16th-14th centuries BC (Period 1: early), by Timothy Darvill

The first substantial phase of occupation at Blenheim Farm comprises four roundhouses, pit clusters, a waterhole, tree-throw pits, and a boundary ditch seemingly marking the north and west sides of an occupation area naturally delimited to the south and east sides by a small stream (Fig. 1). The full extent of the features associated with this phase may be partly truncated by later activity, especially the Roman and medieval enclosures, compounds and field systems, but the surviving evidence provides a fair picture of activity for a period that until now was more or less invisible in the north Cotswolds. Four radiocarbon determinations on short-lived specimens from CPBS1 and CPBS3, and Pit 1860 in Pit Group 12, span the period c. 1600 BC through to c. 1300 BC, centred on the mid 14th century BC. This falls within Period 5 of Needham's (1996; Needham et al. 1997) subdivision of the British Bronze Age, conventionally the later Middle Bronze Age, during which time metalwork of Acton Park 2, Taunton, and Penard industrial phases was in circulation, and Deverel-Rimbury pottery characterises domestic assemblages. Across the British Isles it was a period of change, which Colin Burgess links to upheavals across much of Europe as a result of the collapse of the Mycenaean and Hittite empires (1980, 155-9; but cf. Needham 1996, 134). Certainly, new kinds of settlement appeared, occupation expanded into previously under-used territory, and technical innovations stimulated new kinds of metalwork. It is against such a background that the appearance of a wholly new settlement on seemingly virgin land at Blenheim Farm should be seen.

Topographically the Bronze Age settlement occupies an ideal position: a natural knoll of slightly higher ground with a southerly aspect and ready access to water. Pollen sequences from the Tewkesbury area suggest fairly extensive deforestation during the middle and late second millennium BC (Brown 1982; 1983; Brown and Barber 1985) and at Blenheim Farm isolated and clustered tree-throw pits within and to the north of the settlement area have been recorded. These suggest some partial clearance of the landscape before occupation began, with continued periodic removal of remaining trees over the following centuries, a practice that has been noted at other sites of the second and early first millennium BC in the Thames Valley (Moore and Jennings 1992, 13 and fig. 6). Two tree-throw pits contained material likely to belong with the early Period 1 occupation; many of the others are technically undated but contained similar fills and may therefore have been associated with the same sequence of clearance events. West of the circular post-built structures (CPBS), tree-throw pit 1063 contained a small assemblage of fresh flintworking debitage. Rather more unusual is tree-throw pit 1008, which contained three flint flakes and, in the lower fill, the cremated remains of an adult human. This is the only evidence for burial practices preserved on the site, although it should be borne in mind that soil conditions were not conducive to the survival of unburnt bone. Tree-throw pit 1008 is one of a small cluster of eight such pits immediately south of Waterhole 1 that may together have formed a highly visible landscape feature: a stand of mature trees atop a low but prominent knoll. It is tempting to speculate that following the loss of these ancient trees, perhaps in a gale or as the result of a natural catastrophe, one of the resulting pits was chosen for the ritual deposition of a cremation. Similar evidence has been noted at Reading Business Park, Berkshire, where a single cremation dated to 1688-1431 BC was added to a much earlier monument, perhaps to strengthen ancestral ties to the land (Brossler 2001, 133).

Ditch 1, L-shaped in plan, provides a clearly defined northern and western boundary to the settlement area, running around the contour of the hill. The ditch was up to 3m
wide, a shallow V-form in cross-section, and survived to a maximum depth of 1.3m. There was no evidence of recutting, and only its slightly asymmetric middle fill suggests the former presence of an internal bank. The 2.6m-wide gap opening to the north is taken to be an entrance causeway; its unelaborated form confirms the idea that this insubstantial construction with its incomplete circuit cannot be considered a defensive feature in any meaningful sense. Rather it should be considered as a north-facing facade formally marking the entrance to a compound or occupation area whose other boundaries may well have been marked at the time with light fences, hedges, natural features in the landscapes, or simply a fall-off in the intensity of activity. Charred fragments of blackthorn and hawthorn recovered from the ditch fills may be indirect evidence of hedging alongside the ditch or in areas to the south and east where the ditch is absent. A collection of flint nodules on the floor of the ditch and fresh flint debitage in the lower fills suggests that tool-making may have been carried out near the margins of the settlement but there is no indication that the boundary ditch was systematically used for the disposal of domestic debris and waste. A pollen sequence through the ditch fills suggests construction in a fairly dry environment followed by fairly rapid natural filling. The area defined by the ditch is a minimum of 100m east-west and 80m north-south, but it is unclear whether the full extent of the ditch, which extended beyond the excavated area, originally defined two or three sides of an ‘enclosure’. Comparable examples of both can be cited from the second half of the 2nd millennium BC in southern Britain and are generally known as ‘Martin Down Style Enclosures’ after a type-site excavated by Pitt Rivers in Dorset (Piggott 1942; Barrett et al. 1983; Edmonds 1989). At Angle Ditch, Dorset, just two sides of an area with minimum dimensions of 50m by 25m are defined by a ditch up to 2m deep and with no sign of an accompanying bank (Barrett et al. 1991, 219–22). Boscombe Down East, Wiltshire, has three sides marked by ditches, although the western side is incomplete; the main entrance opens to the north (Stone 1936). The more recently excavated example at Down Farm, Dorset, has two-and-a-half sides, encloses a minimum area 35m by 25m, and had a bank immediately inside the ditch. During phase 2 at this site, dated by a series of radiocarbon determinations to c. 1495–1310 BC, the internal settlement was bounded by a light fence and comprised a roundhouse c. 9m in diameter, two ancillary structures each c. 6.5m across, a small pond and a yard (Barrett et al. 1991, 183–211). Larger examples include Martin Down, Dorset, which is c. 100m by 60m (Barrett et al. 1991, 220) and Ogbourne Down West, Wiltshire, with a more sinuous outline, c. 115m by 60m, and perhaps of more than one phase (Piggott 1942, 52). Within the overall range of such sites, Blenheim Farm is therefore towards the larger end of the spectrum (Fig. 20) and also the most northerly example currently known.

The partial character of the settlement boundary at Blenheim Farm and elsewhere may seem rather odd to modern eyes, but as already indicated this may in part be the result of an incomplete archaeological record. A stream flowing close to the eastern and southern edges of the site at the time of the excavation may reflect the route of an ancient watercourse delimiting Period 1 occupation in these directions. Certainly, where the stream runs close to the southern edge of the site it seems to describe an arc that forms a mirror image of the boundary ditch to the north (Figs 1 and 21). It is possible, therefore, that the boundary ditch was keyed into an existing landscape feature, and that the ‘enclosure’ was formed by a ditch along its northern and western sides and by a stream along its southern and eastern sides.
Contemporary with the enclosure boundary were four CPBSs, ranging from 5m to 7m in diameter. In each the walls were defined by a single ring of postholes although other postholes both inside and outside the wall-line are considered to be part of the overall structure. The entrances probably opened to the south-east although there is little evidence for porches or elaborated portals. CPBS4 probably had a central support. CPBS1 and 3 must have been successive and, while it is noticeable that both appear to have had spreads of material immediately outside the doorways, it is impossible to say
which of the two structures was earlier. Theoretically, a maximum of three out of the four recorded structures could have stood at any one time, but given the evidence for replacement represented by CPBS1 and 3 it seems pragmatic to think in terms of two structures at a time with two main phases of construction. Since none of the floors in these structures survived, little can be said about the purpose or the social use of space within each, although it may be suggested that at any one time there was a main dwelling
together with an ancillary building such as a storehouse or workshop. CPBS1 is dated to 1430–1300 BC on the basis of two radiocarbon determinations on wheat grain from posthole 1101 (3109±31 BP: Wk-17813 and 3063±31 BP: Wk-17814), and was associated with Deverel-Rimbury Ware. CPBS3 dates to 1430–1260 BC on the basis of a single radiocarbon determination on hazel charcoal (3080±31 BP: Wk-17812) and was likewise associated with Deverel-Rimbury style pottery.

Two main architectural styles have been recognised amongst the round timber structures of the late second millennium BC in Britain: single post-ring buildings, and double post-ring buildings (Nowakowski 1991, 184–88). The Blenheim Farm CPBSs are entirely typical of the first style, and examples have been found right across southern Britain. Those at Down Farm, Dorset, have already been mentioned as they lie within a Martin Down Style Enclosure. They are exactly contemporary with those at Blenheim Farm according to available radiocarbon dates and show many affinities in size and design, although the main dwelling in Phase 2 at Down Farm seems to have had a well-defined porch while the ancillary buildings did not (Barrett et al. 1991, 186–95). Other contemporary sites with comparable architecture include, from west to east, Trellethall Farm, Newquay, Cornwall (Nowakowski 1991), Shearplace Hill, Dorset (Rahtz and ApSimon 1962), and Black Patch, East Sussex (Drewett 1979). Nothing of quite the same date is yet known in the Cotswold region, but from around the turn of the first millennium BC are the twenty or more CPBSs at Shorncote, Gloucestershire. Three main groups can be recognized, none of them enclosed, each representing a discrete occupation area (Darvill 2006, 40–1, with earlier refs.). The structures range in size from 4.5m up to 10m in diameter, and most are of single post-ring design. The majority had porches flanking doors opening to the south-east, and a few had internal posts.

A waterhole situated near the core of the Blenheim Farm settlement was excavated. It is undated, but its fills and form suggest a close association with the Period 1 occupation. Similar waterholes are known from many settlements of the later 2nd and early 1st millennium BC, including Kemerton, Worcestershire (Jackson and Napthan 1998, 62), Shorncote (Hearne and Heaton 1994, 21–31, 48–9), and Reading Business Park, Berkshire (Brossler 2001, 133–4). Occasionally, such features had a secondary use as rubbish disposal pits (Jackson and Napthan 1998, 62) but while the tip lines exhibited by the main fills of Waterhole 1 were suggestive of backfilling, the material seems to have been clean topsoil with almost no anthropogenic inclusions other than a few burnt stones.

More than a dozen pits, also undated and variously of round or crescent-shaped outline, may also be associated with the settlement on the basis of their horizontal stratigraphy. To the south-east, Pit Group 12 was distinctive in containing abundant burnt stones. A radiocarbon determination on charcoal from pit 1860 of 1610–1420 BC (3225±32 BP: Wk-17816) is accepted as dating the feature; a second determination falling in the 11th century AD is considered intrusive. Pit Group 134 also contained burnt stones and while undated may be related. All the pits in the vicinity of the stream (Group 12) contain burnt stones and may be remnants of one or more burnt mounds of the type increasingly recognised beside streams in the south Midlands (Barfield and Hodder 1987); examples have been excavated at Frocester (Darvill 2000) and Leckhampton (Leah and Young 2001) in the Cotswolds. Whether such features were cooking places, industrial work-areas involving hot-rock technology, or had some kind of ceremonial role as feasting places or sweat-lodges remains to be determined. Pit Group 10 outside the enclosure to the north
comprised small holes that could have been postholes, but were most likely shallow pits just possibly for ceremonial purposes.

Overall, the mid 2nd millennium BC settlement at Blenheim Farm should be seen as a small farmstead, perhaps occupied by a single extended family whose dwelling, ancillary buildings, water supply, working spaces and yards were sheltered within the embrace of a Martin Down Style Enclosure with its most grandiose aspect facing north. Their material culture was seemingly relatively poor, but they certainly made and used flint tools, and may well have had metal objects too. Their pottery was manufactured locally in the Deverel-Rimbury style suggesting cultural links to the south and south-east; the assemblage, although small, is the first in the area to be securely dated.

Evidence for the nature of the environment around the site remains difficult to interpret. The absence of damp-loving ground weeds in the environmental sequences examined indicates generally dry conditions. The low-level presence of charcoal from wetland tree species may reflect a genuine absence of such species from the environs of the site, but it is possible that their use for building material rather than for fuel has resulted in under-representation amongst the charred plant remains. If it is assumed that Waterhole 1, whose depth was not much greater than that of the ditch, functioned successfully it seems probable that the southern part of the ditch, and the stream bed into which it extended, contained standing water when first cut.

There is very little evidence for cereal processing at the site, a similarity it shares with the slightly later settlements at Kemerton, Worcestershire (Jackson and Napthn 1998), and Shorcote (Darvill 2006, 40). It may also be noted that storage pits and above-ground granaries are absent at Blenheim Farm. This contrasts with general propositions of widespread arable intensification in the later 2nd millennium BC across southern England (e.g. Campbell and Straker 2003), and claims based on higher concentrations of charred cereal processing waste found on larger settlement sites dating to the period after 1200 BC (Jones 1981). Clearly there were regional differences in the subsistence practices followed, with some areas more dependent on cultivation and others focused on animal husbandry. Unfortunately, direct evidence for the nature and quantity of livestock maintained by the Blenheim Farm community is missing because of the poor preservation of bone in the generally acidic soils in the area. The only faunal remains from Period 1, the sheep/goat mandible, came from an animal whose age at death suggests that it was kept for wool production or for breeding.

The importance of the Blenheim Farm site lies in the broad landscape context provided by the investigation of the surrounding area. Unlike the later 2nd millennium BC settlements in the middle Thames region, for example at Reading Business Park, Berkshire (Brossler 2001), and Heathrow T5, Middlesex (FA 2006), the occupation area is not integrated within a contemporary field system. Rather, it must be seen as a semi-open site, lying beside a small watercourse within a comparatively open landscape perhaps with small garden-sized cultivation plots and extensive grazing lands and wood-pasture beyond. However, patterning to the social use of space, in which the dwellings and ancillary structures form the focus of the settlement on the higher and drier ground, pits lie round about, occasional ceremonial deposits and structures lie fully integrated with the domestic space, and burnt mounds for special events, industry and cooking lie adjacent to the nearest watercourse, is entirely typical, whether or not associated with a Martin Down Style Enclosure (Fig. 21). At South Lodge Camp, Dorset, for example, two CPBSs, one larger than the other and
probably representing a house and an ancillary building, stood immediately south-east of a burnt mound, the whole arrangement being set within an enclosure (Barrett et al. 1991, 209). Much the same can be observed at Shearplace Hill, Dorset, where there is a pond rather than a burnt mound (Rahtz and ApSimon 1962), and at Black Patch, East Sussex, where an unenclosed settlement comprised five structures and two ponds (Drewett 1979, fig. 1). At Heathrow T5, Middlesex, waterholes and burnt mounds were found associated with occupation debris and structures of the later 2nd millennium BC, but the buildings are unlike others of the period noted above (FA 2006, 114–47). Further upstream in the middle Thames Valley investigations at Reading Business Park in 1986–8 and 1995 revealed a long-lived occupation site of the later 2nd and early 1st millennium BC, with perhaps as many as twenty round buildings in clusters anything from 10m to 50m to the south-west of an equally long-lived burnt mound that flanked a palaeochannel. Waterholes and pits were also present, the whole arrangement being set within the framework of a rectilinear field system that was probably established early in the 2nd millennium BC (Brossler 2001, with earlier refs). Fragmentary traces of what must be the same overall pattern but with no evidence of contemporary field systems have been excavated in the upper Thames Valley at Roughground Farm (Alien et al. 1993). Here occupation dated to between 1500 and 1000 BC comprised a scatter of nine pits and a human inhumation. Traces of any structures present would probably have been lost through agriculture or the methods of topsoil stripping used. Crucially, no evidence of arable cultivation was found, and amongst the animal bones recovered sheep outnumbered cattle by nearly four to one (Allen et al. 1993, 34–5) suggesting that even off the limestone uplands proper a pastoral economy prevailed.

Evidence of other settlements of the later 2nd millennium BC on the Cotswolds and adjoining areas of the upper Thames Valley and Severn Valley is scant, although gradually building as a result of development-related projects taking investigations into new areas. Traces of what may tentatively be regarded as small farmsteads have been noted at a handful of sites (Darvill 2006, 42) but none are yet fully published. The same applies to what may turn out to be a direct comparison for Blenheim Farm: an L-shaped enclosure containing roundhouses, pits and a fence-line investigated at the Cotswold Community site, Somerford Keynes, in 2003 (Weaver 2004). At Frocester in the Severn Valley excavations have revealed a linear boundary, burnt mound, and scattered traces of occupation (Price 2000), while further north at Hucclecote there are burials dating to the 14th–12th centuries BC but as yet no direct evidence of structures and occupation (Thomas et al. 2003, 8–9). Further north still, near the confluence of the Severn and Avon at Tewkesbury, there is clear evidence of occupation on the valley floor. A small 'D'-shaped enclosure and a curvilinear ditch were found on the east side of a slight promontory between the Tirle Brook and River Swilgate. Investigations in 1991–7 showed that these features date to the later 2nd millennium BC and connect with a series of linear boundaries seen also in nearby excavations that may have been linked with animal husbandry and small-scale cultivation within a fairly structured valley-floor landscape (Walker et al. 2004, 85–7). Quite different in character is the hilltop enclosure at Stow on the Wold, which appears to have been constructed in the period around 1390–970 BC, perhaps as one of a series of regional exchange centres scattered across southern Britain (Darvill 2006, 42).

The tradition of building round barrows, of which there are several hundred scattered across the Gloucestershire Cotswolds and adjacent areas, as burial places was largely over
by 1500 BC, and the later 2nd millennium BC is characterised by cremation burials either singly or in cemeteries. The isolated cremation in tree-throw pit 1008 is wholly within the expected range of deposits and its presence within an occupation area is not unusual. Elsewhere in the north Cotswolds single cremations within urns have been found at Cow Common and Lower Swell (Darvill 1987, 108–9) while about 9km to the east of Blenheim Farm excavations around the Kingstone at Rollright, Oxfordshire, revealed a small cremation cemetery overlying earlier round barrows and here seemingly marked by a standing stone (Lambrick 1988, 70–80). The largest such cemetery so far known in the area lies about 11km to the west of Blenheim Farm at Bevan’s Quarry (O’Neil 1967). Here excavation of a round barrow (Temple Guiting 8) revealed a cemetery of at least five cremation deposits representing six or more men, women and children cut into the top of the barrow mound. It is likely that the cemetery extended beyond the excavated area, perhaps as far as the adjacent Temple Guiting 3 barrow where fragments of broken urns have been found (Darvill 1987, 108). The Deverel-Rimbury style urns at Bevan’s Quarry are very similar to those from Blenheim Farm in terms of form and fabric, although the site is probably too distant to have been directly connected. Richard Bradley (1981, 100) has shown that in central southern Britain cemeteries were typically situated less than 700m from their associated settlement, often with the cemetery northwards of the settlement. In the case of Blenheim Farm attention might usefully be directed to the area east of Dorn Roman settlement (Fig. 1), in a search for contemporary burials.

Landscapes of the later 2nd millennium BC in western Britain often contain natural places that had special meaning to the lives of local communities and which were often used for the deposition of metalwork as gifts to local deities and spirits of the earth (Bradley 1990). Spring, rivers and bogs seem to have been particularly favoured and in this connection the discovery in 1952 of a basal-looped bronze spearhead near a spring in Batsford Park (Neville Terry 1953) may be especially relevant as this piece belongs to the Taunton or Acton Park industrial traditions and would therefore have been contemporary with the occupation at Blenheim Farm just 2.5km away to the east.

8th–5th centuries BC (Period 1: late), by Timothy Darvill

Evidence for activity at Blenheim Farm during Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age, broadly speaking the 8th through to 5th centuries BC, is restricted to some or all of the pits within Pit Group 9 and the tree-throw pit 1248 some c. 90m to the north-west. All are united in being associated with bipartite bowl and bowl/jar forms of pottery of post-Deverel-Rimbury tradition made in a series of sandy fabrics. The pits are generally small, between 0.4m and 0.8m across and up to 0.2m deep. They are clearly not storage pits, and some kind of ceremonial use involving the deposition of offering may be suspected (a large number of hazelnut shells were present in pit 1331). Their position north of Pit Group 10 may also be relevant (see above). Tree-throw pit 1248 contained oak charcoal, possibly from the tree that formerly grew there and may have been a long-lived and well-known landscape feature.

Romano-British (2nd century AD), by Jonathan Hart

The Romano-British features had been truncated by ploughing and shallower features may have been entirely lost. However, the recovered plan suggests that the field system
was broadly contemporary with Enclosures 1 and 2, with Enclosure 3 being later. The key question relating to the enclosures is whether they enclosed buildings, and thus mark settlement, or whether they had a purely agricultural function. No evidence for structures was recovered, although it is possible that the often ephemeral traces of buildings may not have survived. Small ditched enclosures of similar form to those found here have been viewed as marking the locations of buildings at some sites in the Thames valley such as Totterdown Lane (Pine and Preston 2004) and Old Shifford Farm (Hey 1995), frequently in the absence of surviving structural evidence. The most compelling evidence against the interpretation of Romano-British features at Blenheim Farm as a farmstead, however, is the very low quantities of artefacts recovered. The few sherds recovered were small and abraded, suggesting secondary deposition following manuring rather than a primary deposition as domestic waste within the ditches.

On balance, the enclosures at Blenheim Farm are best interpreted as stock pens, perhaps with internal upcast banks surrounded by hedges or fencing. Small amounts of blackthorn and hawthorn charcoal, typical hedge species, were recovered from Enclosure 2 but do not have a secure provenance. The enclosures can be compared with 1st to 2nd-century AD Roman examples at Thornhill Farm in the Upper Thames valley, where units of two or three conjoined enclosures, of slightly smaller dimensions than those at Blenheim Farm, were interpreted as stock-rearing pens (Jennings et al. 2004, 150), despite similarly narrow entrances.

**Medieval (c. 11th–14th centuries AD), by Mary Alexander**

Material evidence for activity spanning the period between the Roman field system and the earliest medieval field boundaries is not present in the archaeological record, although the plan of the latter hints at either continuity or a survival of some Roman boundary alignments as landscape features. Reforestation of the Cotswolds region was sufficiently widespread by the 7th century for the Saxon name to reflect its wooded aspect ('wolds' meaning woodland; Dyer 2002). However, at Blenheim Farm it is apparent that when the medieval field boundaries were established, some remnants of the Roman field system were still present, as the boundary of the Roman Enclosure 1, the southern side of Enclosure 3 and ditch 2105 were incorporated into the later field system.

The origin of the settlement that preceded the planned town of the 13th century at Moreton-in-Marsh is not known, although an early 8th-century presence is suggested in a charter of AD 714 and the place-name ‘Moretune’ is referred to in the Domesday survey of 1086 (Moore 1982, 19.2). The genesis of the village would appear typical of the region, in that the excavated evidence suggests settlement in its present location dates to the 11th century (Dyer 2002; Langton et al. 2000). At this time the scattered farms and hamlets that were a feature of the rural landscape began to be abandoned in favour of nucleated settlements, many of which continue as village locations up to the present day. The land surrounding these nascent villages was worked as extensive open fields, most typically two fields in which each villager worked individual strips of land, and in which a two-course rotation between arable and pasture was undertaken. Moreton-in-Marsh had two documented open fields; the land at Blenheim Farm lay to the north of ‘Lower Field’, which was to the east of the settled area. The evidence of cultivation at Tinker’s Close displays a radical realignment of the ridge-and-furrow on two occasions between the 11th and 13th centuries, possibly reflecting more than one reorganisation of the land in this
transitional period (Langton et al. 2000). Blenheim Farm occupies an area on the boundary of the parishes of Moreton and Batsford, and there is no evidence for ridge-and-furrow cultivation, although the shallow Roman features on the western side of the site suggest truncation by later agricultural practices.

The medieval activity at Blenheim Farm was predominantly rural and falls into two main phases. The earlier phase (A) featuring ditches delineating small enclosures is superseded by much larger fields (Phase B). The small pens or paddocks of the earlier phase with their streamside location may have been for sheep, as opposed to cattle, which would not have been kept in big herds at this time (C. Dyer, pers. comm.). Similar small land divisions are cited in manorial records in association with other elements of medieval sheep management. Separate pens or paddocks enable the carrying out of a wide manner of tasks including counting and, if necessary, dividing sheep belonging to different owners, or separating pregnant animals for lambing. A system of small enclosures also facilitates sheep shearing and allows sick or diseased animals to be divided from the flock (Dyer 1995, 149-50). The stream would have been a convenient supply of drinking water for the livestock and for those tending the flocks as well as for washing sheep and fleeces. Cattle and sheep/goat are present in the bone assemblage in roughly equal quantities, with smaller quantities of pig, horse and dog also present. The faunal remains are more likely to reflect the general diet of the farmer/shepherd and local supply of material used to manure the fields, rather than the livestock kept in the enclosures at the site.

Small pens and enclosures have been recorded by excavation and earthwork surveys in several locations in the north Cotswolds, although with considerable variety of layout and dimensions; some, like the examples at Blenheim Farm, incorporate surviving elements of Romano-British field systems (Dyer 1995, 146-7). All examples noted from earthwork survey display raised enclosure boundaries, denoting banks or walls, while at Blenheim Farm there is no evidence to suggest this, although there may have been delineation by fences or hedges. Within a few kilometres of Blenheim Farm, at Chalk Hill, Temple Guiting, nine enclosures were recorded of similar dimensions to those at Blenheim Farm, varying from 10m to 30m in length (Dyer 1995, 141). Close by, at Kineton Hill (also Temple Guiting), six larger enclosures measuring 20-40m wide and 60–80m long were surveyed (Dyer 1996, fig. 7). More similar to those at Chalk Hill and Blenheim Farm were two or three enclosures measuring 20m by 20m, surveyed at Manless Town, Brimpsfield (Dyer 1995, 146).

These enclosures, and other examples from the archaeological record, were found in association with sheepcotes, a form of rural structure that featured in large numbers in the north Cotswold landscape. These buildings would have housed the sheep at night during the winter months, and provided a sheltered place to feed the flocks hay and fodder when grazing was insufficient. Surviving examples are most numerous in marginal locations, often on the edges of the arable lowland where they would have served to manage flocks grazing on upland pasture in the summer months and at other times on stubble and fallow fields. Manure from the sheepcote would have been collected for enriching the arable soils. These structures were a feature of manorial estates and feature in the documents of estate management in the 13th–15th centuries (Dyer 1996). Manorial sheepcotes are recognised as long narrow buildings averaging 42m in length divided into stalls, accommodating flocks of up to 300 sheep. Less visible in the archaeological record, but frequently mentioned in manorial court roles, were the peasant sheepcotes. Examples recorded in court rolls.
indicate that a typical structure would be of two or three bays, 9–14m long, built with a cruck-framed superstructure on stone foundations. A single excavated example of a two-bay structure that could have served this purpose is from the deserted medieval settlement at Upton. This building measured 9.5m by 4.5m with evidence for a pitched stone floor (Dyer 1995, 159).

The sheepcote was often accompanied by smaller rectangular structures. It is apparent from the documentary sources, and evidence from rarely excavated examples, that the sheepcote or ancillary structures were occupied by the shepherd, dairymaid and other farm workers on an occasional or seasonal basis, including the lambing season when the sheepcote functioned as a lambing shed. An ancillary building, if made secure, could be used to store valuable medicines, equipment and possibly the fleeces that would accumulate during the year as sheep died. The lower stone courses of such a building survived at Chalk Hill, Temple Guiting, where it was located at right angles to the end of a large sheepcote. The building was rectangular, measuring approximately 9m by 4.4m, and was equipped with at least one barred window (Baldwin and O’Neil 1958, 63). Further examples of these ancillary buildings have been recorded at Elmont in Beckford, Worcestershire, where the building contained a hearth, and at Kineton, Temple Guiting. Finds from these structures and the associated sheepcotes date to the 13th–15th centuries (Dyer 1995, 147).

In the light of this evidence it seems likely that the poorly preserved Building 1 at Blenheim Farm should be interpreted either as a more humble peasant sheepcote, or an ancillary building for storage and the seasonal accommodation of shepherds. The eastern wall of Building 1 could have served as an internal division to a small sheepcote of two bays; the southern extent of the building and the absent wall indicated by the extent of the hollow, giving an approximate length of 9m to the structure and a minimum width of 2.5m. However the presence of a possible hearth and the quantity of domestic waste are more consistent with an interpretation as a dwelling, albeit one that may only have been seasonally occupied. Given the relatively low-lying position, if flocks were kept on the site during the winter months they could have been sheltered at night in a less substantial building, not apparent from the archaeological record. The remnant of a spread of stones in Paddock 4 to the west and the postholes and pits (Groups 91 and 93) to the south of this feature may indicate the alternative location of a structure of this kind.

The flocks at Blenheim Farm may have been driven to nearby fields to feed on stubble left by arable cultivation and to graze in fallow periods, returning valuable manure to the fields before the new crop was sown. The flocks could have been driven to pasture on higher and more marginal land in the summer months, but there is environmental evidence from the paddock ditches and pits to suggest crops grown for fodder, such as oats and rye, supplemented the food acquired from grazing. Of particular note in this context is the high percentage of burnt oat and rye grain found close to Building 1 in pit 1798, although in general the environmental evidence is typical of human domestic waste, reflecting the diet available to the occupants of the building (see Charred and waterlogged plant remains, above).

The impetus for the reorganisation of the field boundaries at Blenheim Farm in Phase B cannot be precisely determined. The medieval activity here spans a period of demographic and economic upheaval which wrought its changes on the rural landscape of the region. The period of population expansion from the 11th to 13th centuries was halted by an agrarian crisis which had an early and severe impact on the Cotswolds. The population
was already in decline before the Black Death of 1348–9 and the impact of shrinking and abandoned settlement had its effect on the upkeep and organisation of the surrounding farmland (Dyer 2002, 31). However, some individuals prospered as they took over other smallholdings and the refounded settlement at Moreton-in-Marsh may even have benefited from an incoming migration from the abandoned uplands.

The pottery assemblage suggests that manuring of arable land ceased in the first half of the 14th century. The latest pottery recovered from the site was associated with Building 1, which may have continued in occupation for a short period after the previous arable farming system had been abandoned. What is clear is that the small pens appear to have been rendered redundant at a time when one or more large fields were delineated, overlying the earlier enclosure ditches. The environmental evidence from Waterhole 2, which cuts through an earlier enclosure boundary, suggests domestic waste is present only in small quantities and insect species consistent with open areas and grassland are prevalent. The absence of charred plant remains in the sample from the hollow 2149 is a further indication that manuring had ceased. The inference from this is that a pastoral economy presides at this period, and the necessity to manage stock in small enclosures has been removed from this particular area by the provision of permanent pasture close at hand. A flock owned by a single individual that was provided with lowland pasture would not need to be counted and separated in the same way as animals belonging to several peasants after returning from more distant grazing.

The latest features to be ascribed to this period suggest continuing pastoral activity as Building 1 was abandoned and partially removed by a hollow feature, presumed to be formed by the passage of animals down to the stream. Later still in the sequence, this feature was replaced by a waterhole, to which livestock may have been driven to drink. The plant remains from the earlier of these two features includes woodland, scrub or hedgerow species. The absence of evidence for any human activity, other than the possible provision of a watering hole for livestock, suggests that the excavated area at Blenheim Farm had assumed a marginal status by this period and it is apparent from the location of the post-medieval field boundary that the medieval field ditches were no longer maintained.

The interpretations offered here attempt to set the excavated evidence within the known framework for the development of the medieval countryside in the Cotswolds. Our knowledge to date relies heavily on the work of landscape historians, most notably Christopher Dyer, who have proposed a model of medieval rural land-use based on an interdisciplinary approach combining documentary sources, earthwork survey and excavated evidence. Evidence of comparable sites remains sparse, particularly in the excavated record, and is still biased towards evidence preserved (often by earthwork remains) in areas that have maintained a more marginal status in the rural landscape following the agrarian crisis. A recent overview recognises there are ‘yawning gaps’ in our knowledge of the medieval rural archaeology of the region (Bowden 2006, 182). Sites such as Blenheim Farm provide data, including environmental evidence, which will make a vital contribution to our understanding of the period.
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PREHISTORIC AND MEDIEVAL REMAINS AT
21 CHURCH ROAD, BISHOP'S CLEEVE:
EXCAVATIONS IN 2004

by Kate Cullen and Annette Hancocks

with contributions by
Wendy J. Carruthers, E.R. McSloy, Sylvia Warman and Martin Watts

INTRODUCTION

Numerous archaeological investigations have been made and reported on at Bishop's Cleeve over the last 15 years, with evidence for Iron Age, Romano-British, Late Saxon and medieval activity recorded. The current site (SO 9587 2769: Fig. 1) lies immediately to the south of Gilder's Paddock, where Iron Age, Romano-British and medieval occupation was uncovered in 1989/90 (Parry 1999). Further occupation is attested to the south of Church Road, now Tesco supermarket (Lovell et al. 2007), and to the west at Home Farm (Barber and Walker 1998) and Stoke Road (Enright and Watts 2002).

A planning application for residential development of 21 Church Road was submitted to Tewkesbury Borough Council, which requested an archaeological evaluation to inform the planning process. This evaluation indicated that medieval and post-medieval remains survived within the proposed development area (CA 2003). Planning permission was subsequently granted with an archaeological condition attached that required an excavation and a watching brief to be undertaken. This work was carried out in April/May and November 2004 by Cotswold Archaeology. The results of the evaluation, the excavation and watching brief are reported here.

Topography and geology

The site is within the historic core of the village, at approximately 55m AOD and 200m south-west of the Late Norman church of St Michael and All Angels. Prior to excavation the site comprised a bakery fronting Church Road to the south, with car parking to the side and rear, and a small raised garden, about 1m above the level of the car park, at its northern end. Excavation was undertaken within the car park and garden.

The underlying geology of the area is mapped as Cheltenham Sand of the Quaternary period (GSGB 1981). The natural substrate encountered throughout the excavation area comprised sands and occasional gravel deposits.

Excavation methodology

The excavations were carried out in accordance with a brief prepared by Gloucestershire County Council and comprised the excavation of an area measuring approximately 20m by 45m, and a subsequent watching brief during the demolition of garages on the eastern side of the site (Figs 1 and 2). The topsoil and subsoil were removed by mechanical excavator to a depth of 0.65m in the raised garden area, which sloped slightly downwards to the south. In
Fig. 1: Site location plan (scale 1:2000)
contrast, only 0.3m of car park surface and overburden was removed from the southern part of the site, resulting in a 0.65m difference in height between excavation levels to either side of the retained modern wall. Archaeological remains survived as cut features, stone walls and surfaces. Hand excavation of at least 50% of all discrete features and of at least 20% of all linear features then followed. The total area of excavation was 850m².

EXCAVATION RESULTS

Archaeological features and deposits were encountered across the excavation area (Fig. 2), including ditches, gullies, pits, postholes and structures. Artefactual material was retrieved from the majority of features, which enabled five broad periods of activity to be identified:

Period 1: Iron Age
Period 2: Roman/Early Saxon
Period 3: Medieval
Period 4: Post-medieval
Period 5: Modern

Features and/or artefacts attributed to the first four periods are described below. Modern deposits and features, which included 19th-century stone tanks or cisterns, brick and cobbled yard surfaces and associated construction horizons, and 20th-century service trenches and layers of demolition debris, are not reported on. Full details can be found in the project archive.

Period 1: Iron Age (Figs 2–3)

Evidence of Iron Age activity comprising pits, gullies and ditches was found across the northern half of the site. Most of the features assigned to this period contained a few sherds of Iron Age pottery.

Five intercutting pits were identified in the north-western corner of the site (Pit Group 1). These covered an area approximately 2m in diameter and extended beyond the limit of excavation. The two earliest pits (1146, 1149) were both 0.65m deep, with flat bases and steep or undercut sides (Fig. 3, Section 2), and were subcircular in plan with diameters of 0.65m and 1.2m. Their form suggests that their original function was for grain storage. They contained a few large and unabraded pottery sherds, fired-clay objects and bones from cattle and sheep/goat. The later pits (1154, 1155, 1159) were shallower and more irregular, and their function was unclear, although their fills were similar to those of the earlier pits. Close by were two more pits (Pit Group 2). These were both circular in plan, 0.9m in diameter and up to 0.35m in depth (Fig. 3, Section 3). These pits also may have been for grain storage. Pit 1008 contained several pottery sherds, and a fragment of a blue-and-white glass bead of probable Iron Age date (Fig. 5).

To the east of the pits, two gullies and a ditch formed an 'H' arrangement (Fig. 2). Gully 1 was orientated east/west, was between 0.3m and 0.85m wide with a rounded profile, and survived to a depth of 0.3m (Fig. 3, Section 4). At the western end of Gully 1 was Gully 2, of similar dimensions but aligned north/south. Its northern end could not be clearly
Fig. 2: Plan of excavated features (scale 1:250)
traced, and it was truncated by the car park terracing to the south. At their intersection was a large circular pit (1012), 2m in diameter and 0.65m deep, which contained fragments of pottery and animal bone. The relationships between these features were not certain, although Gully 2 may have been later than pit 1012; if so, the pit may have acted as a soakaway, with Gully 1 channelling rainwater into it. Gully 1 did not extend eastwards beyond its intersection with north/south-aligned Ditch 3, a more substantial feature of up to 1.1m width and 0.25m depth. Like Gully 2, Ditch 3 continued to the north of the excavation area and was truncated by terracing to the south.

To the south of the raised garden area were Ditches 1 and 2, both aligned north-west/south-east. Terracing had removed any evidence for relationships between these ditches and those features to the north. Ditch 1 was 3m wide by 1.2m deep, and had been recut at least once. The primary ditch, 1090, was undated, but a fill (1084) of the recut contained several fragments of animal bone and pottery (Fig. 3, Section 1). Ditch 2 was parallel to and 5.5m to the north of Ditch 1. Ditch 2 had been truncated greatly by the terracing, but to the east, where it survived better, it was over 0.5m deep (Fig. 3, Section 5) and contained a small number of pottery sherds and animal bone fragments. Ditches 1 and 2 presumably defined a broad track or droveway.

**Dating evidence**

Dating evidence for Period 1 is provided primarily by the pottery, with fabrics and forms corresponding to larger assemblages from the Gloucestershire region including Gilder’s Paddock (Hancocks 1999, 105) and Crickley Hill (Elsdon 1994, 213–41). A broad chronological distinction is discernable. Pit Group 1 produced earlier or Middle Iron Age forms in fossil shell/limestone-tempered fabrics, whereas material from pit 1012 and the gullies and ditches consisted of Late Iron Age Malvernian-type fabrics. A glass bead from the primary fill of pit 1008 (Pit Group 2) dates to the Middle to Late Iron Age. The assemblage has close parallels and affinities with the pottery fabrics and forms of Middle Iron Age date recovered from Pit Groups 1 and 2, and features 46/220 and 47/210, at Gilder’s Paddock (Parry 1999, 99).

**Period 2: Roman and Saxon**

This period is only represented by 31 residual sherds of pottery (Tables 1–2) retrieved from later medieval pits. The absence of Roman and Saxon features on the site suggests a lack of continuity of settlement within the site, although not necessarily within the general locality.

**Period 3: Medieval** (Figs 2–4)

This period was represented mainly by pits. The main focus of activity was to the south of (Iron Age) Ditch 1, but three pits (Pit Group 4) lay to the north of Ditch 1. Two of these pits, 1107 and 1229, contained the partially articulated remains of horses; pit 1229 also contained a single fragment of medieval pottery as well as residual sherds of Roman and Saxon pottery (see above). Pit 1107 was 0.7m in diameter and 0.3m deep, while pit 1229 was larger at 1.1m in diameter and over 0.5m deep. The third pit, 1118, was undated but comparable in size, and adjacent to, pit 1107, suggesting it was contemporary.

In the southern part of the site there were at least 17 intercutting pits (Pit Group 3; Fig. 3, Section 6). The pits varied in shape but most were subcircular, up to 2.7m in diameter
Fig. 3: Sections 1 to 6 (scale 1:50)
with concave bases, and several had undercut sides. Their primary function may have been storage, but the recovery of a large quantity of medieval pottery and animal bone, including a partially articulated dog skeleton from pit 1205 (not illustrated), indicates the pits were later used for the disposal of domestic waste, and for a possible pet burial. Sixteen sherdps of residual Saxon pottery were also recovered from this pit group. In the south-east corner of the site was a large pit, 1055, approximately 2.5m in diameter and 1.3m in depth, with undercut edges. Originally it may have been stone-lined as it contained several large limestone fragments. As with Pit Group 3, the pit seems to have been used ultimately for the disposal of domestic waste. After Pit Group 3 went out of use a 0.12m-thick dark soil layer (1124) formed, most probably as a result of ploughing (Fig. 3, Section 6).

**Dating evidence**

Pit Group 4 is dated by a single sherd of Cotswold-type pottery from pit 1229, dating to the 11th to 13th century, while Pit Group 3 is dated by 153 medieval sherds, including a sherd from a tripod pitcher in a glazed Worcester fabric from the mid 12th to mid 13th century. Pit 1055 contained Malvernian and Cotswold-type pottery of 12th to 14th-century date, in forms such as simple and developed everted rimmed jars. The cultivation layer 1124 contained pottery of a similar date range (12th to 13th century). There are few elements, such as imported tableware forms, which might permit closer dating or relative ceramic phasing. Aspects of the Period 3 pottery, such as the proportions of Cotswold and Malvern cooking-pot fabrics, the prevalence of developed rim forms and the occurrence of wheel-finished Malvern jar rims, suggest that most material dates to between the mid 12th to mid 13th century.

**Period 4: Post-medieval** (Fig. 2)

Apart from four pits at the northern end of the site, evidence for post-medieval activity was restricted to the southern third of the site and included the remains of a small building with a cobbled surface and drain, and a number of postholes.

The remains of Building 1 comprised four parallel robber trenches, with a fifth robber trench at the eastern end (all trench 1062), all of which contained the same rubble infill. The robbed walls were probably foundations for a raised rectangular structure, approximately 5m by 3m (Fig. 2). To the west, two parallel stone walls (1059 and 1060) survived up to two courses high. Wall 1059 was 0.7m wide whereas wall 1060 was 0.35m wide, but both were aligned with Building 1 and may have supported steps up to it. Pottery dating from the 11th to 13th century was retrieved from a deposit associated with the construction of wall 1059, but this was probably residual from soil layer 1124, through which the foundation trenches had been dug. A token dating to 1690 and a bone-handled iron knife of probable 18th-century date were recovered from the rubble fill of robber trench 1062.

To the south were the remains of an undated cobbled surface (1038), which was probably associated with Building 1, although no direct evidence survived. Running east/west across surface 1038 was one of three heavily truncated sections of a stone drain (1039), with the two other surviving sections to the west (1231) and east (1115). Pottery associated with the construction of the drain dated from the 13th or 14th century, and this was also considered to be residual. A buckle, probably dating to the later 16th or 17th century, was retrieved from deposit 1167 (not illustrated) from within drain 1115. This deposit spread well beyond drain 1115, and was cut by the southernmost part of robber trench 1062.
A number of postholes were situated around the eastern and southern sides of Building 1, but there was no coherent pattern to indicate their function. Ten postholes were excavated, varying in size from 0.2m to 0.55m in diameter and from 0.2m to 0.4m in depth. Three of the ten postholes, 1132, 1134 and 1136, appeared to be intercutting. Pottery sherds dating from the 18th century were recovered from postholes 1132, 1068 and 1224. Four pits at the northern end of the site also yielded pottery dating to the 17th or 18th century.

THE FINDS
by E.R. McSloy

The pottery

Analysis of the pottery was confined to Periods 1 to 3. A small quantity of post-medieval pottery was also recovered from Period 4 features, largely utilitarian coarseware types from Malvern Chase or Staffordshire, for the most part dateable to between the 16th and 18th centuries (Table 1). Small quantities of tableware included tin-glazed earthenwares, most probably from Bristol, and stonewares from the Rhineland.

Fabric codes for Iron Age material are those utilised at the adjoining Gilder's Paddock site (Hancocks 1999, 104–5). Codes for later material conform to those used for Roman to medieval groups at Home Farm (Timby 1998, 126–8) and Stoke Road, Bishop's Cleeve (Timby 2002, 22–6), which incorporate nomenclature of the National Roman Fabric Reference Collection (Tomber and Dore 1998) and Gloucester City Museum (see Vince 1983).

Pottery fabrics were identified macroscopically or with the use of x20 binocular microscope. Recording was by minimum vessel and sherd counts, weight and rim estimated vessel equivalents (EVEs). Preservation of the stratified pottery was good with little abrasion or weathering noted. Average sherd weight for the small Iron Age group is very high at 23g, the effect of joining sherds from pit 1149, fills 1017 and 1150 (Pit Group 1; Fig. 3, Section 2).

Period 1: Iron Age

The Iron Age pottery (Tables 1–2) falls into two well-defined fabric groups, which almost certainly reflect differing chronology. The larger group from Pit Group 1 consists mainly of fossil shell/limestone-tempered fabric 3; significantly, Malvernian-type fabrics are absent. Identifiable forms include a slack-shouldered jar (Fig. 4.1) of Early or earlier Middle Iron Age date, and four Middle Iron Age-type barrel jars (Fig. 4.2–4). The second group, consisting of material from linear features and pit 1012 (Table 2: ‘other features’), comprises Malvernian type B1, local limestone or quartz-tempered fabrics. No forms were identifiable among this group but the relative prominence of the Malvernian material, particularly the limestone-tempered type, probably indicates a Late Iron Age date.

The small Iron Age assemblage corresponds closely in terms of fabric range and broad chronology to the Iron Age material from Gilder’s Paddock (Hancocks 1999, 105). The slack-shouldered jar with high neck and expanded rim from pit 1149 (Pit Group 1, Fig. 4.1) is close to a number of vessels from there (ibid., nos 28 and 31–2) and examples of Early Iron Age date from Crickley Hill (Elsdon 1994, 204). This vessel came from the basal fill of the earliest of a sequence of pits; the later fills of Pit Group 1 produced examples
Table 1: Pottery quantification by fabric, all periods

Fabric codes relate to previously published Iron Age material (Hancocks 1999), the Gloucester City Museum fabric type series (Vince 1983) and to the National Roman Fabric Reference Collection (Tomber and Dore 1998).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fabric Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Min. vess.</th>
<th>EVEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period 1: Iron Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvernian rock-tempered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Peacock 1968, A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvernian limestone-tempered</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Peacock 1968, B1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local fossil-shell/limestone-tempered</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz-tempered</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period 2: Roman</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severn Valley ware</td>
<td>SVW OX2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfordshire red colour-coated</td>
<td>OXF RS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local greyware</td>
<td>LOC GW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local imitation BB</td>
<td>LOC IMBB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvernian wheel-thrown</td>
<td>MAL RT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period 2: Anglo-Saxon</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic-tempered</td>
<td>SAX ORG</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz-tempered</td>
<td>SAX QZ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz with limestone</td>
<td>SAX QZLS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz with organic</td>
<td>SAX QZORG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period 3: medieval</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotswold oolitic</td>
<td>TF41</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Chase cooking pot</td>
<td>TF40</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester? sandy</td>
<td>TF42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quartz and limestone</td>
<td>TF43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minety ware</td>
<td>TF44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvern Chase glazed</td>
<td>TF52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester glazed</td>
<td>TF90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2511</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Period 4: post-medieval</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvernian redware</td>
<td>TF52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine, micaceous (Newent Glasshouse?)</td>
<td>TF54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin glazed (Bristol/Staffs)</td>
<td>TF62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frechen stoneware</td>
<td>TF68C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow slipware (Bristol/Staffs)</td>
<td>TF72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffs Black-glazed earthenware</td>
<td>TF75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsourced glazed red earthenware</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>296</td>
<td>4189</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2: Pottery by Period and feature group, Periods 1 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Weight (g)</th>
<th>Min. vess.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Iron Age</td>
<td>Pit Group 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other features</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Medieval</td>
<td>Pit Group 3</td>
<td>LOC BB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOC GW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MAL RT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVW OX2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAX ORG</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAX QZ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAX QZLS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAX QZORG</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OXF RS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAX QZLS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAX QZ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building 1</td>
<td>TF40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pit 1055</td>
<td>OXF RS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVW OX2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TF42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>254</td>
<td>3304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of barrel jars of distinctively Middle Iron Age type. Overall the pottery conforms to the regional pattern, which experienced an increasing dominance of ‘traded’ wares in the Late Iron Age period (Ford and Rees forthcoming).

**Period 2: Roman and Anglo-Saxon**

Small quantities of Roman and Anglo-Saxon pottery were recovered (Table 1), all of which were residual within Period 3 features (Table 2). Roman material consists of local-type fabrics well known from other sites in Bishop’s Cleeve, including Home Farm (Timby 1998, 126–8) and Stoke Road (Timby 2002, 22–6). Sherds of Oxfordshire red colour-coated ware and a late form of Severn Valley ware tankard (Webster 1976) suggest 3rd to 4th-century AD dating, which is in accordance with previously excavated stratified groups.

Anglo-Saxon pottery, all of which is handmade, is also comparable in terms of the range of fabrics to material recovered from elsewhere in Bishop’s Cleeve (Timby 1998, 134; 2002, 22–6), and a similarly broad c. 5th to 9th-century AD date range can be assigned. No rims or decorated sherds were recovered, although joining sherds from Pit Group 3 derive from a mid-size globular-bodied vessel. Though residual, 16 of the 19 Anglo-Saxon sherds were recovered from Pit Group 3 and the unabraded condition of this group, its spatial coherence and the presence of cross-context joins, suggests that this material was disturbed from stratified deposits nearby.

**Period 3: medieval**

Medieval pottery accounts for the larger part of the assemblage (Table 1), much of which was recovered from Pit Group 3 (Table 2). The medieval assemblage consists predominantly of coarse ‘cooking-pot’ fabrics of two distinct classes: Malvern Chase ware (TF40) and oolitic limestone-tempered types (TF41 and TF43), probably from the Gloucester area. Sandy coarseware type (TF42) is unsourced but possibly derives from the Worcester area together with glazed type TF90. Other glazed tableware types comprise material from Malvern Chase (TF52) and Minety, north Wiltshire (TF44). The assemblage compares in some respects with the much larger group from Stoke Road (Timby 2002, 27–32). A significant difference, and one which probably relates to chronology, is the proportionately much greater incidence (30% by vessel count) of oolitic limestone-tempered Cotswold-type fabrics (TF41). The greater abundance of Cotswold-type fabrics and other aspects of the assemblage suggest that the bulk of the pottery dates to the mid 12th to mid 13th centuries. A possible (earlier) exception is a small group of pottery from pit 1229 (Pit Group 4). A single sherd of Cotswold type TF41 from this feature provides a 10th to 13th-century *terminus post quem*.

Vessel forms among the medieval pottery are largely confined to jars, with ‘developed’ everted-rims probably implying dating after c. AD 1150. Single examples of the earlier ‘clubbed’ and simple everted-jar rims are present among the Cotswold oolitic (TF41) material, although these are residual. The only medieval vessel illustrated (Fig. 4.5) is a typical Malvernian straight-sided jar with sagging base. Aside from cooking-pot types, few other forms were identifiable. A sherd tentatively identified as a glazed Worcester product from pit 1250 (Pit Group 3), but which is of an unusually coarse fabric, features decoration in the form of a wavy applied strip and comb stabbing. It is handmade and probably derives from a tripod pitcher of 12th to earlier 13th-century date (Bryant 2004, 297).
Fig. 4: Iron Age pottery (nos 1–4; scale 1:3) and medieval pottery (no. 5; scale 1:4)
Catalogue of illustrated sherds (Fig. 4)


The token

A single token was recovered from robber trench 1062. This is an example of Irish ‘Gun Money’ issued by James II in exile to pay his troops during the Irish campaign (identified by E. Besly). Tokens of this type, which appear to have been in fairly common circulation, include the month and year when minted: the token is stamped ‘MAY 1690’. The intention was that they were to be exchanged, in the order they were issued, on the successful completion of the campaign and James’s restoration. The ‘XXX’ on the reverse indicates 30 pence, or half-crown denomination.

Other finds

Analysis was restricted to material from deposits dating to Periods 1–3. A single item, an Iron Age glass bead, is of intrinsic interest and is described fully and illustrated. Metalwork, worked stone items and the fired clay are summarised briefly below with full details reserved for the archive.

Glass

A glass bead recovered from fill 1110 of pit 1008 (Pit Group 2) belongs to Guido’s long-lived ‘miscellaneous wave-decorated’ class 5A (4th/3rd centuries BC to 6th/7th centuries AD). A Middle Iron Age date (c. 4th to 1st centuries BC) is suggested in this instance by associated ceramics. The earliest beads of this class are from the Arras burials of Yorkshire (Stead 1965, 59–60), which date to the 4th/3rd centuries BC. Geographically closer examples from Meare, Somerset, are perhaps as early as the 3rd century BC (Guido 1978, 63). This bead differs from these earlier examples in respect of its much greater size, which is however comparable with other Iron Age types. Untypical of the class as a whole is its strong cobalt-like colour and its opacity, although this may be due to decay (Eleanor Standley, pers. comm.)

Illustrated glass artefact (Fig. 5)

Approximately half of an annular glass bead. Opaque blue glass with white marvered white wave pattern. D-shaped section. Thickness 7 mm; diam. approx. 23 mm. Fill 1110 of pit 1008, Pit Group 2, Period 2.

Fig. 5: The glass bead (scale 1:1)
Metalwork
A total of 57 items of metalwork were recovered. The bulk of material relates to Period 4, with only fragmentary (and non-classifiable) iron nails or intrusive items from Period 3. Of note amongst the Period 4 material are 44 copper-alloy wire pins, mainly from deposits associated with the demolition and robbing of Building 1. Most examples are within the range 20–25mm, and as such are more typical of later 16th and 17th-century examples (Crummy 1988, 7). Remaining copper-alloy items include a lace end from robber trench 1062, which is typical of Crummy's non-riveted Type 2 and dateable to c. 1575–1700+ (ibid., 13) and a double-looped, rectangular-framed buckle from layer 1167, which probably dates to c. 1570–1700 (Whitehead 1996, 74). An iron knife retaining its plain bone handle, from robber trench 1062, is of post-medieval (probably 18th-century) bolstered form.

Fired clay and worked stone
Quantities of fired/burnt clay amounting to 3.5kg were recovered. All derived from Period 1 features and almost entirely from Pit Group 1. A single fragmentary clay loomweight of Iron Age triangular type was recovered from pit 1149, together with large, slab-like fragments of unknown function. The remainder (approximately 1.8kg) comprises generally formless fragments which probably represent burnt structural daub. A Norwegian ragstone whetstone of early medieval type was recovered from Period 3 cultivation layer 1124. Typically it has been perforated for suspension even though it is only 47mm long. It has clearly been worked down from a much larger whetstone.

THE BIOLOGICAL EVIDENCE
Animal bone, by Sylvia Warman
Animal bone recovered from Periods 1 and 3 was studied in detail. Measurements recorded follow von den Driesch (1976) unless otherwise specified. Material identified to species and element is presented and discussed in this report.

The hand-collected bone from Period 1 comprises 42 fragments, weighing 980g, and from Period 3 940 fragments, weighing 1.2kg (Tables 3 and 4). Totals for the number of identified specimens (NISP) and the minimum number of individuals required to produce the assemblage (MNI) have been calculated. In addition to the hand-collected bone, two Period 1 soil samples produced 307 bone fragments, weighing 31g, and three Period 3 samples produced 123 fragments, weighing 22g.

Table 3: Animal Bone, Period 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Sheep/Goat</th>
<th>Pig</th>
<th>Horse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Identified Specimens (NISP)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight (g)</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Number of Individuals (MNI)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% by NISP</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% by weight</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Period 1: Iron Age**
The animal bone from Period 1 comprises cattle, sheep/goat, pig and horse (Table 3). The assemblage is small but consistent with the domestic fauna expected for this period. The cattle and sheep/goat remains show the widest range of body parts. The horse bones comprise limb bones and a couple of teeth; pig is represented by a single tooth. The soil samples produced sheep/goat, frog, vole and mouse. The Period 1 animal bone bears butchery evidence in the form of chop marks on nine bones from cattle, sheep/goat and horse.

**Period 3: Medieval**
The Period 3 assemblage includes cattle, horse, sheep/goat, pig and dog (Table 4), and is dominated by an incomplete dog skeleton from pit 1205 (Pit Group 3) and two largely complete horse skeletons from pits 1107 and 1229 (Pit Group 4). All bone was in good condition and well preserved. Such burials are not unusual for this period, and the

*Table 4: Animal Bone, Period 3*

MNI = Minimum Number of Individuals; NISP = Number of Identified Specimens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Sheep/Goat</th>
<th>Pig</th>
<th>Dog</th>
<th>Horse</th>
<th>Mole</th>
<th>Water voles</th>
<th>Chicken</th>
<th>Turdus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vertebra</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costal cartilage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacarpal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innominate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacrum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sternum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patella</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibula</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metatarsal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapodial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessamoid</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalanges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NISP totals</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total weight</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>10495.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% by NISP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% by weight</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
examination of more or less complete skeletons provides the opportunity to investigate the size and type of animal used at the time. Table 4 shows the entire range of skeletal parts present from these animals, for which an accurate estimate of both age and stature has been calculated, and lists other species present in the Period 3 bone assemblage.

Pit 1107 contained the substantially complete skeleton of Horse 1, with bones from at least one other adult horse; pit 1229 contained the near-complete skeleton of Horse 2, and the foot of an immature pig. The withers (shoulder) height calculated for Horse 1 is 1.26m (or 12 hands 2 inches), the equivalent of a smaller modern pony such as the Dartmoor breed; for Horse 2 it is 1.30–1.37m (or 13 hands 1 inch), the equivalent of a medium-sized modern pony such as the New Forest breed. The latter is a very similar size to that deduced for horse remains found in a medieval pit at Stoke Road (Maltby 2002, 49). Horse 1 has some changes in the skeleton which appear to be the result of infection, including swelling and extra bone growth on the shaft of the cannon bone (metatarsal). Unusual bone growth can also be seen in the spine, where several thoracic and lumbar vertebrae are enlarged and fused together. This may have been the result of overloading, either from riding or use as a draft or pack animal. Dental wear on both horses indicates an age of least 12 years. The horse skeletons may well represent the burial of old or lame animals at the end of their working life. The dog from pit 1205 was an adult and is estimated to have had a withers height of 0.60–0.63m, similar to a medium to large modern breed such as a German Shepherd.

The medieval assemblage shows some similarities with the material from Stoke Road (Maltby 2002), although only domestic species were present there. The bone shows a low incidence of butcher marks as it largely comprises three partially articulated carcasses. Unlike the small quantity of horse bone from Period 1, which shows evidence of butchery and seems to relate to domestic waste, the horse bone from Period 3 has no butcher marks and represents the deliberate burial of entire or near-entire animals.

**Charred plant remains**, by Wendy J. Carruthers

Soil samples were taken from six pits (dating to Periods 1, 3 and 4) for the recovery of environmental remains, and processed using standard methods of flotation. The unsorted flots from six 10-litre subsamples were assessed, along with charred material sorted from the residues and small fractions of residues from samples <2> and <3>. Following assessment, Period 1 samples <2> and <3> were subject to full analysis of all 40 litres collected. Table 5 presents the results. The taxa recovered from the 10-litre subsamples from <1>, <4>, <5> and <6>, identified during the assessment, are also included as they provide information about the medieval and early post-medieval economies.

Although only small quantities of poorly preserved charred plant remains were recovered, a surprisingly wide range of possible crops is represented. The scarcity of chaff fragments and weed seeds means that there is little evidence for cereal processing and crop husbandry is present, and all of the charred material probably represents burnt domestic waste.

**Period 1: Iron Age**

Samples from the primary fills of Iron Age pits 1149 (Pit Group 1) and 1008 (Pit Group 2) were fully analysed. The samples were not particularly rich in charred plant remains. Pit 1149 contained evidence of oat (*Avena* sp.; although this could have been growing wild as an arable weed), hulled barley (*Hordeum vulgare*), emmer/spelt wheat (*Triticum dicoccum/spelta*) and bread-type free-threshing wheat (*Triticum aestivum*-type). The same types of
Table 5: Charred plant remains, all periods

Habitat Preferences: A = arable; C = cultivated; D = disturbed/waste; E = heath; G = grassland; H = hedgerow; M = marsh/bog; R = rivers/ditches/ponds; S = scrub; W = woods; Y = waysides/hedgerows; a = acidic soils; c = calcareous soils; d = dry soils; n = nutrient-rich soils; o = open ground; w = wet/damp soils. All remains charred apart from ( ); cf. = uncertain ID; * = plant of economic value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample no:</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context no:</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>1167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature:</td>
<td>pit 1149</td>
<td>pit 1008</td>
<td>pit 1196</td>
<td>pit 1055</td>
<td>pit 1248</td>
<td>pit 1167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cereals (grain):</th>
<th>Common name</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triticum aestivum/turgidum</td>
<td>bread/rivet-type free-threshing wheat</td>
<td>* 4 7 - - 1 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. dicoccum/spelta</td>
<td>emmer/spelt wheat</td>
<td>* 1 6 - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triticum sp.</td>
<td>indeterminate wheat</td>
<td>* 10 - - - 1 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hordeum vulgare L. emend.</td>
<td>hulled barley</td>
<td>* 3 11 - - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secale cereale L.</td>
<td>rye</td>
<td>* - - cf.1 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secale cereale/Triticum sp.</td>
<td>rye/wheat</td>
<td>* - - 1 - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avena sp.</td>
<td>wild/cultivated oat</td>
<td>* 1 - - - - cf.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avena/Bromus sp.</td>
<td>oat/chess</td>
<td>* - - 3 4 - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate cereals</td>
<td>* 4 38 5 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chaff:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. dicoccum/spelta (glume base)</td>
<td>emmer/spelt wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. dicoccum/spelta (spikelet fork)</td>
<td>emmer/spelt wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cereal-sized culm base</td>
<td>1 - - - - -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeds:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corylus avellana L. (shell frag.)</td>
<td>hazelnut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicia faba var. minor (frag)</td>
<td>Celtic bean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicia/Lathyrus/Pisum sp. (4-5mm)</td>
<td>vetch/tare/pea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legume pod frag.</td>
<td>* - - cf.1 - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odontites verna/Euphrasia sp.</td>
<td>red bartsia/eyebright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambucus nigra L. (seed)</td>
<td>elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poaceae</td>
<td>small-seeded grass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | Total: | 25 67 12 9 (47) 6 (5) 5 |
|---|---|
| Sample size (litres): | 40 40 10 10 10 10 10 |
| Fragments per litre: | 0.6 1.7 1.2 0.9 (4.7) 0.6 (0.5) 0.5 |
wheat and barley were present in pit 1008, along with possible rye (cf. *Secale cereale*) and possible pea (or a large-seeded vetch; *Vicia/Lathyrus/Pisum* sp.). Oats, rye and peas only start to appear in Britain in the Late Bronze Age/Iron Age period, so the appearance of all three in these small samples, albeit in low numbers and as poorly preserved tentative identifications, is not unexpected. In addition, bread-type wheat was surprisingly frequent in the samples, outnumbering emmer/spelt wheat grains (although numbers were low for all remains). Interpretation based on such poor assemblages must be highly tentative, but results suggest that Iron Age arable agriculture was advanced, at least in terms of the range of crops being grown. This may be because Bishop’s Cleeve is situated on a small area of river terrace gravels surrounded by clay soils. This range of growing conditions will suit most crops: cereals like barley could be grown on the gravel, and wheat and oats on the clay.

**Periods 3 and 4: Medieval and post-medieval**

As with the Iron Age samples, the medieval and post-medieval samples produced small quantities of burnt domestic waste, most of which was poorly preserved. The evidence suggests that bread-type wheat, possible rye (*Secale cereale/Triticum* sp.), possible oat (*Avena/Bromus* sp.) and possible Celtic bean (*Vicia faba* var. *minor*) were being grown during the 12th to 14th centuries. The only cereal recovered from the Period 4 samples was possible oat (cf. *Avena* sp.).

There was no evidence to indicate that any of the sampled medieval features had been cesspits, which often contain mineralised plant remains (see Green 1979; Carruthers 2000). Several uncharred elder seeds recovered from samples <5> and <6> may have been partially mineralised (they were not modern contaminants as no embryos were present). If so, their preservation suggests that the diet was fairly simple, since no other fruit remains were present. The presence of charred possible Celtic beans and hazelnut shell (*Corylus avellana*) fragments is further evidence of a simple rural diet. Native hedgerow fruits and nuts would have added variety to the cereal and legume-based diet.

**DISCUSSION**

by Annette Hancocks and Martin Watts

The excavations have provided further evidence for the Iron Age, Roman, Anglo-Saxon and medieval occupation revealed over the past decade in and around the historic core of Bishop’s Cleeve (Fig. 1). Although the excavation area was relatively small and the results of excavation relatively modest, the presence of Iron Age and medieval remains and the apparent lack of Roman and Anglo-Saxon features provide further evidence for the settlement history in the village. This is particularly so for the Iron Age features, which relate directly to features recorded at the immediately adjacent Gilder’s Paddock excavation (Parry 1999).

**Iron Age**

It is now clear that the Middle Iron Age agricultural settlement identified at Gilder’s Paddock extended southwards for a further 20m to 25m across the current site, and all the
groups of features recorded here can be related to those found previously to the north. Pit Groups 1 and 2 here compare with Pit Group 1 at the south-west corner of Gilder's Paddock in terms of size and form (suggesting a primary function of food storage) and fill (suggesting a secondary function for the disposal of domestic waste). Although there was no evidence for a northward continuation of Gully 2, Ditch 3 here is clearly the southern continuation of Ditch 100 at Gilder's Paddock (Fig. 1; Parry 1999, fig. 2), and they possibly formed the north-west corner of a rectangular enclosure. Further to the south, Ditches 1 and 2 are on the same north-west/south-east alignment as the major boundary ditches 46/220 and 47/210 at Gilder's Paddock, and are clearly related.

The dating evidence recovered from the current site also supports the chronology suggested at Gilder's Paddock, where most features were dated to the Middle Iron Age, with some residual Early Iron Age material. The major north-west/south-east boundaries appeared to have been the latest features at Gilder's Paddock. Pottery suggested that the pit groups were probably out of use before they were constructed, and stratigraphically they were later than north/south Ditches 37 and 295 (Parry 1999, fig. 2, 99). At the current site, the pottery also suggests that the pit groups were the earliest features and the major boundary ditches were the latest, and they are more securely dated to the Late Iron Age than those at Gilder's Paddock, where only a single sherd of Late Iron Age pottery was recovered (ibid., 98–9). Although Late Iron Age material was also recovered from the other linear features (and associated pit) these were probably also earlier than the major boundary ditches: no relationship survived at the current site but the major boundaries at Gilder's Paddock clearly post-dated the smaller north/south ditches (ibid., fig. 2).

Interpretation of the Gilder's Paddock Iron Age remains as those of an agricultural settlement was based on the presence of food storage pits and boundary ditches for livestock management, and the recovery of quern fragments and animal bone (Parry 1999, 100). This interpretation is augmented by the evidence from the current site, where further storage pits and boundary ditches have been recorded, and where analysis of biological remains is also indicative of Iron Age agricultural settlement. While small, the animal bone assemblage is dominated by cattle and sheep/goat, the expected Iron Age domestic fauna, and the charred plant remains suggest that a wide range of crops were being grown including bread-type wheat, emmer/spelt wheat and hulled barley, and possibly oats, rye and peas.

Ditch 1 represents the southern extent of Iron Age activity at the current site, however, excavations on the southern side of Church Road (about 100m to the south of Ditch 1) have revealed further evidence for Middle to Late Iron Age settlement, including roundhouses, pits and postholes (Lovell et al. 2007). It is possible that both sites were parts of a single, substantial Iron Age settlement centred around Church Road, but it is more likely that they were separate farmsteads. They may have been part of a wider integrated network of rural Iron Age settlement, akin to that attested by cropmark and excavated evidence in the Carrant valley in south Worcestershire (Parry 1999, 100; Dinn and Evans 1990; Coleman et al. 2006).

**Roman and Anglo-Saxon**

No features of Roman or Anglo-Saxon date were identified but 12 sherds of Roman and 19 sherds of Anglo-Saxon pottery were recovered as residual finds from later features. The Roman pottery is consistent with assemblages recovered from other sites in Bishop's...
Cleeve, including nearby Home Farm (Fig. 1), where evidence for sustained Romano-British occupation over several centuries was recorded, including ditches, pits, ovens and demolition material suggestive of a masonry building (Barber and Walker 1998). Roman remains immediately to the north at Gilder's Paddock, including a boundary ditch and linear inhumation cemetery, appeared to have been sited well away from the focus of occupation (Parry 1999, 101), and the lack of identified Roman features at the current site supports this interpretation. The assemblage of Anglo-Saxon pottery adds to the 17 sherds recovered as residual finds from Home Farm (Timby 1998, 134) and the 230 sherds recovered from south of Church Road (Lovell et al. 2007), which strongly suggests that there was a focus of Anglo-Saxon activity in the vicinity of that site.

**Medieval and post-medieval**

The medieval remains comprised a number of pits and a later cultivation layer. To the south, there was no evidence from the charred plant remains to suggest that the pits in Pit Group 3 were cesspits, though the large quantity of pottery sherds and animal bone recovered from them is indicative of domestic waste disposal, and one had been used for a dog burial. To the north, the pits in Pit Group 4 were dug for the burial of horse carcasses. The pottery from the pits, and from the cultivation layer that post-dated Pit Group 3, indicates that all of this activity could have occurred between the mid 12th to mid 13th centuries AD. The pits would be typical of the rear part of property plots fronting onto Church Road, although no trace of any medieval building was found. Similar groups of medieval pits were excavated at Stoke Road (Enright and Watts 2002), towards the rear (north) of plots adjoining the road to the south.

During the medieval period the manor of Bishop's Cleeve was under the lordship of the Bishop of Worcester, with a manor house at Cleeve Hall, parts of which date to the 13th century (Dyer 2002, 70). The 12th to 14th-century tofts excavated at Stoke Road were probably parts of peasant holdings on the western fringes of the manorial site (ibid., 71). The location of the Church Road site to the east of Cleeve Hall mirrors that of Stoke Road, and a similar interpretation seems reasonable, although the pair of medieval ditches recorded at Gilder's Paddock were thought perhaps to relate to occupation focused on the church of St Michael and All Angels, about 200m north-east of the current site (Parry 1999, 102). The animal bone and charred plant remains recovered from the current site are comparable to those recovered from Stoke Road, suggesting a similar level of subsistence.

Post-medieval activity was represented by the remains of Building 1 and associated structures in the southern half of the site. The function of Building 1 is unknown. It seems unlikely that this was a dwelling, which presumably fronted onto Church Road, but it may have been a food store to the rear, raised on dwarf stone walls and accessed by steps to the north-west. The date of its construction is unclear (it may have been later medieval in origin) but it was demolished and its foundation walls dug up sometime after 1690, and almost certainly during the 18th century. Development gathered pace during the 19th century with the construction of new buildings (probably a stable block or barn), cobbled yard surfaces, stone tanks and drains.
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