somerset. The results are intended to be submitted with a forthcoming planning application to inform the planning decision, and advise should any further archaeological mitigation be necessary.

Archaeological investigations in the area of the site have been limited, however during works adjacent to the A303 c1.5km north of the site Bronze Age and Iron Age features have been identified indicating occupation in the close vicinity, and scatters of Roman pottery suggest activity in this period. Clapton Farm itself was originally a small village, recorded as such in the Domesday Book, but falls in on itself in the post-medieval period, becoming a single farm by the mid 19th century.

The site has been subject to geophysical survey, which identified a number of strong magnetic anomalies which were subsequently targeted by a total of thirteen 20m x 2m trenches. These anomalies included two potential tracks lying perpendicular to each other suggesting multiple phases of activity, a large enclosure with internal features, and a second enclosure anomaly located in the southeast corner of the site. The majority of anomalies targeted by the trenches were positively identified as archaeological features, with dating evidence indicating Iron Age agriculture and occupation.



Figure 1: Site location map at scale 1:25,000. Site location shown in red. (OS mapping © Crown copyright. All rights reserved. PCAS licence no. 100049278).

1.0 Introduction

Pre-Construct Archaeological Services Ltd (PCAS) was commissioned by British Solar Renewables to undertake an archaeological evaluation on land at Clapton Farm, Tinkers Lane, Wincanton, Somerset.

The site is being considered for a forthcoming planning application. The Historic Environment Officer recommended a scheme of pre-application archaeological investigation to support the planning application and inform the decision making process. A programme of archaeological evaluation in the form of trial trenching has therefore been recommended in order to inform a planning application for a renewable energy project. The results of the trial trenching will then be used to mitigate the impact of the development on any historic assets on site.

This document follows current best practice and appropriate national guidance including:

- NPPF, National Planning Policy Framework, 2012;
- CIFA Code of Conduct (2008 as revised);
- CIFA Standards and Guidance for Archaeological Evaluations (2008);
- Management of Research Projects in the Historic Environment (MoRPHE v1.1, English Heritage 2009)
- Lincolnshire Archaeological Handbook (Lincolnshire County Council, 2010).

2.0 Site Location and Description (fig. 1)

Clapton Farm lies in the civil parish of Cucklington, in East Somerset, c.700m south of the A303 between Wincanton (3.5km west) and Bourton (2.5km east). The proposed development site lies c.750m southeast of the main farm buildings.

The site comprises c.30acres of arable farmland, a single large field (previously divided into four smaller plots) lying on the west side of Tinkers Lane, a minor road running south from the B3081 to Cucklington. The overall site is roughly rectangular, with the eastern boundary following Tinkers Lane. The western boundary is irregular following existing field boundaries and the contour of Tinkers Hill sloping down to the west. The area of the proposed solar panels is c.15 acres in the southeast corner of the site (blue line on Figure 2).

The approximate central NGR of the site is ST 75707 28700.



3.0 Topography and Geology

Tinkers Hill is formed by a ridge of limestone surrounded by mudstone. The bedrock geology of the site is Cucklington Oolite Member Limestone, Oodial, formed in the Jurassic period in a shallow carbonate sea. The limestone is described as shelly and locally sandy. Trenches at the northern end of the site may encounter Hazelbury Bryan Formation – Mudstone which occupies a small island on the top of Tinkers Hill, and trenches along the southern edge of the site may lie over Sturminster Pisolite Member - Limestone, Ooidal. There are no recorded overlying deposits (http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html).

The development site lies at the top of Tinkers Hill, the summit of which lies a little above 160mOD. The east and west boundaries of the site lie roughly on the 150m contour line. A benchmark recorded on a rivet close to the junction of Tinkers Lane and the B3081 c.35m from the north corner of the site is recorded as 146.755m (http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/benchmarks/).

4.0 Planning Background

This site is currently being considered for a forthcoming planning application for a renewable energy project. The Historic Environment Officer for South West Heritage Trust, acting as archaeological advisor to Somerset County Council, was consulted concerning the proposals, and recommended pre-application archaeological works to investigate the archaeological potential of the site, including a geophysical survey, which was undertaken in April 2015, followed by targeted trenching. A heritage chapter is also under preparation for an Environmental Statement to be submitted with the planning application.

The results of the geophysics and trenching, and the heritage chapter, will be submitted in support of the proposed planning application to inform and advise the planning process.

5.0 Archaeological and Historical Background

There are no known archaeological sites/artefacts from within the boundaries of the proposed development site. In the immediate vicinity of the site there have been few archaeological investigations to inform the archaeological background.

Archaeological works around the A303 c1.5km north of the site has identified Prehistoric occupation. During monitoring a very large ditch, excavated to c13m wide and 5m deep was revealed, associated with a double bank earthwork and a dense scatter of Bronze Age flints (SHER ref: 15158). Slightly to the north a group of mid-Iron Age storage pits were revealed (SHER ref: 57118), indicating the presence of a settlement in the area although the exact location of this settlement has yet to be confirmed. Scatters of Roman pottery and historic place name evidence would suggest Roman occupation in this area and slightly west towards Leigh Common (SHER 54607), however archaeological remains to confirm this have yet to be revealed and recorded.

The southwest in the post Roman period remained in the hands of the Britons, until the mid 6th century when Saxon settlers advanced into and across the county. There is no known evidence for post Roman or Saxon occupation around the site. By the mid 11th century and the Domesday Book there are a handful of settlements scattered around the area ,the closest being Clapton itself. The small village of just two villagers, three smallholders and two slaves is held by Mauger of Carteret, tenant in chief is recorded as Count Robert of Mortain. Prior to 1066 the manor was held jointly by two unnamed thanes. Clapton was considerably smaller than neighbouring Cucklington and Stoke Trister, both of which had over twenty households (http://domesdaymap.co.uk/).

The village of Clapton appears to have survived the medieval period. Earthworks around the present farm are interpreted as settlement remains, the 1841 census records a small

population at Clapton hamlet, however by 1st edition OS mapping the site is named as Clapton Farm (SHER ref: 53824).

A geophysical survey of the site was undertaken in April 2015 (Bunn, 2015), identifying a range of magnetic anomalies. Linear features bisect the site on north-south and east-west alignments, interpreted as tracks with characteristics indicating these features are not contemporary, the north-south anomaly is thought to be a later phase of activity. To the north of the east-west track there is a large sub-rectangular enclosure which appears to respect the track, with a number of discrete internal features including potential pits, areas of burning and short, curvilinear features. At the western end of this track two clusters of small circular features with distinct central pits are typical of Bronze Age barrows, clusters which appear to respect the trackway and therefore may be contemporary. The central and southern areas of the site are scattered with further discrete anomalies, and a second rectangular enclosure, three sided and open to the north, lies in the southeast corner of the site.

6.0 Methodology (fig. 2)

Fieldwork was undertaken between 17/8/15 – 9/9/15, by S. Savage, P. Evans, D. Brown and D. Bower.

The evaluation trenches were opened by machine equipped with a toothless bucket under archaeological supervision to the first natural or archaeologically significant horizon. The trenches were then cleaned and defined by hand.

Where identified, archaeological features were examined sufficiently to determine their date, character and survival condition and then recorded by measured plan and section drawings at appropriate scales (normally 1:20 or 1:50), incorporating Ordnance Survey datum heights where applicable.

A written record of each significant stratigraphic horizon and archaeological feature was made on standard PCAS context recording forms. These were supplemented by a narrative account in the form of a site diary. The archaeologist paying due attention to the landscape aspect of any exposed remains.

A digital photographic record, supplemented by colour slide and monochrome film photography as appropriate, was maintained during the course of the archaeological intervention.

All artefacts were treated in accordance with UKIC guidelines, *First Aid for Finds* (Watkinson & Neale 1998). All artefacts encountered during the groundworks were retrieved and returned to PCAS offices for cleaning, marking and in-house assessment and subsequent dispatch to external specialists.

7.0 Results (figs: 3 - 7)

Trench 1 (figs: 3a – 3b)

Trench 1 targeted a north-west to south-east aligned linear feature, interpreted as a potential trackway. The south-western end of trench 1 did not extend across the second anomaly approximately 4*m* to the west, so the full profile of this feature could not be established. Under investigation the north-eastern anomaly proved to be two phases of undated ditch.

The earliest deposit encountered was light to mid brown silty clay containing frequent limestone inclusions (101).



South Facing section through metalled surface (302)

Situated at the south-western extent of trench 1 was ditch [103] which initially exhibited a shallow profile, descending to a well defined step on the north-eastern edge and contained a single, light to mid orange brown, compact, silty clay (105) which yielded no dating evidence.

Cutting the south-western edge of [103] was a substantial re-cut [102], approximately 3.9m wide and 0.9m deep. This ditch clearly shows up on the geophysical survey as a stronger signal, approximately 75m in length, masking the earlier ditch [103] and was filled by a single deposit of orange brown silty clay (104) which contained two iron objects, a small undated hinge and a 17th century buckle fragment (SF 6 & 7). Both [103] and [102] were initially interpreted as being later phases of activity, with [102] being potentially a long narrow limestone extraction feature.

All the above were sealed by mid brown silty clay topsoil (100).

Trench 2 (fig: 9a)

A negative trench initially placed over a cluster of discrete anomalies which under investigation proved to be voids in the natural limestone brash.

The natural formation within Trench 2 comprised mid brown silty clay within degraded limestone (202). Above this was a shallow subsoil interface of orange brown silty clay (201) with frequent small limestone fragments, pebbles and pea gravel.

These layers were subsequently covered by red brown, silty clay topsoil (200) from which a single abraided sherd of Black Burnished ware pottery was recovered.

Trench 3 (figs: 3c – 3e)

An east-west aligned linear feature was revealed to be a possible metalled trackway with a shallow pit to the north.

The earliest layer encountered within Trench 3 was natural limestone brash (305) within which was a shallow, 1.5m wide depression, the surface of which exhibited evidence of metalling and has been interpreted as a possible trackway (302), aligned east to west, south of and adjacent to the large eastern enclosure.

Trackway (302) was subsequently filled by mid brown sandy silt (301), a deposit derived from general silting and wind-blown material.

Approximately 2m north of (302) was a small, shallow pit [304], 0.15m deep, containing mid brown sandy silt (303) with frequent limestone fragments and yielding three sherds of abraided Iron Age pottery.

All the above were sealed by mid brown silty clay topsoil (300).

Trench 4 (figs: 4a – 4f)

Trench 4 was placed across the V shaped intersection of two linear anomalies. Investigation revealed a double ditch/gully alignment with a small discrete posthole located to the north between them.

Cut into the natural limestone brash (401) were a series of three ditches and a gully forming part of a small sub-square enclosure approximately 20m in length.

The northernmost features comprised a ditch [408] and adjacent, internal gully [406] aligned northeast to southwest, approximately 1m apart.



Figure: 4 Trench 4 plan and sections. Scale: 1:100 & 1:20

Ditch [408] was 1.55m wide and 0.38m deep and exhibited gently sloping sides with a sharp descent to a flat base. The north-western edge appears more irregular with a series of steps, probably a result of weathering and erosion and contained a single, light to mid brown silty sand (409) yielding a single fragment of unidentified medium-sized mammal animal bone.

Gully [406] was situated to the south of and ran parallel with ditch [408]. The south-eastern edge was cut steeply and subsequently became more irregular and shallow, descending to a flat sloping base approximately 0.23m deep, rising up to the north-west with a more defined, steeper gradient. Contained within [406] was light brown firm silty sand (407).

Located approximately 1m to the south of gully [406] was a small, 0.43m diameter posthole with steep sloping sides descending to a rounded base 0.27m deep. A dark red brown, silty sand (405) was contained within it yielding no dating evidence.

The two southernmost ditches [402] and [410] were very similar in both profile and dimensions. Ditch [402] was 1.34m wide and 0.38m deep and exhibited gently sloping sides, descending to a slightly eroded, flat base and contained single fill (403) which comprised light to mid brown silty sand with limestone fragments situated towards the base. An assemblage of 41 sherds of Iron Age pottery, including a sherd from an Iron Age bead rimmed jar and fifteen sherds from a single Iron Age sandy ware vessel, and three fragments of animal bone (two identified as sheep/goat) was recovered as well as an iron looped spike, thought to be of post-medieval date (SF 8). Barley, wheat and hazel were all found in an environmental sample taken from (403), along with grasses, docks and alder (\diamond 4).

Approximately 1.2m to the south of [402] was ditch [410] which had a more clearly defined profile, similar to [402] but without the erosion and a distinct flat base. A single fill (411) was evident within the ditch, having an almost identical matrix to that of (403), yielding a small assemblage of Iron Age pottery (three sherds) and an animal bone corpus that included sheep/goat and large – medium sized mammal bone. Low numbers of barley and spelt wheat, along with the wild species of dock and hazel were recovered in the environmental sample from (411) \Diamond 7.

All the above were subsequently sealed by mid brown silty clay topsoil (400) from which two sherds of abraided late Iron Age-Roman pottery was recovered.

Trench 5 (figs: 5a – 5f)

Trench 5 targeted the southwest corner of the large enclosure to the east of the site as well as a vague anomaly lying just outside the enclosure to the northeast which upon excavation proved to be a small 7m diameter ring ditch.

The earliest deposit encountered was limestone brash (501) into which was cut ditch [502] forming the earliest phase of the main enclosure.

Ditch [502] was approximately1.56m deep, displaying sharply sloping sides, descending to a narrow flat base containing two distinct fills. The lower, basal fill (505) comprised light orange brown, compacted silty clay with more frequent limestone inclusions to a thickness of 0.55m, containing a bone pin of probably Iron Age or Roman date (SF12). An environmental sample from this context yielded spelt and barley grains and a quantity of spelt wheat chaff, which would indicate grain processing in the area. the sample also contained large number of snail shells, with species identified indicating a mainly dry environment. The upper fill (504) comprised light to mid brown silty clay with very occasional limestone fragments, yielding a large assemblage of twenty-nine sherds of Iron Age pottery, some of which were very abraided suggesting they may have been redeposited or disturbed. Fifty-three fragments of animal bone, including cattle, sheep/goat and a Roe Deer metatarsal were also recovered from this deposit. A sheep/goat metatarsal in this assemblage had a hole drilled through the centre of it; the purpose of this is unknown however it may have been used as a toggle. The



Figure: 5 Trench 5 plan and sections. Scale: 1:100, 1:50 & 1:20

large assemblage of finds from this horizon may indicate this is domestic refuse, possible redeposited from a midden elsewhere.

Three fragments of neonate human bone were also identified in the finds assemblage from deposit (504). Both left and right femurs and left tibia were identified by the specialist, with measurements indicating this individual was approximately six weeks old at the time of death. No other human bone was found in either this deposit or across the site. Neonate remains are not uncommon from domestic Iron Age sites, and it appears that burial of these infants was traditionally closer to or within the settlement as opposed to the adult inhumations in this period.

Approximately two thirds of the south-eastern end of ditch [502] was truncated by re-cut [506], exhibiting very steep sides, 1.66m wide descending sharply to a flat base at a depth of 0.78m. A single fill was present which comprised a firm, light brown silty clay (503) with limestone inclusions. The assemblage of forty-six sherds of pottery yielded from the single fill included five from a single jar, however the fabrics were in use throughout the Iron Age and in some cases into the 1st century AD and dating could not be narrowed and further. A large assemblage of animal bone was also recovered from horizon (503), including cattle bone, sheep/goat, a pig radius and a mandible from a dog or fox.

Approximately 2.7m north of ditch [502] was a 7m diameter ring ditch [507]. A total of three investigative slots were excavated throughout its length, all exhibiting similar dimensions between 0.54m and 0.72m in width with shallow sloping sides descending to a gentle rounded base. All profiles contained the same single deposit, a mid brown silty sand recorded as (508), (510) and (511); two sherds of very abraided Iron Age pottery were recovered from (510) and two fragments of unidentified mammal bone were also recovered from the ring ditch. A single small flint blade fragment was recovered from (508); dated to the Mesolithic – Neolithic this is thought to be residual evidence of early prehistoric activity. An environmental sample taken from (508) of the ring ditch contained no domestic cereals, however a fragment of hazel shell and wild plant species were identified within the flots, indicating a grassland with weeds in the historic environment.

All features in Trench 5 were subsequently sealed by topsoil (500).

Trench 6 (figs: 6a – 6c)

Trench 6 was placed to investigate the main enclosure ditch at its southern end, revealing a large internal pit and the continuation of the metalled trackway revealed in trench 3.

Ditch [603], a continuation of the enclosure ditch recorded in Trench 5 was cut into the natural limestone brash (614) approximately 2.5m wide. No re-cut was visible in this intervention, revealing instead a sequence of three deposits to a partially excavated depth of 0.5m. The earliest deposit (613) comprised mid orange brown sandy silt, with frequent limestone inclusions, excavated to a depth of 0.2m. No datable material was recovered from this horizon and the characteristics suggest this may have been a slumping of material from the sides of the ditch soon after it was first excavated. Above (613) was light grey silty sand (602), 0.18m thick yielding a small amount of cattle and other mammal bone. The upper fill (601) comprised mid to dark grey, friable silty sand, 0.2m thick with limestone inclusions and an assemblage of fifty-one sherds of Iron Age pottery (including thirty-five sherds of black burnished ware and seven sherds from a single Iron Age sandy ware vessel) and eighteen fragments of animal bone including cattle, sheep/goat and pig. A fragment of iron-working slag was recovered from this horizon.

Approximately 5m due north of enclosure ditch [603] was large pit [608]. Partially covered by the western edge the trench, it appeared to be roughly circular in plan, 2m in diameter with steeply cut upper edges descending vertically to a flat base at a depth of 0.8m. The basal fill (611) comprised grey brown silty sand with frequent large limestone fragments, possibly



Figure: 6 Trench 6 plan and sections. Scale: 1:100, 1:50 & 1:20

backfilled quarried waste containing no datable evidence. A small dump deposit of brown silty sand (612) was situated in the eastern corner of the pit covered by a small 'triangular' wedge of light brown silty sand (609) containing a small quantity of animal bone including a horse tooth.

Sealing all the above was a deposit of mid brown clay sand (610), approximately 0.1m thick, which may have formed the basal silting deposit of a possible re-cut as it appears to follow the line of the shallower gradient rising up to the top edge of the pit. No finds were retrieved from this material and was subsequently covered by a 0.3m thick mid to light brown silty sand (607), containing frequent small limestone fragments along with a very small assemblage of animal bone and two sherds of late Iron Age - Roman pottery. Bindweed, cereal and a seed from the cabbage family were all identified in the environmental sample from context (607). An upper silting deposit (606) of dark brown silty sand capped the pit and yielded seven sherds of Iron Age pottery and animal bone including sheep/goat. A fragment of a worked bone disc was recovered from (606), around 12mm in diameter this disc is thought to be part of a bead, probably Roman dating from the $3^{rd} - 4^{th}$ century AD (SF1). This is the only evidence of late Roman activity on the site, and may be intrusive in an earlier feature.

A continuation of metalled surface (605), the same metalled surface as recorded in Trench 3, was located 2.5m due south of enclosure ditch [603] where it became substantially wider at 2.7m and covered with a silting deposit of silty sand (604) to a depth of 0.18m. Associated with the metalled deposit and the overlying silt were seven sherds of Iron Age pottery, nineteen fragments of animal bone, the majority of which were identified as being sheep/goat, and a single flint flake dated to the Mesolithic - Neolithic. This was covered by 0.14m thick deposit of topsoil (600) which also yielded two sherds of Iron Age pottery and a flint flake that could only be dated as prehistoric.

Trench 7 (figs: 7a – 7b)

Trench 7 was located within the main enclosure. A single pit was revealed, similar in dimensions to the other recorded internal pit in trench 6.

The earliest layer encountered within Trench 7 was limestone brash (705).

Into this was cut a large circular pit [704] with steep sides descending to a flat base, 1.8m in diameter and 0.7m deep. The basal deposit within the pit comprised mid brown grey silty sand (703), 0.2m thick with frequent large limestone fragments, yielding a single sherd of Iron Age pottery. Above (703) lay a 0.18m thick deposit of pale brown grey silty sand (702), and limestone which exhibited signs of burning but not in situ. Three sherds from a single Iron Age – early Roman coarse-ware vessel and a small amount of animal bone were also recovered. The environmental sample from this context had only minimal potential, with a charred hazel shell fragment indicating wild foods were being consumed (\Diamond 5).

Sealing both (702) and (703) was deposit (701) which comprised mainly of large limestone fragments within mid brown sandy silt, yielding an assemblage of eighteen late Iron Age – early Roman pottery sherds, including Black Burnished ware and hand-made wares, and more medium mammal bone. Two large stone fragments from this context were identified as fragments of saddle quern, possibly fragments of the same stone although no joining faces could be confirmed (SF 10&11).

This deposit was subsequently covered by mid brown silty sand (706) and sealed by generic topsoil (700) from which a prehistoric worked flint flake was recovered.



Trench 8 (figs: 7c – 7d)

Trench 8 was placed south of the east to west aligned trackway and parallel with the north to south trackway, targeting a circular anomaly which under investigation was revealed as a potential ring ditch.

Cut into the natural limestone brash (801) was a shallow 0.53m wide curving gully [802], interpreted as being the southern edge of a 12m diameter ring ditch with gently sloping sides descending to a rounded base, 0.19m deep. A single fill (803) was present and comprised firm red brown silty clay containing three sherds of Iron Age pottery and a single fragment of sheep/goat animal bone. The environmental sample from context (803) contained small numbers of charred wheat and bindweed $\delta 8$. The function of this ring ditch is unknown; the anomaly resembles the probable barrows to the west, however this could also be the drip gully from an Iron Age roundhouse or other building.

Trench 9 (fig: 9b)

Trench 9 was located in the southwest quarter of the site as a control and was deemed negative.

The earliest layer encountered was natural limestone brash (901) which included patches of red brown sandy silt drift material, covered by topsoil (900).

Trench 10 (figs: 8a – 8f)

Trench 10 targeted a linear anomaly which appears to form a partial enclosure to the northwest of the small enclosure at the south-eastern corner of the site. Upon investigation a small gully was revealed along with two pits and the terminal end of a north to south aligned gully.

Natural limestone brash (1014) comprised the earliest layer into which was cut gully [1002]. Aligned southwest to northeast, this feature turned sharply northwest towards the metalled trackway (302) / (605) and exhibited a shallow gradient on its north-western edge, descending to a rounded base before rising steeply towards the south-east, approximately 0.52m in width. A small quantity of Iron Age pottery including four sherds from a single shell gritted vessel and animal bone (including a single equine metatarsal) was recovered from the single fill (1001) which comprised mid grey brown sandy silt up to 0.2m thick.

Pit [1007] was located 4.5m south of gully [1002] and followed a similar pattern with the other recorded pits of having steep, near vertical sides and a flat base, 1.5m wide and 0.5m deep.

A sequence of seven dump deposits were present in pit [1007], the earliest being pale grey and 'creamy' yellow sandy silt (1013) forming a silting deposit 0.04m thick in the base of the pit. Above this had settled a 0.04m thick deposit of mid to dark grey sandy silt (1005) which yielded a single fragment of animal bone, four sherds of Iron Age – early Roman curse ware, a single very abraided sherd identified as possible Roman greyware, and a fragment of a rubber stone with a polished/worn surface, thought to be a muller to use with a saddle quern for grinding flour (SF5). A 0.18m thick mound of dumped material (1006) partially covered (1005) and comprised mixed elements of mid grey to red brown and creamy white sandy silt producing twenty six sherds of Iron Age pottery, twenty-two of which derived from the same coarse-ware flat-topped rim jar and sixteen fragments of animal bone. Another fragment of the same muller stone that was recovered from (1005) was found in (1006) – SF3, along with a second, much larger stone that is also interpreted as either a muller or a hone (SF9). The environmental sample from (1006) contained hazel, cleavers and bindweed, suggesting open grassland in the area.



Figure: 8 Trench 10 plan and sections. Scale: 1:100 & 1:20



Figure: 9 Trenches 2, 9, 11 & 12 Representative sections & Trench 13 plan & sections. Scale: 1:100 & 1:20

Context (1006) was partially covered on both western and eastern extents by (1012), mid brown sandy silt, possibly representing slumping around the periphery of the pit. Sealing both deposits (1012) and (1006) was mid brown sandy silt (1004) which contained occasional large limestone fragments, some of which appear heat affected. No finds were retrieved from this material which appears to have been deposited post collapse of the pits sides. The upper fill was represented by 0.15m thick deposit of mid grey brown sandy silt (1003), again containing heat affected fragments of limestone, from which a single fragment of iron working slag was recovered.

Adjacent to pit [1007] was a second, possible circular feature [1011], partially obscured by the trench edge and interpreted as being a either a shallow pit or tree throw due to the uneven nature of the edges and base. The fill of [1011] comprised mid grey brown sandy silt with frequent limestone fragments and no finds.

The southern extent of Trench 10 revealed the terminal end of a possible curvilinear anomaly approximately 0.22m wide and 0.22m deep exhibiting sloping sides descending to a small rounded base, and filled by mid brown sandy silt (1008). No datable evidence was retrieved from this feature.

Trench 11 (fig: 9c)

Trench 11 targeted the small enclosure located in the southeast corner of the site. Initial machining down to the limestone brash proved inconclusive so the decision was made to excavate more material from the north-east end of the trench prior to backfilling. An exploratory sondage was excavated, removing 0.3m of limestone with no sign of the enclosure ditch.

The earliest layer encountered comprised limestone brash (1102), sealed by mid brown clay sandy subsoil (1101) approximately 0.14m thick and subsequently covered by topsoil (1100) from which a Mesolithic – Neolithic flint flake was recovered.

Trench 12 (fig: 9d)

Trench 12 was located at the southern end of the site and targeted a dark linear anomaly aligned north to south. Upon investigation this anomaly revealed itself to be nothing more than deposits of glacial till within voids in the natural limestone brash.

Limestone brash (1200) formed the basal layer within Trench 12, subsequently sealed by red brown sandy clay subsoil (1201) and topsoil (1200).

Trench 13 (figs: 9e – 9g)

Trench 13 was located towards the southwest corner of the site and revealed single discrete feature in the form of an undated posthole.

A small posthole [1303] was cut into the natural limestone brash (1301) towards the southern end of trench 13. Slightly irregular in plan, the profile was well defined with concave sides descending to a rounded base, 0.52m wide and 0.15m deep, and filled with a mid red brown silt clay (1302).

The above was subsequently covered by topsoil (1300). A Palaeolithic flint end scraper which showed evidence of retouching was found in the topsoil of this trench.

8.0 Discussion and Conclusion

The evaluation at Land at Clapton Farm, Tinkers Lane, Wincanton, revealed a substantial Iron Age enclosure with internal pits (Figs: 5 & 6). The depth and form of the enclosure ditch

recorded to the west (Fig: 5f) may suggest a potentially defensive attitude, later re-cutting of which to a shallower feature indicates a possible change in function and to a more domestic arable purpose, possibly for corralling domestic animals.

To the south of the enclosure lay a metalled trackway (Figs: 3 & 6). The track and enclosure respect each other indicating they were contemporary in the landscape and in use at the same time. The track appears to head directly towards the periphery of the southernmost group of potential barrows which lie to the west of the proposed solar farm site (Fig: 2 not mitigated). The track may therefore have had some ceremonial purpose as well as being a general thoroughfare; the probable round barrow features are likely to be Bronze Age in date and were therefore part of the established landscape of the Iron Age community identified here. The track may therefore have earlier, Bronze Age origins which may require further investigation. It is interesting that these probable barrows lie at the top of the west facing slope of Tinkers Hill, and would therefore have been prominent features in the open Bronze Age landscape. Many barrow cemeteries are found in prominent position such as this. Bronze Age occupation has been identified to the north of the site, around the head of the valley the barrows overlook.

The western apex of the enclosure revealed a group of three small enclosures, the largest of which targeted by Trench 4 (Fig: 4) comprised a double ditched enclosure, almost mimicking the layout of the larger enclosure with its 'pointed' western apex. Two smaller potential ring ditches (Figs: 5 & 7) appear to flank the western apex of the large enclosure and together may form smaller livestock enclosures or potential barrows.

A partial enclosure (Fig: 8) located to the south-east of the site appears to align with the juncture of the south-eastern corner of the large enclosure, probably truncated by the alignment of the metalled trackway and flanked to the south by a large pit containing heat affected material and the terminal end of another small, potential ring ditch.

Investigation of the small square enclosure to the southeast proved negative despite removing more material from Trench 11 in an effort to locate it. However, the presence of this anomaly and the enclosure it likely represents should not be discounted and there remains the distinct possibility that weathering of an open area may reveal its location if originally backfilled with limestone rubble.

The artefact and finds assemblage from this evaluation are strong evidence for domestic occupation both within and in the vicinity of the proposed solar farm site. The pottery corpus largely dates from the Iron Age, with some ware and fabric types extending the timeframe from the late Bronze Age to 1st century Roman Britain. Overall the vast majority of the wares present are Iron Age in date, and the forms are jars or bowls. This combined with the density of the pottery suggests a domestic setting. The presence of the saddle querns is also indicative of a prehistoric domestic site; in Iron Age communities grain was often stored close to occupation sites where small quantities could be processed as required. Saddle querns would therefore have been a common feature in a domestic setting.

The animal bone corpus is predominantly sheep/goat. In the mid-late Iron Age sheep/goat were the most commonly kept domesticated agricultural animals, requiring minimal supervision and being smaller and therefore easier to handle and coral. The shift towards cattle dominated farming occurs in the 1st century with the introduction of farming techniques from the continent. There was no evidence of butchery on the recovered animal bones, and although a small number showed evidence of burning this is thought to have represented inccidential events. Canine gnawing of a small number of the bones would indicate the dog/fox bones are likely to be dog, however their gracile appearance would suggest fox. Fox is not the only wild animal species to be identified in the assemblage; Roe deer bone is also identified, showing that wild animals were being hunted, possibly for consumption, but low numbers suggest this was restricted to when the opportunity presented and supplemental to the diet rather than commonly occurring.

The environmental data indicates the setting of this Iron Age community was open grassland, with spelt wheat and barley being grown in arable fields interspersed with weed species. The presence of hazel in many of the samples would suggest this natural resource grew in the immediate area and was exploited, much like the wild animal species were hunted when available. The relatively low amount of chaff in the samples generally, and the concentration in (505) and (411) may indicate seasonal activity at the time of deposition, or the processing of small quantity of grain as required.

The presence of the two fragments of iron working slag from the evaluation is evidence of small scale metal working in the vicinity. Evidence of burning was noted in a small number of the features, but no confirmed hearths etc. were encountered in the evaluation. Small scale metal working was probably undertaken in the vicinity as it is unlikely that the slag waste would have been transported very far before disposal, but the metal working is perhaps slightly removed from the focus of the enclosures identified here.

This evidence together indicates primarily agricultural activity in very close proximity to domestic occupation, however there is very limited evidence for domestic buildings on the site, just one possible drip gully indicating a small roundhouse was identified in Trench 5, while a circular anomaly targeted in Trench 8 may be another such building or the remains of an earlier funerary monument. The main focus of occupation does not appear to lie within this site but there is strong evidence for an established community in the vicinity throughout much of the Iron Age. Roman and Bronze Age occupation, and Iron Age storage pits, have been found c.1.5km north of the site, and it is considered likely that the focus of Iron Age occupation probably lies in this direction, off of the exposed hilltop of Tinkers Hill.

9.0 Effectiveness of Methodology

Intrusive evaluation was an appropriate method for gathering further information about the sites archaeological potential. The evaluation confirmed the presence of the large enclosure and the majority of the other features targeted by the geophysics, however the smaller enclosure in the southeastern corner of the site was not identified. Trenches were positioned based on the georeferenced geophysics therefore it is unlikely this trench was simply misplaced, however the reasons for not identifying the targeted anomaly is unclear. The largely positive results of the evaluation mean it is highly likely the other anomalies identified in this field are evidence of archaeological activity, the form of some of the anomalies suggestive of prehistoric funerary remains.

To fully understand the extent and form of the enclosure and its internal components, along with the external satellite enclosures/ring ditches to the south and west further work may be necessary. This evaluation yielded a significant body of data in terms of artefactual and ecofactual evidence; further work on the site and its surrounds may be anticipated to yield a larger corpus of material which would add to the understanding of the occupation and activity in the area in the later prehistoric – early Roman period.

The body of data produced by this evaluation is considered sufficient to inform the planning and development process, and any further required mitigation strategy developed in relation to the forthcoming planning application.

10.0 Project Archive

The site records, currently in the custody of PCAS, will be deposited with a printed copy of the full report at Somerset County Museums Service where it can be accessed using the accession number TTNCM 40/2015. A digital copy of the full report will be uploaded to OASIS, where it will be accessible via the ADS website.

11.0 Acknowledgements

Pre-Construct Archaeological Services would like to thank British Solar Renewables. for this commission.

12.0 References

Bunn, 2015, Archaeological Geophysical Survey: Land at Clapton Farm, Tinkers Hill, Wincanton, Somerset. Client report by Pre-Construct Geophysics.

Evans, P, forthcoming, *Environmental Statement: Heritage Chapter: Clapton Farm, Tinkers Hill, Wincanton, Somerset.* Prepared by PCAS Ltd.

Grove, J. & Croft, B, 2012, *The Archaeology of South West England: South West Archaeological Research Framework Research Strategy 2012-2017*, Somerset Heritage Service, Taunton

Lane, A, 2015, *Written Scheme of Investigation: Archaeological Evaluation on land at Clapton Farm, Tinkers Hill, Tinkers Lane, Wincanton, Somerset, BA9 8LH.* SWHeritage approved document by PCAS

http://domesdaymap.co.uk/

http://www.heritagegateway.org.uk/Gateway/

http://list.historicengland.org.uk/mapsearch.aspx

http://mapapps.bgs.ac.uk/geologyofbritain/home.html

https://www.old-maps.co.uk

http://www.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/benchmarks/

http://www.swheritage.org.uk/

Appendix 1: Plates



Plate 1: General shot of site looking south.



Plate 3: Trench 1 looking north showing excavated ditches [102] & [103]



Plate 2: General shot of site looking southwest.



Plate 4: South-east facing section of ditch [103].



Plate 5: South-east facing section of ditch re-cut [102].



Plate 6: Metalled trackway surface (302) looking west.



Plate 7: Trench 4 looking south-east.



Plate 9: East facing section of enclosure ditch [410].



Plate 8: Trench 4 looking north-west.



Plate 10: Trench 5 looking south-east.



Plate 11: Ring ditch [507] looking east.



Plate 12: North-east facing section of large enclosure ditch [502] & re-cut [506].



Plate 13: Metalled trackway surface (605) looking west.



Plate 14: South facing section of pit [608].



Plate 15: East facing section of large enclosure ditch [603].





Plate 16: Trench 7 looking north-west.



Plate 17: North facing section of pit [704].



Plate 18: South-west facing section of ring ditch [802].



Plate 19: North-east facing section of gully [1002]





Plate 20: South facing section of pit [1007].



Plate 21: Terminal end of possible ring ditch [1009] looking south.



Plate 23: Trench 11 looking north-east, showing machine investigation of the small enclosure to the south-east of the site.



Plate 24: South-east facing section of machine sondage in Trench 11, showing no indication of enclosure ditch.

СТХ	Туре	Description	Dimensions
100	Layer	Topsoil	0.22m thick
101	Layer	Natural limestone brash	
102	Cut	N-S aligned ditch re-cut (post-medieval?)	3.9m wide/0.9m deep
103	Cut	N-S aligned ditch 9post-medieval?)	2.2m wide/0.78m deep
104	Fill	Single orange brown silty clay fill of [102]. SF Δ 6: Fe object, SF Δ 7 Fe object	0.9m thick
105	Fill	Light orange brown silty clay fill of [103]	0.78m thick

Trench 2

200	Layer	Topsoil. Single sherd of LIA-RB pottery	0.2m thick
201	Layer	Orange brown silty clay subsoil	0.14m thick
202	Layer	Natural limestone brash	

Trench 3

300	Layer	Topsoil	0.24m thick
301	Deposit	Mid brown sandy silt (silting of trackway surface	0.15m thick
		(302)	
302	Surface	Metalled surface of worn/smooth limestone	1.5m wide
303	Fill	Mid brown sandy silt fill of [304]. IA pottery	0.15m thick
304	Cut	Shallow pit.	0.9m wide/0.15m
			deep
305	Layer	Natural limestone brash	

400	Layer	Topsoil. LIA-RB pottery	0.2m thick
401	Layer	Natural limestone brash	
402	Cut	Inner ditch for small enclosure.	1.34m wide/0.38m
403	Fill	Light brown silty sand, single fill of ditch [402]. LIA pottery, animal bone, SF Δ 8: Fe object. \Diamond 4	0.38m thick
404	Cut	Small posthole	0.43m wide/0.27m deep
405	Fill	Dark red brown fill of posthole [404]	0.27m thick
406	Cut	Inner gully for small enclosure	0.45m wide/0.23m deep
407	Fill	Light brown silty sand, single fill of gully [406]	0.23m deep
408	Cut	Outer ditch for small enclosure	1.55m wide/0.38m deep
409	Fill	Light to mid brown silty sand, single fill of [408]. Animal bone	0.38m deep
410	Cut	Outer ditch for small enclosure	1.27m wide/0.4m deep
411	Fill	Light to mid brown silty sand, single fill of [410]. IA pottery, animal bone. ◊7	0.4m deep

500	Layer	Topsoil	0.19m thick
501	Layer	Natural Limestone brash	
502	Cut	Enclosure ditch (Western corner).	2.24m wide/1.56m deep
503	Fill	Light brown silty clay, frequent limestone fragments. Fill of enclosure ditch re-cut [506]. LBA-IA pottery, animal bone	0.78m thick
504	Fill	Light to mid brown silty clay. Upper fill of enclosure ditch [502]. LBA-IA pottery, animal bone and human bone.	0.74m thick
505	Fill	Light orange brown silty clay. Basal fill of enclosure ditch [502]. SF∆12: Bone pin, ◊1	0.55m thick
506	Cut	Re-cut of enclosure ditch (Western corner)	1.66m wide/0.78m deep
507	Cut	Ring ditch	0.6m wide/0.13m deep
508	Fill	Mid brown silty sand. Single fill of ring ditch [507]. Same as (510) (511). IA pottery, animal bone, flint (Mesolithic-Neolithic), ◊2	0.13m thick
509	Void		
510	Fill	Same as (508). IA pottery, animal bone	0.13m thick
511	Fill	Same as (508)	0.13m thick

600	Layer	Topsoil. IA pottery	0.13m thick
601	Fill	Mid to dark grey silty sand. Upper fill of enclosure	0.2m thick
		ditch [603]. Mid-late 1 st century RB pottery, animal	
		bone, slag, flint (prehistoric)	
602	Fill	Light to mid grey silty sand. Fill of enclosure ditch	0.18m
		[603]. Animal bone	
603	Cut	Enclosure ditch (Southern end)	2.5m wide/0.5m
			thick
604	Deposit	Mid brown clay sand. (silting of trackway surface	0.18m thick
		(605). Animal bone, flint (Mesolithic-Neolithic)	
605	Surface	Metalled surface of worn/smooth limestone. IA	2.7m wide
		pottery, animal bone	
606	Fill	Dark brown silty sand. Upper fill of pit [608]. IA	0.18m thick
		pottery, animal bone, SF Δ 1: Bone disc	
607	Fill	Light to mid brown silty sand, frequent limestone	0.3m thick
		inclusions. Fill of pit [608]. LIA-?Roman pottery,	
		animal bone. ◊6	
608	Cut	Cut for large pit	2m diameter/0.8m
			deep
609	Fill	Light brown silty sand. Fill of pit [608]. Animal bone	0.22m thick
610	Fill	Mid brown silty sand, some clay. Well defined tip line	0.1m thick
		in pit [608]	
611	Fill	Grey brown silty sand, frequent large limestone	0.25m thick
		fragments. Basal deposit in pit [608]	
612	Fill	Mid to dark brown silty sand. Lower fill of pit [608]	0.3m deep
613	Fill	Mid orange brown sandy silt. Lowest deposit	0.2m+ thick
		recorded in enclosure ditch [603]	
614	Layer	Natural Limestone brash	

700	Layer	Topsoil. Flint (prehistoric)	0.13m thick
701	Fill	Mid brown silty sand, frequent large limestone	0.2m thick
		inclusions. Fill of pit [704]. LIA-?Roman pottery,	
		animal bone, SF Δ 10&11: fragments of saddle qern	
702	Fill	Pale brown grey silty sand, frequent large limestone	0.18m thick
		inclusions, evidence of burning. Lower fill of pit [704].	
		IA pottery, animal bone. ◊5	
703	Fill	Mid brown grey silty sand, frequent limestone	0.27m thick
		inclusions. Basal fill of pit [704]. IA pottery	
704	Cut	Circular pit	1.8m
			diameter/0.7m
			deep
705	Layer	Natural limestone brash	
706	Fill	Mid brown silty sand, small limestone inclusions.	0.21m thick
		Upper fill of pit [704]	

Trench 8

800	Layer	Topsoil	0.18m thick
801	Layer	Natural limestone brash	
802	Cut	Ring ditch	0.53m wide/0.19m deep
803	Fill	Red brown silty clay. Single fill of ring ditch [802]. IA pottery. ◊8	0.19m thick

Trench 9

900	Layer	Topsoil	0.22m thick
901	Layer	Natural limestone brash	

1000	Layer	Topsoil. Roman pottery	0.26m thick
1001	Fill	Mid grey brown sandy silt, frequent limestone inclusions. Single fill of gully [1002]. Roman pottery, animal bone	0.2m thick
1002	Cut	Gully cut for possible partial enclosure	0.54m wide/0.2m deep
1003	Fill	Mid grey brown sandy silt, occasional large limestone fragments, evidence of burning. Upper fill of pit [1007]. Slag	0.15m thick
1004	Fill	Mid brown grey sandy silt, occasional large limestone fragments, evidence of burning. Fill of pit [1007]	0.3m thick
1005	Fill	Mid to dark grey sandy silt. Lower fill of pit [1007]. Roman pottery, animal bone, SF∆5: Rubberstone pebble rubber smooth on one side. Possible muller used with saddle quern.	0.03m thick
1006	Fill	Mixed mid grey to red brown and 'creamy' white sandy silt. Fill of pit [1007]. IA pottery, animal bone, SF Δ 3&9: Possible muller used with saddle quern. \Diamond 3	0.18m thick
1007	Cut	Sub-Circular pit	1.5m diameter/0.5m deep
1008	Fill	Mid brown sandy silt. Single fill of Gully terminus [1009]	0.24m deep

1009	Cut	North – south aligned gully terminus	0.22 -0.52m wide/0.12 – 0.24m deep
1010	Fill	Mid grey brown sandy silt, frequent limestone inclusions. Single fill of possible pit [1011]	0.25m thick
1011	Cut	Possibly circular pit or tree throw	0.75m wide/0.25m deep
1012	Fill	Mid brown sandy silt. Slumped deposit within pit [1007]	0.32m thick
1013	Fill	Pale grey to 'creamy' white sandy silt. Basal fill of pit [1007]	0.03m thick
1014	Layer	Natural Limestone brash	

1100	Layer	Topsoil. Flint (Mesolithic, possibly Palaeolithic)	0.22m thick
1101	Layer	Mid brown clay sand subsoil	0.14m thick
1102	Layer	Natural limestone brash	

Trench 12

1200	Layer	Topsoil	0.25m thick
1201	Layer	Mid red brown clay sand	0.07m thick
1203	Layer	Natural limestone brash	

1300	Layer	Topsoil. Flint (Palaeolithic)	0.28m thick
1301	Layer	Natural limestone brash	
1302	Fill	Mid red brown silt clay, occasional limestone fragments. Single fill of small posthole [1303]	0.15m thick
1303	Cut	Small possible posthole	0.52m wide/0.15m deep

Appendix 3: Clapton Farm, Tinkers Lane, Wincanton, Somerset (CFWE15, ST 75707 28700): The Prehistoric and Roman pottery assessment

I.M. Rowlandson October 29th 2015

Introduction

Two hundred and sixty-two fragments were presented for study (1.887kg, RE 0.75). The pottery present could be dated from the first millennium BC to sometime the early Roman period and the majority of the sherds could be attributed to and Iron Age or 1st century AD date. The pottery ranged from fresh to abraded with five fresh groups of twenty-five sherds or more present. Three vessels from context 503 and a further example from context 703 had evidence of internal carbonised cooking residues. The vessel forms present were predominantly handmade jars. The range of fabrics fits is similar to contemporary groups from Cadbury Castle (Barrett et al. 2000).

Methodology

The pottery has been archived using count and weight as measures according to the guidelines laid down for the minimum archive by *The Study Group for Roman Pottery* (Darling 2004) using the codes developed by the City of Lincoln Archaeological Unit- CLAU (see Darling and Precious 2014). The East Midlands Iron Age form code system developed by Knight (1998) has been used to characterise the attributes of the handmade pottery. A concordance of the fabrics has been made with the descriptions of the pottery from Cadbury Castle (Woodward 2000) and the National Roman Fabric Reference Collection (Tomber and Dore 1998) and form parallels have been made with the Cadbury Castle form series (Woodward 2000).

Rim equivalents (RE) have been recorded and an attempt at a 'maximum' vessel estimate has been made following Orton (1975, 31). The archive record (tabulated below at the end of the report) is an integral part of this report and will be curated in an Access database, available from the author in a digital format.

Results

Dating summary

Presented below is a tabulated summary of the dating for the ceramics by context. Full descriptions and parallels are included in the pottery archive data (tabulated at the end of this report). The dates provided represent the pottery recorded here: the main text of the report and other specialist contributions should be consulted to ascertain the overall date attributed to each context.

			Preh	istoric and Roman pottery dating summary			
F No	F Туре	Context	Spot date	Comments	Sherd	Weight (g)	Total RE %
0200	Topsoil	0200	LIA- Roman	A tiny fragment from a Black Burnished ware I vessel.	1	5	0
0304	Pit	0303	IA	A small very abraded group of calcareous handmade sherds.	3	6	0
0400	Topsoil	0400	LIA- Roman	Very abraded sherds from a coarse quartz- gritted necked jar or bowl.	2	15	0
0402	Ditch	0403	LIA	A medium sized group of calcareous gritted sherds including a bead-rimmed jar.	41	154	7
0410	Ditch	0411	IA	A small very abraded group of calcareous handmade sherds.	3	4	0
0506	Ditch	0503	LBA-IA	A medium sized group of calcareous gritted sherds including two jar with in-turned rims. This would fit with Cadbury Castle Ceramic Assemblages 4-8 (Woodward 2000).	46	525	14

			Preh	istoric and Roman pottery dating summary			
F No	F Туре	Context	Comments	Sherd	Weight (g)	Total RE %	
0502	Ditch	0504	LBA-IA	A medium sized group of calcareous gritted sherds including a large jar with an in-turned rim and a finer bead-rimmed jar. This would fit with Cadbury Castle Ceramic Assemblages 4-8 (Woodward 2000).	29	290	14
0507	Ring ditch	0508	IA	A single calcareous handmade sherd.	1	2	0
0507	Ring ditch	0510	IA	A small very abraded group of calcareous handmade sherds.	2	2	0
0600	Topsoil	0600	IA	A small very abraded group of calcareous handmade sherds.	2	5	0
0603	Ditch	0601	ML1	A small group including handmade calcareous sherds and a wheel made grog-gritted jar possibly of Savernake type. Also present were sherds from Black Burnished ware I bead- rimmed jars (Seager Smith 1993 Type 16) and a necked jar with cordon decoration (Seager Smith 1993 Type 17). This would fit with Cadbury Castle Ceramic Assemblage 9 (Woodward 2000).	51	294	20
0605	Surface	0605	IA	A small very abraded group of calcareous handmade sherds.	7	29	0
0608	Pit	0606	IA	A small very abraded group of calcareous handmade sherds.	7	29	0
0608	Pit	0607	LIA- ?Roman	Two handmade sherds.	2	14	0
0704	Pit	0701	LIA- ?Roman	A small group of handmade sherds including shell and oolitic gritted sherds, two sherds of Black Burnished ware I were also present.	18	148	4
0704	Pit	0702	IA	Handmade sherds from a single vessel.	3	8	0
0704	Pit	0703	IA	A single handmade sherd.	1	17	0
0802	Ring ditch	0803	IA	A small group including shell-gritted sherds.	3	8	0
1000	Topsoil	1000	Roman	A small group including a grey ware sherd.	1	7	0
1002	Gully	1001	Roman	A small group including grey ware, shell-gritted and grog-gritted wares.	8	61	0
1007	Pit	1005	Roman	A small group including handmade shell-gritted wares and a single abraded grey ware sherd.	5	13	2
1007	Pit	1006	IA	A medium sized group mostly consisting of sherds from a handmade shell-gritted jar with a triangular rim. This would fit with Cadbury Castle Ceramic Assemblages 6-7 (Woodward 2000).	26	251	14

Forms and fabrics

	Fabric Summary											
Fabric code	Fabric group	Fabric details	Cadbury Castle	NRFRC	Sherd	Sherd %	Weight (g)	Weight %	Total RE %			
ОХ	Oxidised	Misc. oxidized wares	-	-	1	0.38%	2	0.11%	0			

		Fabri	c Summa	ry					
Fabric code	Fabric group	Fabric details	Cadbury Castle	NRFRC	Sherd	Sherd %	Weight (g)	Weight %	Total RE %
BB1	Reduced	Black burnished 1, unspecified	h	SOW BB1	38	14.50%	211	11.18%	20
GREY?	Reduced	Miscellaneous grey wares	-	-	2	0.76%	9	0.48%	0
IASA1	Reduced	Iron Age Sandy: Site Fabric 1	S	-	14	5.34%	65	3.44%	0
IASA2	Reduced	Iron Age Sandy: Site Fabric 2- as coarser range of <i>fabric h</i> with moderate coarse quartzite	h?	-	5	1.91%	38	2.01%	7
IAOOL2	Calcareous	Iron Age- Early Roman oolithic-gritted coarse wares	е	-	45	17.18%	275	14.57%	15
IASH1	Calcareous	Iron Age Shell Gritted: Site Fabric 1	с	-	149	56.87%	1155	61.21%	33
IASH3	Calcareous	Iron Age Shell Gritted; Site Fabric 3	i	-	1	0.38%	32	1.70%	0
IAGROG	Grog	Iron Age Grog tempered wares	t	-	2	0.76%	49	2.60%	0
SAVGT	Grog	Savernake Grog-tempered ware	-	SAV GT	1	0.38%	30	1.59%	0
FCLAY	Fired Clay	Fired Clay	-	-	4	1.53%	21	1.11%	0

	Form Summary													
Form	Form Type	Form Description	Sherd	Sherd %	Weight (g)	Weight %	Total RE %							
-	Unknown	Form uncertain	186	70.99%	880	46.63%	0							
CLSD	Closed	Form	5	1.91%	46	2.44%	0							
J	Jar	Unclassified form	23	8.78%	253	13.41%	0							
JB	Jar/Bowl	Unclassified form	3	1.15%	8	0.42%	2							
JBL	Jar/Bowl	Large	5	1.91%	128	6.78%	0							
JBR	Jar	Bead rimmed	8	3.05%	83	4.40%	34							
JEV	Jar	Everted rim	1	0.38%	4	0.21%	4							
JFT	Jar	Flat-topped rim	22	8.40%	234	12.40%	14							
JIR	Jar	In-turned rim	7	2.67%	200	10.60%	21							
JL	Jar	Large	1	0.38%	42	2.23%	0							
JNK	Jar	Necked	1	0.38%	9	0.48%	0							

The pottery present was mostly made up of shell or oolithic-gritted handmade sherds. The prevalence of these types should be no surprise given the location of the site on Jurassic deposits. The forms present in these fabrics consisted of simple jars with in-turned rims, rounded partially beaded rim types and simple everted rims. The range of these vessels present can probably be attributed to the Iron Age. Small quantities of contemporary grog or shell and grog-gritted wares were also present. On the basis of the limited evidence from this group it was not certain if the sand and quartzite fabric IASA2 could be attributed an exclusively later Iron Age date.

The present of Poole Harbour wares/Black Burnished ware 1 vessels including bead rimmed jars and necked jars with cordoned decoration and a sherd from a hollow pedestal base were also noteworthy suggesting that the occupation of the site continued into the later Iron Age and such vessels dominate assemblages of this period at Cadbury Castle (Leach 2000, 220-1, Ceramic Assemblage 9). A similar coarser variant (IASA1) was also retrieved including a bead rimmed jar similar to those in more recognisably BB1 type fabrics. A single sherd of Savernake type grog-gritted ware suggests activity on the site at least as late as the Neronian period or perhaps into the later 1st century AD.

There was little amongst the assemblage to suggest that occupation continued further into the Roman period with only small scraps of oxidised and grey wares present.

Discussion of Potential

The assemblage demonstrates evidence of activity beginning perhaps as early as the late Bronze Age or Iron Age continuing into the 1st century AD. Earlier investigations in the vicinity of the site have produced evidence for contemporary groups and the freshness of a few of the larger groups it would appear that prehistoric settlement existed on the site.

Recommendations

The pottery is stable and this assemblage should be deposited in the relevant local museum along with the rest of the pottery from the scheme. In the event of further investigations on the site the retrieval of larger groups of Prehistoric and Roman pottery should be expected. None of the pottery here is worthy of illustration as it can be paralleled to existing corpora although further investigations on the sight might produce more significant groups of vessels.

References

Barrett, J. C., Freeman, P. W. M. and Woodward, A., 2000, Cadbury Castle, Somerset: The Later prehistoric and early historic archaeology, English Heritage Archaeological report 20

Darling, M.J., 2004, Guidelines for the archiving of Roman Pottery. *Journal of Roman Pottery Studies* 11, 67-74.

Darling, M.J. and Precious, B.J., 2014, *Corpus of Roman Pottery from Lincoln*, Lincoln Archaeological Studies No. 6, Oxbow Books, Oxford

Knight, D. 1998, Guidelines for the Recording of Later Prehistoric Pottery from the East Midlands, unpublished Trent and Peak Archaeology report

Leach, P., 2000, The Late Cadbury 'Roman' Ceramics, in Barrett et al., 219-223

Orton, C. R., 1975, Quantitative pottery studies, some progress, problems and prospects. *Science and Archaeology* 17, 30-5

PCRG, 1997, The Study of Later Prehistoric Pottery: General Policies and Guidelines for analysis and Publications, Prehistoric Ceramic Research Group, Occasional Paper No1 and No2, Revised 1997

Seager Smith, R. and Davies, S.M. 1993, The Roman Pottery from Excavations at Greyhound Yard, Dorchester, Dorset. *In Woodward et al.*, 229-289

Tomber, R. and Dore, J., 1998, The National Roman Fabric Reference Collection: A Handbook, MoLAS Monograph 2, Museum Of London

Woodward, A., 2000, The late Bronze Age and Iron Age ceramic type series, in Barrett et al., 325-346

Woodward, P.J, Davies, S.M. and Graham, A. H, 1993, Excavations at the Old Methodist Chapel and Greyhound Yard, Dorchester 1981-1984. Dorset Natural History and archaeological Society Monograph Series 12

							Pr	ehistoric and F	Roman pottery archive data				
Context	Fabric	Form	Rim	Body	Base	Decoration	Vessels	Alt	Comments	Sherd	Weight (g)	Rim diam	Rim eve
0200	BB1	-	-	-	FLP	НМ	1		BASE; R	1	5	0	0
0303	IAOOL2	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	ABR	BS; IRF	1	2	0	0
0303	IASH1	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	ABR	BS; R	1	2	0	0
0303	οх	-	-	-	-	НМ	1	VAB	BS; ROMAN?; SMALL SCRAP	1	2	0	0
0400	IASA1	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	VAB	BS; R	2	15	0	0
0403	IASA2	JBR	BEAD	OV/GLOB	-	НМ	1	ABR	RIM; R; CADBURY JC2	1	10	18	7
0403	IASH1	-	-	-	-	НМ	24		BS; IRF; ?NO OF VESSELS	24	46	0	0
0403	IASH1	J	-	OV	-	НМ	1		BS SHLDR; IRF; NEAR RIM	1	10	0	0
0403	IASH1	l	-	ΟV	-	НМ	1		BS; OX/R	15	88	0	0
0411	IAOOL2	-	-	U	-	НМ	1		BS	2	2	0	0
0411	IASH1	-	-	U	-	нм	1	ABR	BS	1	2	0	0
0503	IAOOL2	-	-	-	U	НМ	1	CARBON DEP	BS; IRF	1	7	0	0
0503	IAOOL2	JIR	RD	GLOB	-	НМ	1		RIM; IRF; CADBURY PA3	5	99	22	9
0503	IASA1	CLSD	-	U	-	НМ	1		BS; R	1	9	0	0
0503	IASA2	-	-	U	-	НМ	1		BS; OX	1	13	0	0
0503	IASH1	-	-	U	-	НМ	1		BS; IRF	1	3	0	0
0503	IASH1	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	CARBON DEP	BS; R	1	4	0	0
0503	IASH1	-	-	U	-	НМ	2	ABR	BS; IRF	2	9	0	0
0503	IASH1	-	-	U	-	НМ	27		BS; IRF; ?NO OF VESSELS	27	195	0	0
0503	IASH1	l	-	OV/GLOB	-	НМ	1		BS; OX	5	119	0	0
0503	IASH1	JIR	FD	GLOB	-	НМ	1		RIM; IRF; ?DIA; CADBURY PA3	1	35	30	5
0503	IASH3	J	-	OV/GLOB	-	нм	1	CARBON DEP	BS; R	1	32	0	0

							Pr	ehistoric and	Roman pottery archive data				
Context	Fabric	Form	Rim	Body	Base	Decoration	Vessels	Alt	Comments	Sherd	Weight (g)	Rim diam	Rim eve
0504	FCLAY	-	-	-	-	-	1		FORMLESS; OX; CLAY PELLETS & CALC	2	13	0	0
0504	IAGROG	-	-	-	FLT	HM?	1	ABR	BS; R	1	26	0	0
0504	IAOOL2	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	ABR	BS; IRF	1	4	0	0
0504	IASA2	-	-	U	-	НМ	1		BS; R	1	5	0	0
0504	IASH1	-	-	OV/GLOB	-	НМ	1		BS; IRF	1	29	0	0
0504	IASH1	-	-	U	-	НМ	20	ABR	BS; IRF; NO OF VESSELS	20	92	0	0
0504	IASH1	JBR	BEAD	OV/GLOB	-	НМ	1	ABR	RIM; IRF; CADBURY JC2	1	13	14	7
0504	IASH1	JIR	FD	OV/GLOB	-	нм	1		BS; OX/R; CADBURY PA3	1	66	33	7
0504	IASH1	JL	-	OV/GLOB	-	HM; CORD	1	VAB	BS; IRF	1	42	0	0
0508	IASH1	-	-	U	-	нм	1	ABR	BS; R	1	2	0	0
0510	IASH1	-	-	U	-	нм	1	VAB	BS; OX	2	2	0	0
0600	IAOOL2	-	-	U	-	нм	1	ABR	BS; OX/R; THIN SHERD	2	5	0	0
0601	BB1	-	-	-	-	нм	26		BS; R; ?NO OF VESSELS	26	107	0	0
0601	BB1	CLSD	-	-	FLT	HM?	1		BASE; R	1	5	0	0
0601	BB1	CLSD	-	-	HPED	HM?	1		BASE; R;HOLLOW PEDISTAL- CADBURY BS1	1	16	0	0
0601	BB1	JBR	BEAD	OV/GLOB	-	HM?	1		RIM; R; AS SEAGER SMITH 1993 TYPE 16; CADBURY JC3.6/BC3.3	2	9	16	6
0601	BB1	JBR	BEAD	OV/GLOB	-	HM?	1		RIM; R; AS SEAGER SMITH 1993 TYPE 16; CADBURY JC3.6	2	32	18	4
0601	BB1	JBR	BEAD	OV/GLOB	-	HM?	1		RIM; R; AS SEAGER SMITH 1993 TYPE 16; CADBURY JC3.6/BC3.3	1	12	20	4
0601	BB1	JBR	BEAD	OV/GLOB	-	HM?	1	BURNT	RIM; IRF; AS SEAGER SMITH 1993 TYPE 16; CADBURY JC3.6/BC3.3	1	7	0	2
0601	BB1	JNK	-	NJ/NB	-	HM?; CORD	1		BS SHLDR; R; CORDON SHLDR AS SEAGER SMITH 1993 TYPE 17/ CADBURY BD2	1	9	0	0
0601	FCLAY	-	-	-	-		1		BS; OXIDISED; FORMLESS	2	8	0	0
0601	IAOOL2	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	ABR	BS; R	1	4	0	0

							Pr	ehistoric and F	Roman pottery archive data				
Context	Fabric	Form	Rim	Body	Base	Decoration	Vessels	Alt	Comments	Sherd	Weight (g)	Rim diam	Rim eve
0601	IASA1	-	-	U	-	НМ	7	ABR	BS; R; NO OF VESSELS; COARSER THAN BB1	7	28	0	0
0601	IASH1	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	ABR	BS; OX	1	7	0	0
0601	IASH1	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	ABR	BS; R	3	19	0	0
0601	IASH1	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	ABR	BS; R; SCRAP	1	1	0	0
0601	SAVGT	JBL	-	-	-		1		BASE	1	30	0	0
0605	IAOOL2	-	-	U	-	НМ	4	ABR	BS; IRF	4	11	0	0
0605	IAOOL2	CLSD	-	-	FLT	НМ	1	ABR	BASE; IRF	2	16	0	0
0605	IASH1	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	ABR	BS; IRF	1	2	0	0
0606	IAOOL2	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	ABR	BS; IRF	2	10	0	0
0606	IASA2	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	ABR	BS; R	2	10	0	0
0606	IASH1	-	-	U	-	НМ	3	VAB	BS; IRF	3	9	0	0
0607	IAOOL2	-	-	U	-	HM	1	VAB	BS; IRF; ?FABRIC	1	9	0	0
0607	IASH1	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	VAB	BS; IRF	1	5	0	0
0701	BB1	-	-	U	-	HM; BWL	1		BS; R	2	9	0	0
0701	IAOOL2	-	-	U	-	HM	11		BS; IRF; ?NO OF VESSELS	11	58	0	0
0701	IAOOL2	JEV	EVR	-	-	HM	1	ABR	RIM; IRF; BROADLY CADBURY JB4.2	1	4	15	4
0701	IASA1	-	-	-	-		1		BS	1	2	0	0
0701	IASH1	JBL	-	-	FLT	НМ	1	VAB	BASE	3	75	0	0
0702	IAOOL2	-	-	U	-	HM	1	ABR	BS; IRF	3	8	0	0
0703	IAOOL2	-	-	U	-	нм	1	CARBON DEP INT	BS; IRF	1	17	0	0
0803	IAOOL2	-	-	U	-	нм	3	ABR	BS; IRF	3	8	0	0
1000	GREY?	-	-	-	-		1	VAB	BS; ?FABRIC	1	7	0	0
1001	IAGROG	JBL	-	-	FLT	НМ	1	ABR	BS; R	1	23	0	0
1001	IASA1	-	-	U	-	НМ	1	VAB	BS; OX; ?FABRIC	2	7	0	0

	Prehistoric and Roman pottery archive data												
Context	Fabric	Form	Rim	Body	Base	Decoration	Vessels	Alt	Comments	Sherd	Weight (g)	Rim diam	Rim eve
1001	IASA1	J	-	U	-	НМ	1	VAB	BS SHLDR; IRF	1	4	0	0
1001	IASH1	-	-	U	-	НМ	1		BS; IRF; VESSEL?	4	27	0	0
1005	GREY?	-	-	-	-		1	VAB	BS	1	2	0	0
1005	IAOOL2	-	-	U	-	НМ	1		BS; IRF	1	3	0	0
1005	IAOOL2	JB	U	-	-	НМ	1	ABR	RIM; IRF; SCRAP	3	8	0	2
1006	IASH1	-	-	-	-		5		BS; IRF; ?VESSEL NO	4	17	0	0
1006	IASH1	JFT	FRE	OV/GLOB	_	-	1		RIM; IRF; BROADLY AS CADBURY JB2.6	22	234	30	14

Appendix 4: Clapton Farm, Tinkers Lane, Wincanton, Somerset (CFWE 15)

The Animal Bone - By Jennifer Wood

Introduction

A total of 216 (1629g) refitted fragments of animal bone and 3 fragments (11g) of neonatal human bone were collected by hand, during trial trenching undertaken by Pre-Construct Archaeological Services Ltd at Clapton Farm, Tinkers Lane, Wincanton, Somerset.

The remains were recovered from contexts within Trenches 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 18, predominantly originating from pits, ditches, gullies, enclosure ditches and metalled surface deposits. The remains were tentatively dated as Iron Age at the time of assessment.

Methodology

The entire assemblage has been fully recorded into a database archive. Identification of the bone was undertaken with access to a reference collection and published guides. All animal remains were counted and weighed, and where possible identified to species, element, side and zone (Serjeantson 1996). Ribs and vertebrae were only recorded to species when they were substantially complete and could accurately be identified. Undiagnostic bones were recorded as micro (rodent size), small (rabbit size), medium (sheep size) or large (cattle size). The separation of sheep and goat bones was done using the criteria of Boessneck (1969) and Prummel and Frisch (1986) in addition to the use of the reference material. Where distinctions could not be made the bone was recorded as sheep/goat (S/G).

The quantification of species was carried out using the total fragment count, in which the total number of fragments of bone and teeth was calculated for each taxon. Where fresh breaks were noted, fragments were refitted and counted as one. The data produced the basic NISP (Number of Identified Specimen) counts.

The condition of the bone was graded using the criteria stipulated by Lyman (1996). Grade 0 being the best preserved bone and grade 5 indicating that the bone had suffered such structural and attritional damage as to make it unrecognisable. Also fusion data, butchery marks (Binford 1981), gnawing, burning and pathological changes were noted when present.

Tooth eruption and wear stages were measured using a combination of Halstead (1985), Grant (1982), Levine (1982) and Payne (1973), and fusion data was analysed according to Silver (1969). Measurements of adult, that is, fully fused bones were taken according to the methods of von den Driesch (1976), with asterisked (*) measurements indicating bones that were reconstructed or had slight abrasion of the surface.

Results

Condition and Taphonomy

The remains were generally of a moderate overall condition, averaging at grade 3 on the Lyman criteria (1996).

Burning

A total of 5 fragments of bone recovered from Trench 4 ditch [402] and Trench 7 pit [704] displayed evidence of burning. The burnt bone probably represented incidental burning events or hearth sweepings.

A single fragment of Cattle metatarsal recovered from Trench 6 deposit (601) displayed a smooth bone lump on the distal medial shaft, possibly representing a well healed ossified haematoma, probably traumatic in origin.

A total of four fragments of bone recovered from deposits within Trenches 5 and 6 displayed evidence of gnawing. The gnawing appears to have been canid in origin.

A sheep/goat metatarsal recovered from Trench 5 enclosure ditch [502] displayed a single drilled hole through the central midshaft. The function of the piece is uncertain, it may have been used as a toggle.

No evidence of butchery was noted within the remains.

Species Representation

Table 1 summarises the identified taxa identified within the assemblage, by cut. As can be seen, sheep/goat are the most abundant species identified within the assemblage, with a single fragment positively identified as sheep. Cattle remains are the second most abundantly identified species within the assemblage. Smaller numbers of human, equid, pig, dog/fox and roe deer was also identified. The remaining assemblage was unidentifiable beyond taxa.

Discussion

The assemblage recovered from the Land off Clapton Farm, Tinkers Lane, Wincanton, Somerset is relatively small and of a moderate overall condition.

The assemblage is too small to provide notable information on the underlying site economy, save the presence of the remains on site. The composition of the assemblage appears relatively typical for an Iron Age settlement assemblage, with a large emphasis on sheep/goat based husbandry and a suggestion of the occasional hunting of wild species. The skeletal elements represented suggest the remains were probably from a mixture of food and butchery waste.

The presence of neonatal human remains comingled with animal bone is relatively typical, as formal cemetery burial of infant remains is less common, with the tradition of burial close to settlement appearing to be more the normal practice. Although the remains were fragmentary, rough measurements of a femur would suggest that the remains were recovered from an infant aged approximately 1.5 months (Schaefer, Black and Scheuer, 2009).

In the possible event of further archaeological works, the site would be liable to produce further remains of a similar condition and nature, with moderate potential to provide further information on dietary economies and underlying husbandry practices for the site.

References

Baker, J, and Brothwell, D, 1980 Animal Diseases in Archaeology, Academic Press

Binford, L., 1981, Ancient Men and Modern Myths, New York: Academic Press.

Boessneck, J, 1969 Osteological Differences in Sheep (*Ovis aries* Linné) and Goat (*Capra hircus* Linné), in D Brothwell and E Higgs (eds) *Science in Archaeology*, Thames and Hudson, 331-358

- von den Driesch, A, 1976 A Guide to the Measurement of Animal Bones from Archaeological Sites, Peabody Museum
- Grant, A, 1982 'The Use of Tooth Wear as a Guide to the Age of Domestic Ungulates', in B Wilson *et al. Ageing and Sexing Animal Bones from Archaeological Sites*, BAR British Series 109, 91-108, Oxford
- Halstead, P, 1985 A Study of Mandibular Teeth from Romano-British Contexts at Maxey, in F Pryor, Archaeology and Environment in the Lower Welland Valley, East Anglian Archaeology Report 27:219-224
- Levine, M A, 1982 The Use of Crown Height Measurements and Eruption-Wear Sequences to Age Horse Teeth. In Wilson, B et al. *Ageing and Sexing Animal Bones from Archaeological Sites.* BAR British Series 109. 223 – 250
- Lyman, R L, 1996 Vertebrate Taphonomy, Cambridge Manuals in Archaeology, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Payne, S. 1973. Kill-off patterns in sheep and goats: the mandibles from Asvan Kale. *Anatolian Studies* 23, 139-47.
- Prummel, W and Frisch, H-J, 1986 A Guide for the distinction of species, sex and body size in bones of sheep and goat, *Journal of Archaeological Science* XIII., 567–77

Schaefer, M. Black, S. and Scheuer, L. (2009) *Juvenile Osteology: A Laboratory and Field Manual*. Academic Press, London

Trench		4			5			6			7	8	1	10	Total
Row Labels	Ditch [402]	Enclosure Ditch [408]	Enclosure Ditch [410]	Enclosure Ditch [502]	Enclosure Re-cut [506]	Ring Ditch [507]	Enclosure Ditch [603]	Sand Deposit (604)	Metalled Surface (605)	Pit [608]	Pit [704]	Ditch [802]	Gully [1002]	Sub- circular pit [1007]	
Human				3											3
Equid										1			1		2
Cattle				2	7		5		1						15
Sheep/Goat	2		1	9	7		4		10	2	2	1		1	39
Sheep					1										1
Pig					1		2								3
Dog/Fox					2										2
Roe Deer				1											1
Large Mammal			5	6	13	1	6		2	2			4	4	43
Medium Mammal	1	1	2	18	6	1	5	1	5	11	7		2	12	72
Small Mammal											1				1
Unidentified			2	17	16						2				37
N=	3	1	10	56	53	2	22	1	18	16	12	1	7	17	219

Table 1, Summary of the Identified Taxa, by Cut.

	Sample																			Froch			Tooth					
Ctxt No	No	Taxon	Element	Side	Z1	Z2	Z3	Z4	Z5	Z6	Z7	Z8	Prox	Dist	Path	Butch	Worked	Burnt	Gnaw	Break	Assoc'd	Measured	Wear	Surface	Condition	No	(g)	Notes
403		0 Medium Mammal	Long Bone	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		NX	x	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	x	3	1	0	Burnt white
403		0 Sheep/Goat	Metacarpal	R	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		NX	x	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	R	4	1	6	Barrie Mille
403	(0 Sheep/Goat	Radius	R	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1	NX	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R	4	1	3	
409	(0 Medium Mammal	Long Bone	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	1	NX	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R	4	1	3	
411		0 Unidentified	Unidentified	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	1	NX	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Х	3	2	7	
411	(0 Large Mammal	Long Bone	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	1	NX	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R	4	3	14	
411		0 Sheep/Goat	Radius	R	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N			X	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R	3	1	10	
411		U Large Mammal	RID	X D	N N	N	N	N	N	N N	IN N			x	N	N	N	N	IN N	N	IN N	N	N	ĸ	3	1	/	
411		Large Marina	нуош	n	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN			^	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	^	5	1	3	
411		0 Medium Mammal	Long Bone	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	I	NX	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	5	1	1	
411		0 Medium Mammal	Long Bone	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		NX	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	x	3	1	1	
503		0 Cattle	Tibia	R	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y		ΥX	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	x	3	1	80	
503	(0 Medium Mammal	Mandible	х	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	1	NX	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	3	1	7	
503	1	0 Large Mammal	Skull	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	1	NX	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Х	3	3	81	
503	(0 Unidentified	Unidentified	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	1	NX	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	3	16	47	
503	(0 Sheep/Goat	Metacarpal	R	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	1	NX	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	X	2	1	1	Neonatal
503	(0 Large Mammal	Long Bone	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		N X	X	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	X	2	1	9	
503			Radius	L.	N	N	Ŷ	Ý	Y	Y	N			U	N	N	N	N	IN N	N	N	N	N N	X	3	1	23	
503		0 Lattie	Scapula	L	Y	Ŷ	Ý	Y	IN N	N	N N			X	N N	N	N	N	IN N	N	N N	Y	N N	X	2	1	92	T
503		0 Cattle	Tooth	A D	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N	N N	IN N	IN N	,		×	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N	N V	x v	3	1	10	Inansverse process
503		0 Large Mammal	Mandible	x	N	N	N	N V	N	N	N			×	N	N	N	N	N	v	N	N	T N	^ X	3	1	27	Body fragment
503		0 Sheen	Mandible	R	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		NX	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	x	2	1	11	body naginent
503	(0 Cattle	Tooth	R	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		NX	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Ŷ	X	2	1	12	Lower M1=e
																												Carnivore gnawing on the
503	(0 Sheep/Goat	Radius	L	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	I	NX	х	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	х	3	1	7	proximal and distal ends
503	(0 Large Mammal	Rib	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	1	NX	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	2	1	5	
503	(0 Cattle	Mandible	R	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	I	NX	х	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Х	2	1	36	No teeth in occlusion
503	1	0 Cattle	Tooth	R	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	1	NX	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Х	2	1	11	Lower M2=b
503	(0 Sheep/Goat	Metatarsal	R	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	1	NX	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Х	2	1	5	
503		0 Medium Mammal	Long Bone	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		NX	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	x	3	4	5	
503	(0 Sheep/Goat	Metatarsal	R	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	NX	X	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	X	2	1	4	
503	(0 Sheep/Goat	Tooth	L	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	1	NX	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	2	1	5	
503	(0 Dog/Fox	Mandible	L	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	I	NX	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	х	2	1	6	Gracile. Possible fox
503	Ū	0 Dog/Fox	Mandible	R	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N		NX	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	х	2	1	5	Gracile. Possible fox
503	(0 Large Mammal	Long Bone	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	-	NX	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	2	6	17	
503	(0 Sheep/Goat	Horncore	х	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	1	NX	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	2	1	2	
503		0 Medium Mammal	Rib	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		NX	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	x	3	1	1	
503		0 Cattle	Horncore	L	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N		NX	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	x	3	.1	6	
503		0 Sheep/Goat	Mandible	R	N	Ŷ	Y	Y	N	N	N	1	NX	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	х	3	1	25	
		1																										
504	(0 Medium Mammal	Rib	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		NX	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	x	2	2	1	
504		0 Large Mammal	Scapula	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		NX	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	3	3	21	

Chit No	Sample	Tayon	Flomont	Sido	71	70	73	74	75	76	77	70	Drov	Diet	Doth	Butch	Worked	Durat	Crow	Fresh	Accord	Maggurad	Tooth	Surface	Condition	No	(7)	Notos
504	0	Large Mammal	Skull- maxilla	y Side	Z I N	22 N	23	24 N	20 N	20 N		20		DISL X	Paur	DUICH	WOIKed	Burnt	Gilaw	Dieak	ASSOCIU	N	N	y Sunace	Condition		(y)	notes
504	0	Sheep/Goat	Tooth	R	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	i x	x	N	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	Y	x		3 1	-	Lower M2=g
504	0	Sheep/Goat	Mandible	L	N	Y		' N	N	N	N	N	i X	x	N	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	x		3 1		No teeth in occlusion
504	0	Sheep/Goat	Humerus	L	N	N	N	N	Y	Y Y	Y	,	(X	F	N	N	N	N	N	I N	N	Y	N	X		3 1	14	1
504	0	Medium Mammal	Long Bone	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	I X	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	3	3 13	31	L
504	0	Unidentified	Unidentified	Х	N	N	Ν	N	N	N	N	Ν	I X	х	N	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	х	2	2 17	17	7
504	0	Sheep/Goat	Tooth	R	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	I X	х	N	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	Y	х	1	2 1	2	Lower M2=h
504	0	Madium Mananal	Long Done	~	N			N		N			. v	v									N	v		1		
504	0	Roo Deer	Long Bone Metatarcal	×	IN N	IN N	P N	I N	N	IN N	IN N	r N		×	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N			IN N	IN N	IN N	x v		2 1		Chaft fragment
504	0	Large Mammal	Long Rone	v	N	N		N	N	N	N			v	N	N	N	N			N	N	N	x		1 1	. 4	
504	0	Sheen/Goat	Tooth	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	I X	x	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	x		2 1		Broken unner molar
504	0	Cattle	Tooth	R	N	N		N	N	N	N		I X	x	N	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	x		2 1	35	Upper M2
504	0	Sheep/Goat	Tibia	R	N	N	N	N	Y	Y Y	N	N	I X	U	N	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	х	3	3 1	5	5
504	0	Medium Mammal	Long Bone	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Ν	Х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	1	2 2	8	3
		e																										
504	0	Cattle	Scapula	к	N	N	P N	Y	N	N	N	N N	/ X	x 	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	X			. 55	Carnivore gnawing on the neck
504	0	Human	Femur	L	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Ŷ	,		U r	N	N	N	N	N	Y Y	N	N	N	X	-		. 5	GL=91mm
504	0	Sneep/Goat	Ivietapodiai	~	IN N	IN N	r r	I IN	IN N	IN N	IN			F	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N			IN N	IN N	IN N	×	-	2 1		Single condyle
504	0	Large Mammai	Long Bone	A P	N V	N V	р 		N	IN N	IN V	۳ ۱	/ 11		IN N	IN N	N N	N			IN N	IN N	N	x v		2 1		3 -
504	0	Human	Tibia	N.	T N	T N	N	T N	v	v v	N	N		v v	N N	N	N	N			N	N	N	x		2 1	1	
504	0	numun	TIDIO	-										Χ										~		, <u> </u>		Hole drilled through central
																												midshaft of the bone. Function
504	0	Sheep/Goat	Metacarpal	L	Y	Y	١	Y Y	Y	Ý	N	1	f F	F	N	N	Y	N	N	I Y	N	N	N	х	1	2 1	10) unknown
504	0	Sheep/Goat	Tooth	L	N	N	Ν	N	N	N	N	Ν	I X	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	х	1	2 1	. 4	Lower M3=f
508	0	Large Mammal	Long Bone	Х	N	N	Ν	N	N	N	N	Ν	I X	х	N	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	х	4	1 1	10)
F10	0	Modium Mammal	Long Bono	~	N	N		N	N	N	N		l v	v	N	N		N	. N		N	N	N	D		1	,	
601	0	Dig		^	N V	N V	, I		v	v v	N V	, n		^ V	IN N	N	N	N			N	N	N	v	-	+ 1 2 1	12	•
601	0	Large Mammal	Long Bone	X	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	I X	x	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	N	x		2 2	33	
001	0		Long Done	~										Χ										~				Possible carnivore gnawing on
																												the proximal end. Smooth raised
																												lump on the medial distal shaft.
604		Contra												~										~			4.00	Possible healed ossified
601	0	Cattle	Metatarsal	L	Ŷ	Y	1	Y	Ŷ	Y	N	P	1 F	х	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	X	:	3 1	106	haematoma
601	0	Medium Mammal	Long Bone	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	ı x	х	N	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	х	1	3 2	3	3
601	0	Sheep/Goat	Tibia	L	N	N	١	Y Y	N	N	N	N	ιU	х	N	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	R		2 1	. 8	3
601	0	Sheep/Goat	Calcaneus	L	Y	Y	١	Y Y	Y	Ý	Y	N	U	х	N	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	х		2 1	. 3	3
601	0	Cattle	Skull- occipital	R	N	N	Ν	N	N	N	N	Ν	I X	х	N	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	х	3	3 1	14	1
601	0	Pig	Mandible	L	Y	Y	١	' N	N	N	N	Ν	I X	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	3	3 1	45	Lower canine visible in crypt
601	0	Cattle	Metacarpal	R	N	N	Ν	N	Y	Y	N	Ν	Х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	3	3 1	20)
601	0	Medium Mammal	Rib	X	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	I X	Х	N	N	N	N	N	I Y	N	N	N	X		3 1	. (Neonatal?
601	0	Sheep/Goat	Radius	R	N	N	1	N	N	N	N	N	I X	X	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R	4	1 1	4	-
601	0	Sneep/Goat	rooth	к	N	N	N N	N	N	N	N		IX I	X	N	N	I N	I N	N N	I N	N	N	N	X	1 2	4 1	4	Lower W11=e

Ctxt No.	Sample	Taxon	Flement	Side	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	Prox	Dist	Path	Butch	Worked	Burnt	Gnaw	Fresh Break	Assoc'd	Measured	Tooth Wear	Surface	Condition	No	(0)	Notes
0000110			Liomont				20			20		20		Diot		Baton	Trontou	Buint	onan	Diodit	1.00004	modourou			Contailion		(9)	
601	0	Medium Mammal	Rib	X	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	X	X	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	x	3	1	2	
601	0	Large Mammai	Skull	X D	IN N	N	N		N	N	IN N	N	X	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	IN N	IN N	N	x v	3	2	15	
602	0	Large Mammal	Humerus	ĸ	IN N	IN N			Ť	T N	IN N		×	× ×	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N	IN N	×	3		49	
602	0	Cattle	Mandible	A D	N V	N	N		N	N	IN N	N	v	^ V	IN N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	×	2	1	14	
002	0	Cattle	Manuble	n	T	IN	N		IN	IN	IN	N	^	^	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	IN	N	IN	IN	^	3		15	
602	0	Medium Mammal	Long Bone	х	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R	3	1	5	
604	0	Medium Mammal	Long Bone	x	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	x	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	з	1	7	
605	0	Sheep/Goat	Tooth	L	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	х	2	1	2	Lower M1= g
605	0	Cattle	Tooth	R	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	Х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	х	3	1	24	Lower M2=g
605	0	Sheep/Goat	Tooth	L	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	х	2	1	2	Lower M3=e
605	0	Sheep/Goat	Mandible	R	N	N	N	I N	N	Y	N	N	Х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	3	1	6	
605	0	Sheep/Goat	Tooth	R	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	Х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	х	3	1	2	Lower M1=g
605	0	Medium Mammal	Long Bone	x	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	x	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	x	з	1	0	
605	0	Sheep/Goat	Tooth	R	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	Х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	х	3	1	3	Lower M3=g
605	0	Sheep/Goat	Mandible	L	N	Y	N	I N	N	N	N	N	Х	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	3	1	3	
605	0	Large Mammal	Rib	х	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	Х	х	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	х	2	1	1	
605	0	Sheep/Goat	Mandible	L	N	N	١	Y Y	N	N	N	N	Х	Х	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	х	3	1	4	fragmentary body
																												Possible carnivore gnawing on
605	0	Sheep/Goat	Tibia	R	N	N	N	I N	Y	Y	N	N	Х	Х	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Х	3	1	6	the shaft
605	0	Sheep/Goat	Radius	L	N	N	N	I N	Y	Y	N	N	Х	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Х	3	1	3	
605	0	Large Mammal	Rib	х	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	Х	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Х	2	! 1	4	
C05	0	Madium Manunal	Long Done	v	N								v	~	N		N			N				v	-			
605	0	Sheen/Goat	Mandible	P	N	N N			N	N	N		v	^ V	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	IN N	<u>x</u>	3	4	3	
606	0	Sheen/Goat	Tooth	x	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	X	x	N	N	N	N	N	v	N N	N	N	x	3	1	2	Broken lower molar
000	0	Sheepy doat	100011	^	IN				N	IN IN	IN		^	^	IN	IN	IN		11					~	2		2	broken lower molar
606	0	Medium Mammal	Long Bone	х	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	3	7	5	
607	0	Medium Mammal	Long Bone	х	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	Х	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Х	3	4	3	
607	0	Sheep/Goat	Mandible	L	N	Y	١	Y Y	N	N	N	N	Х	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Х	4	1	10	
607	0	Large Mammal	Long Bone	х	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	Х	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Х	4	1	6	
609	0	Large Mammal	Rib	Х	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	Х	х	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	х	4	1	5	
609	0	Equid	Tooth	R	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	Х	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Х	3	1	29	Broken lower Molar
701	0	Unidentified	Unidentified	х	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	Х	Х	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Х	3	1	4	Burnt grey/black
701	0	Sheep/Goat	Mandible	L	Y	Y	N	I N	N	N	N	N	Х	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	2	1	2	
701	0	Medium Mammal	Rib	x	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	x	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	2	1	1	
701	0	Medium Mammal	Rib	x	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	х	х	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	x	з	1	2	Burnt black
701	0	Medium Mammal	Long Bone	x	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	x	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	x	3	2	1	
701	0	Small Mammal	Rih	x	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	x	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	x x	3	1		
,01	0			^		N.		N I	IN		IN IN				iN	i N	IN IN	(N	N .	IN IN				~				
701	0	Medium Mammal	Long Bone	х	N	Ν	N	I N	N	N	N	N	х	х	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	х	з	3	2	Burnt grey
702	0	Unidentified	Unidentified	Х	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	Х	х	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	х	3	1	1	Burnt grey/white
702	0	Sheep/Goat	Radius	R	N	N	Y	N N	Y	N	N	Ν	Х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	2	1	5	

Ctxt No	Sample No	Taxon	Element	Side	Z1	Z2	Z3	Z4	Z5	Z6	Z7	Z8	Prox	Dist	Path	Butch	Worked	Burnt	Gnaw	Fresh Break	Assoc'd	Measured	Tooth Wear	Surface	Condition	No	(g)	Notes
803	0	Sheep/Goat	Tibia	L	N	N	N	N	Y	' Y	' N	Ν	I X	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R	4	1	4	
1001	0	Large Mammal	Long Bone	Х	N	N	N	N	N	N	I N	Ν	х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R	4	1	22	
1001	0	Medium Mammal	Innominate	L	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y Y	Ν	F	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R	4	1	9	
1001	0	Medium Mammal	Long Bone	x	N	N	Z	N	N	N	I N	Ν	x	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R	4	1	4	
1001	0	Large Mammal	Scapula	R	N	N	Y	' N	N	N	N	N	х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R	4	1	11	
1001	0	Equid	Metatarsal	L	Y	Y	Y	Y Y	Y	Y Y	Y Y	١	F	F	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	R	4	1	126	
1001	0	Large Mammal	Scapula	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	х	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	R	4	2	17	blade fragments
1005	0	Large Mammal	Scapula	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	х	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	R	4	1	6	Blade fragment
1006	0	Large Mammal	Rib	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Х	R	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	R	3	1	4	
1006	0	Large Mammal	Long Bone	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Ν	х	х	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	х	4	2	15	
1006	0	Medium Mammal	Long Bone	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Ν	ı x	x	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	x	4	12	21	
1006	0	Sheep/Goat	Femur	L	N	N	Y	Y Y	Y	Y	' N	N	Х	Х	N	N	N	N	I N	N	N	N	N	R	3	1	8	

Animal bone archive continued:

Measurements

Context Number	Taxon	Element	Side	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
503	Cattle	Scapula	L	66	56	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
503	Cattle	Tibia	R	0	0	0	57	0	0	0	0	0	0
504	Sheep/Goat	Humerus	L	0	0	0	26	24	0	0	0	0	0
1001	Equid	Metatarsal	L	0	0	0	41	37	0	0	21	40	28

Tooth wear

Context	Taxon	Side	dpm4	PM4	M1	M2	M3	Notes
503	Sheep/Goat	R		f	В	f	b	
503	Sheep	R	g		С			
607	Sheep/Goat	L		j	h			

Appendix 5: CFWE15 Slag assessment

M.Wood BA (Hons) Mlitt MCIfA

Introduction

Two fragments of slag were recovered during a programme of archaeological work on land at Clapton Farm, Tinkers Lane, Wincanton, Somerset. The finds are derived from features of possible Iron Age date based on spot dates available at the time of writing.

Methodology

The assemblage was cleaned of surface debris, counted, weighed and macroscopically examined to identify diagnostic material. Full reference was made to published guides (Crew 1996, English Heritage 2011).

Results

A summary of the assemblage is recorded below in Table 1.

Context	Feature	No. Frags	Weight (g)	Description	Recommendations
601	Fill of Enclosure ditch [603]	2	193	Fractured lump of fuel waste	Retain
1003	Fill of pit [1007]	1	396	Fragment of furnace base, retains charcoal impressions	Retain

Table 1: Slag

Discussion

This is a relatively small assemblage, but suggests possible late prehistoric iron production occurred either within or adjacent to the trenched area, as it is unlikely slags would have been moved far and were probably dumped into convenient nearby pits and ditches. Pit [1007] also retained evidence of burning and may represent a destroyed furnace or an associated pit used to dump waste from adjacent industrial activities.

Recommendations

No further work is recommended at this stage. The material should be kept with the archive and any environmental samples scanned for evidence of metalworking.

Should further mitigation be undertaken on site, it would be advisable to involve an archaeological metallurgist at an early stage in any future works, to provide appropriate advice on any sampling strategies.

References

Crew, P. 1996 *Bloom refining and smithing slags and other residues* The Historical Metallurgy Society Data sheet 6

English Heritage, 2011 pre-industrial ironworks Introductions to Heritage Assets

Appendix 6: Flint

By Tom Lane

Introduction

A group of flints from site CFWE 15 was submitted for analysis

Condition

All the item were heavily abraded. No special conservation measures are required. **Results**

Cxt No	Description	No	Wt(g)	Date
400	Chip. Natural unworked	1	<1	
508	Flake. Natural unworked	1	1	
508	Small blade fragment. Heavily patinated. Dorsal ridge.	1	<	Mesolithic/Early Neolithic
	The becondary working. O'N'' N 21111			
600	Large flake. Damaged on edge. Cortex remains over one side. Heavily crazed/fire-cracked. 36 x 32 x 12	1	21	Prehistoric
604	Blade flake. All surfaces heavily patinated. 18 x 12 x 3mm	1	1	Mesolithic/Early Neolithic
604	Flake. Natural Unworked.	1	<1	
700	Flake. Natural but with scars of later removal of narrow, short blade-like flakes. Possibly attempt at secondary working. 25 x 22 x 9mm	1	4	Prehistoric
700	Natural unworked flake.	1	3	
1100	Natural unworked flake.	1	2	
1100	Natural unworked flake.	1	4	
1100	Natural unworked flake.	1	15	
1100	Flake. Dorsal ridge. Heavily patinated. Damage along one edge and unmodified on opposing edge. Heavily abraded. 41 x 27 x 6mm	1	7	Mesolithic. Poss Palaeolithic
1100				
1100	Nodule. Heavily patinated but with some later damage.	1	24	
A2	Natural. Unworked.			
1200	Natural unworked flake.	1	<1	
1200	Natural unworked flake.	1	1	
1200	Natural unworked flake.	1	1	
1200	Natural unworked flake.	1	<1	
1300	End Scraper. Heavily patinated. Steep retouch, possibly 'Carinate' scraper. 21 x 20 x 10mm	1	6	Possibly Upper Palaeolithic

Range

Many of the items submitted were unworked but the collection included an End Scraper of possibly Palaeolithic date (eg Butler 2005, fig. 27, 6). A second item, a damaged flake may also be of a similar date, while other are also of an early prehistoric, but blade-based, industry.

Potential

All the worked items suggest an early prehistoric date for flints in the area. The fire-cracked piece suggests the possibility of some nearby settlement.

Reference

Butler, C., 2005, Prehistoric Flintwork (Stroud, Tempus)

Appendix 7: THE OTHER FINDS

By Gary Taylor

Introduction

Thirteen items weighing a total of 3487g were recovered. It is probably that a maximum of 9 individual items are represented by the assemblage.

Condition

The other finds are in moderate-good condition, though the metal items are corroded.

Results		
Table 1,	Other Material	s

Cxt	Material	Description	NoF	W (g)	Date
104 ∆6	Iron	Rectangular strip, 115mm x 33mm x 3mm. Possibly part of strap hinge	3(link)	36	
104 ∆7	Iron	Buckle, square, one piece. Only loop of pin survives	1	8	c. 17 th century
403 <u>∆</u> 8	Iron	Looped spikes	2	64	Post- medieval?
505 ◊12	Bone	Hairpin/needle, shaft and point, 47mm long, max width 4mm	1	1	Roman or possibly Iron Age
606 ∆1	Bone	Half of small ring, 12mm diameter, perforation 7mm across, 4mm thick, polished outer face. Probable disc bead	1	1	Roman, 3 rd century+
701 ∆10	Stone	Possible saddle quern. Sandstone block, 1 side slightly worn, opposite side very worn; the 2 faces approach at an angle. Possibly part of ∆11, but no definite link. Iron Age?	1	435	Prehistoric? Iron Age?
701 ∆11	Stone	Possible saddle quern. Sandstone block, 1 side slightly worn, opposite side very worn; the 2 faces approach at an angle. Possible that ∆10 was part of this, but no definite link. Iron Age?	1	2242	
1005 ∆5	Stone	Rubber. Water-worn sandstone pebble/cobble, very worn/polished flat on one side. Burnt. Links to piece from (1006). Possible muller for use with saddle quern?	1	161	Prehistoric? Iron Age?
1006	Stone	Rubber. Water-worn sandstone pebble/cobble, extremely worn/polished flat on one side. Burnt? Links to piece from (1005). Possible muller for use with saddle quern? Iron Age?	1	182	Prehistoric? Iron Age?
1006 ∆9	Stone	Rubber. Sandstone slab, very worn on one side, worn on opposite side. Possible hone or muller for use with saddle quern. Iron Age?	1	357	

Provenance

The other finds were recovered from ditch fills (104, 403, 505), and pit fills (701, 1005, 1006).

Range

A variety of metal, bone and stone items were recovered. All of the metal items are of iron. They include several connecting pieces of what is probably a strap hinge, though no rivet holes to connect it to timber are obvious. There is also a buckle, perhaps from a shoe, of post-medieval, probably 17th century, date. In addition, there are two looped spikes. Both have just a single spike or shaft and they appear to be formed on fairly round-sectioned rods, suggesting they are drawn rather than smithed. As such, they are likely to be post-medieval.

There are two bone items. One is part of the shaft of a hairpin or needle. Hairpins are commonly of Roman date, though do occur in Iron Age contexts (Greep 1996a, 345—7), as do needles (Greep 1996b, 347; Winham *et al.* 1985, 95-6). The pin/needle lacks the head, the part of such artefacts that provides their typological and chronological distinction. As such, it cannot be dated beyond the likelihood that it is Roman, though could be Iron Age.

Also found was half of a disc bead. At Colchester, disc, and similar short oblate, beads occur in later Roman, 3rd-4th century, contexts, and generally in graves (Crummy 1995, 32-3).

There are also several grinding stones, five pieces probably representing 3 items. Two of the pieces, from (701), though not linking, are probably parts of a saddle quern. Querns of this type occur commonly in prehistoric contexts, from the Neolithic onwards and although they persist until the Roman period or even later, they began to be replaced in the middle and late Iron Age by beehive querns (Wright 1996, 365).

The other grinding stones include two connecting halves of a cobble, each half having a very worn flat face. These are probably for use as rubbing stones to grind and polish another object. However, they may be parts of a broken muller used with a saddle quern for grinding foodstuffs. If this is correct then these are likely to be prehistoric, perhaps Iron Age. Another grinder, on a slab, was also found. The specific function of this is also unclear but it could possibly be another muller for use with a saddle quern and, if so, again of prehistoric date.

Potential

The other finds are of moderate significance and potential. The hairpin and bead fragments suggest domestic Roman activity at the site. Probable quern fragments indicate the grinding of foodstuffs at site, probably as domestic handmilling. The polished fractured cobble may be from abrading and smoothing another object, and a worn slab could be a hone. At least some of the metal items are likely to be post-medieval.

SPOT DATING

Table ? Spot dates

The dating in Table 2 is based on the evidence provided by the finds detailed above.

	-r · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Cxt	Date	Comments
104	c. 17 th century	Based on 1 metal
403	Post-medieval?	Based on metal
505	Roman or possibly Iron Age	Based on 1 bone
606	3 rd century +	Based on 1 bone
701	Prehistoric? Iron Age?	Based on stone
1005	Prehistoric? Iron Age?	Based on 1 stone
1006	Prehistoric? Iron Age?	Based on stone

ABBREVIATIONS

CXT	Context
NoF	Number of Fragments
W (g)	Weight (grams)

REFERENCES

- Crummy, N, 1995 *The Roman Small Finds from Excavations in Colchester 1971-9*, Colchester Archaeological Report **2** (reprint)
- Greep, S J, 1996a 'Hair pins', in J May, Dragonby, Report on Excavations at an Iron Age and Romano-British Settlement in North Lincolnshire vol 1, Oxbow Monograph 61, 345-7
- Greep, S J, 1996b 'Needles', in J May, *Dragonby, Report on Excavations at an Iron Age and Romano-British Settlement in North Lincolnshire vol 1*, Oxbow Monograph **61**, 347
- Winham, R P, Coy, J P and Maltby, J M, 1985 'Antler and bone objects', in P J Fasham, *The Prehistoric Settlement at Winnall Down, Winchester*, Hampshire Field Club Monograph **2**, 93-6

Wright, M E, 1994 'Querns', in J May, *Dragonby, Report on Excavations at an Iron Age and Romano-British Settlement in North Lincolnshire vol 1*, Oxbow Monograph **61**, 365-376



on behalf of Pre-Construct Archaeological Services Ltd

> Clapton Farm Wincanton Somerset

palaeoenvironmental assessment

report 3940 November 2015



Contents

1.	Summary	1
2.	Project background	2
3.	Methods	2
4.	Results	3
5.	Discussion	3
6.	Recommendations	4
7.	Sources	4

Appendix 1: Data from palaeoenvironmental assessment 5

1. Summary

The project

- 1.1 This report presents the results of palaeoenvironmental assessment of eight bulk samples taken during archaeological works at Clapton Farm, Tinkers lane, Wincanton, Somerset.
- 1.2 The works were commissioned by Pre-Construct Archaeological Services Ltd (PCAS), and conducted by Archaeological Services Durham University.

Results

1.3 The samples comprise background levels of domestic waste. The small assemblage of charred palaeobotanical remains indicates that spelt wheat and barley were used at the site. These were typical crops of the late prehistoric and Roman periods. Charred fragments of hazel nutshell from several of the samples suggest wild-gathered foods were also utilised at the site.

Recommendations

1.4 No further analysis is required for these samples. However, if additional work is undertaken at the site, other features with the potential to preserve palaeoenvironmental remains should be sampled and assessed. The results of this assessment should be added to any further palaeoenvironmental data produced. The charred residues noted on some of the pottery fragments may be suitable for radiocarbon dating and/or further analysis.

2. Project background

Location and background

2.1 Archaeological works were conducted by Pre-Construct Archaeological Services Ltd (PCAS) at Clapton Farm, Tinkers Lane, Wincanton, Somerset. This report presents the results of palaeoenvironmental assessment of eight bulk samples comprising of gully, ditch, linear and pit fills of possible Iron Age origin.

Objective

2.2 The objective of the scheme of works was to assess the palaeoenvironmental potential of the samples, establish the presence of suitable radiocarbon dating material, and provide the client with appropriate recommendations.

Dates

2.3 Samples were received by Archaeological Services on 2nd October 2015. Assessment and report preparation was conducted between 2nd October and 11th November 2015.

Personnel

2.4 Assessment and report preparation was conducted by Dr Carrie Armstrong. Sample processing was by Dr Carrie Armstrong and Dr Magdolna Szilágyi.

Archive

2.5 The site code is **CFWE15**, for **C**lapton **F**arm **W**incanton **e**valuation 20**15**. The flots and finds are currently held in the Palaeoenvironmental Laboratory at Archaeological Services Durham University awaiting collection. The charred plant remains will be retained at Archaeological Services Durham University.

3. Methods

- 3.1 The bulk samples were manually floated and sieved through a 500μm mesh. The residues were examined for shells, fruitstones, nutshells, charcoal, small bones, pottery, flint, glass and industrial residues, and were scanned using a magnet for ferrous fragments. The flots were examined at up to x60 magnification for charred and waterlogged botanical remains using a Leica MZ6 stereomicroscope. Identification of these was undertaken by comparison with modern reference material held in the Palaeoenvironmental Laboratory at Archaeological Services Durham University. Plant nomenclature follows Stace (1997). Habitat classifications follow Preston *et al.* (2002).
- 3.2 Selected charcoal fragments were identified, in order to provide material suitable for radiocarbon dating. The transverse, radial and tangential sections were examined at up to x600 magnification using a Leica DMLM microscope. Identifications were assisted by the descriptions of Schweingruber (1990) and Hather (2000), and modern reference material held in the Palaeoenvironmental Laboratory at Archaeological Services Durham University.
- 3.3 The snail assemblages were scanned and identified to species using the descriptions of Cameron (2008) and Kerney & Cameron (1979). Nomenclature follows Anderson (2005) and habitat classifications follow Cameron (2008) and Kerney & Cameron (1979).

3.4 The works were undertaken in accordance with the palaeoenvironmental research aims and objectives outlined in the regional archaeological research framework and national resource agendas (Webster 2007; Huntley 2010).

4. Results

- 4.1 Finds from the residues included sherds of pottery in many of the samples. Pit fill [403] had a large number of pottery fragments, although many of these were tiny. Charred residues were noted on some of the pottery fragments from ditch fill [505]. Small quantities of calcined and unburnt animal bone occurred in many of the samples, and tooth enamel fragments were noted in four of the fills. A broken polished bone artefact was recovered from ditch fill [505] and a polishing stone was present in pit fill [1006].
- 4.2 The small charred plant macrofossil assemblages generally comprised of cereal grains including wheat and barley, and a small number of weed seeds. Spelt wheat chaff was noted in ditch fill [505] and linear fill [411]. The grain from linear feature [403] was noted as in particularly poor condition, with many of the grains exhibiting puffing and pitting, possibly as a result of intense heat (Boardman & Jones 1990). This prevented identification in some instances. Fragments of hazel nutshell occurred in five of the samples. Other charred plant remains included black-bindweed, cleavers, docks and vetches as well as members of the grass and cabbage families. Small amounts of charcoal were present, these generally comprised only a few fragments, and included oak, alder, hazel, Maloideae and cherry family (blackthorn, wild or bird cherry).
- 4.3 Material suitable for radiocarbon dating is available for all of the samples, although material from [508], [1006] and [803] may be unsuitable due to long-lived species or insufficient weight of carbon there may be insufficient weight of carbon. The results are presented in Appendix 1.

5. Discussion

- 5.1 The presence of small amounts of animal bone, pot and small assemblages of plant macrofossils and charcoal in the samples suggest that they comprise background levels of domestic waste. Although diagnostic palaeoenvironmental remains are few in number, the assessment indicates that spelt wheat and barley were used at the site. These were the main field crops cultivated in Britain during the late prehistoric and Roman periods (Greig 1991). The occurrence of spelt wheat chaff may indicate crop processing at or near to the site. A variety of wood species were noted, which may reflect the range of wood available locally. The small size of the charcoal assemblage prevents further discussion of woodland resources and fuel use.
- 5.2 Charred fragments of hazel nutshell from several of the samples suggest wildgathered foods were also utilised at the site, although their presence in low numbers perhaps reflects a minor use of this particular food source.
- 5.3 The small assemblages of charred wild taxa recorded are likely to represent weeds of arable fields and the local environs of the site.

5.4 While all of the samples contained low quantities of land snail remains, ditch fill [505] contained a greater number. The assemblages were dominated by catholic species which provide limited palaeoenvironmental data, including *Cochlicopa cf. lubricella* (Rossmässler), *Trochulus* sp, *Oxychilus* sp. and *Cepaea hortensis* (Müller).

6. Recommendations

6.1 No further analysis is required for these samples. However, if additional work is undertaken at the site, other features with the potential to preserve palaeoenvironmental remains should be sampled and assessed. The results of this assessment should be added to any further palaeoenvironmental data produced. The charred residues noted on some of the pottery fragments may be suitable for radiocarbon dating and/or further analysis.

7. Sources

Anderson, R, 2005 An annotated list of the non-marine Mollusca of Britain and Ireland. J Conch **38**, 607-637

- Boardman, S, & Jones, G, 1990 Experiments on the effects of charring on cereal plant components. *J Archaeol Sci* **17**, 1-11
- Cameron, R, 2008 *Land Snails in the British Isles*. Field Studies Council Occasional Publication **79**. Shrewsbury
- Greig, J R A, 1991 The British Isles, in W Van Zeist, K Wasylikowa & K-E Behre (eds) Progress in Old World Palaeoethnobotany. Rotterdam
- Hather, J G, 2000 *The identification of the Northern European Woods: a guide for archaeologists and conservators.* London
- Huntley, J P, 2010 A review of wood and charcoal recovered from archaeological excavations in Northern England. Research Department Report Series no. **68**. London
- Kerney, M P, & Cameron, R A D, 1979 A Field Guide to the Land Snails of Britain and North-west Europe. London
- Preston, C D, Pearman, D A, & Dines, T D, 2002 New Atlas of the British and Irish Flora. Oxford

Schweingruber, F H, 1990 Microscopic wood anatomy. Birmensdorf

- Stace, C, 1997 New Flora of the British Isles. Cambridge
- Webster, C J, 2007 The Archaeology of South West England: South West Archaeological Research Framework, Resource Assessment and Research Agenda. Somerset County Council

Appendix 1: Data from palaeoenvironmental assessment

Sample	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Context	505	508	1006	403	702	607	411	803
Feature number	502	507	1007	402	704	608	410	802
Feature	Ditch	Ditch	Pit	Linear	Pit	Pit	Linear	Gully
Material available for radiocarbon dating	\checkmark	(✔)	(✔)	✓	\checkmark	✓	✓	(✔)
Volume processed (I)	40	40	30	40	10	20	40	40
Volume of flot (ml)	80	60	55	60	15	40	45	40
Residue contents								
Bone artefact	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Bone (calcined) indet. frags	(+)	-	-	++	(+)	(+)	+	+
Bone (unburnt)	++	++	++	+	-	+	+++	++
Flint	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	3
Polishing stone	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Pot (number of fragments)	6	2	6	65	1	5	9	6
Snails terrestrial	++	-	-	-	(+)	-	-	-
Tooth (animal - enamel fragment)	-	6	1	-	-	2	-	3
Flot matrix			1					
Bone (calcined) indet. frags	-	-	-	-	-	-	(+)	(+)
Bone (unburnt)	+	(+)	+	(+)	(+)	(+)	+	-
Charcoal	++	+	++	+	-	+	++	-
Earthworm egg case	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
Insect / beetle	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Roots (modern)	++	+++	++	++	++	+++	+++	++
Snails terrestrial	+++	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Uncharred seeds	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Charred remains (total count)			1					
(a) Fallopia convolvulus (Black-bindweed) nutlet	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
(c) Cerealia indeterminate grain	-	-	-	11	-	1	-	1
(c) Hordeum sp (Barley species) grain	2	-	-	4	-	1	2	-
(c) <i>Triticum spelta</i> (Spelt Wheat) glume base	1	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
(c) Triticum sp (Wheat species) glume base	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
(c) Triticum sp (Wheat species) grain	-	-	-	4	-	-	2	-
(r) Galium aparine (Cleavers) seed	-	-	7	1	-	-	-	-
(t) Corylus avellana (Hazel) nutshell frag.	-	1	1	4	1	-	6	-
(x) Brassicaceae undiff. (Cabbage family) seed	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
(x) Poaceae undiff. <1mm (Grass family) caryopsis	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
(x) Poaceae undiff. >1mm (Grass family) caryopsis	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
(x) Rumex sp (Docks) nutlet	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
(x) Vicia sp (Vetches) seed	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Identified charcoal (1	1	1		1	1	
Alnus glutinosa (Alder)	-	-	-	✓	-	-	-	-
Corylus avellana (Hazel)	-	-	\checkmark	-	-	-	\checkmark	-
Maloideae (Hawthorn, apple, whitebeams)	-	✓	\checkmark	-	-	-	✓	-
Prunus sp (Cherries-blackthorn, wild and bird cherry)	\checkmark	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Quercus sp (Oaks)	-	✓	-	-	-	-	-	-

[a-arable; c-cultivated; r-ruderal; t-tree/shrub; x-wide niche. (+): trace; +: rare; ++: occasional; +++: common; ++++: abundant

 (\checkmark) may be unsuitable for dating due to size or species]

Appendix 9: GIS trench locations

(co-ords: x, y)

Tr. 13 S: 375723.934,128547.308 Tr .13 N: 375723.934,128527.308 Tr. 12 NW: 375780.483,128569.079 Tr. 12 SE: 375795.905,128556.345 Tr. 11 SW: 375863.381,128614.939 Tr. 11 NE: 375874.479,128631.577 Tr. 10 N: 375839.484,128639.039 Tr. 10 S: 375839.484,128619.039 Tr. 9 N: 375694.540,128611.673 Tr. 9 S: 375694.540,128591.673 Tr. 8 SE: 375761.025,128646.354 Tr. 8 NW: 375751.609,128663.999 Tr. 7 NW: 375814.497,128721.582 Tr. 7 SE: 375829.270,128708.101 Tr. 6 N: 375786.321,128692.231 Tr. 6 S: 375786.321,128672.231 Tr. 5 SE: 375749.567,128694.842 Tr. 5 NW: 375735.136,128708.689 Tr. 4 NW: 375708.075,128703.077 Tr. 4 SE: 375718.074,128685.756 Tr. 3 N: 375676.890,128680.471 Tr. 3 S: 375676.890,128660.471 Tr. 2 N: 375751.609,128790.431 Tr. 2 S: 375751.609,128770.431 Tr. 1 NE: 375672.023,128811.660 Tr. 1 SW: 375663.947,128793.364

OASIS DATA COLLECTION FORM: England

List of Projects | Manage Projects | Search Projects | New project | Change your details | HER coverage | Change country | Log out

Archaeological Evaluation on land at Clapton Farm, Tinkers Hill, Wincanton - Pre-Construct Archaeological Services Ltd

OASIS ID - preconst3-248929

Versions								
View	Version	Completed by	Email		Date			
View 1	1	Alison Lane	alison@pre-construct.co.uk		20 April 2016			
Completed sections in current version								
Details	Location	Creators	Archive		Publications			
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		1/1			
Validated sections in current version								
Details	Location	Creators	Archive		Publications			
No	No	No	No		0/1			
File submission and form progress								
Grey literature report submitted? No			Grey literature report filename/s					
Boundary file submitted? No Boundary filename								
HER signed off? NMR signed off?								
Grev literature	Lipload images	Lipload bound	arv filo	Request record re-opene	d Printable version			
arey merature	opioad images	Opioad bound	aryme	riequestrecolu le-opene				

Email Somerset HER about this OASIS record



Please e-mail Historic England for OASIS help and advice

© ADS 1996-2015 Created by Jo Gilham and Jen Mitcham, email Last modified Wednesday 16 December 2015 Cite only: http://www.oasis.ac.uk/form/formctl.cfm?oid=preconst3-248929 for this page