Roman Horncastle

Naomi Field and Henry Hurst

Horncastle has been recognised as a Roman walled site at least since Stukeley's description and map of 1722 (Stukeley 1724; cf. Whitwell 1970, 71-4), but discoveries made over the last two decades have radically changed our view of the site. Roman Horncastle (formerly referred to as a 'lesser walled town') is now seen to consist of two main elements: a walled enclosure of about 2 hectares (5 acres) at the junction of the rivers Bain and Waring (at the modern town centre) and an unwalled settlement covering up to 54 hectares (135 acres) on a slightly higher gravel terrace south of the Waring and east of the Bain. Finds from the unwalled settlement suggest that it originated in the pre-Roman period and that a substantial area was in use at least until the late 4th century A.D., while the walled circuit is shown to have been a late 3rd- or 4th-century military construction on an adjacent site without evidence of continuous earlier occupation. This paper brings together the results of recent excavations and fieldwork as well as the casual discoveries made over many years. It is divided into four main parts:

1. The setting of Roman Horncastle.
2. The walled area: recent excavations and fieldwork.
3. The unwalled area: a summary of the evidence.
4. Summary and discussion of the present state of knowledge.
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1. THE SETTING OF ROMAN HORNCastle

The modern town of Horncastle, which covers both Roman sites, lies on river terrace gravels close to the 30 m. contour in the valley of the river Bain near the south-west corner of the Lincolnshire Wolds where the Bain valley flattens out into the fenland surrounding the Wash (Fig. 2). The Bain is the main river flowing southwards from the Wolds and it is joined at Horncastle from the east by a tributary, the Waring. The Bain itself joins the Witham nearly 10 km. to the south at Dogdyke, from where it flows into the Wash.

The topography of the Fens has, however, undergone such radical changes since Roman times that the significance, in Roman terms, of this setting is no longer apparent. There is little doubt that in A.D. c. 200 the Wash extended westwards over a substantial area of modern Fenland. Work being carried out by Brian Simmons and others (Simmons 1980) suggests that the high tide line at that date lay close to the 10 ft. contour, with the sea level rising perhaps a further three or four feet by A.D. c. 400. There is evidence from soil studies of estuarine-type silt deposits either side of the Bain below the 10 ft. contour, suggesting that the lower part of the river was once an inlet of the sea. These deposits have been traced as far up as Coningsby, about 9 km from Horncastle. (Mr J. D. Robson of the Soil Survey kindly supplied this information.) The Woodhall Spa sheet (TF 10) of the Soil Survey, covering an area west and south-west of Horncastle, also suggests that there was an extinct watercourse—marked by estuarine-type clays—extending eastwards from the Witham towards Horncastle (Simmons 1980, 71 and fig. 33). It is interesting to note the tradition about Horncastle recorded by Stukeley (1724, 28): ‘Some don’t scruple to affirm it was a seaport, that is, navigable.’ The estuarine deposits have yet to be dated directly, but as they lie directly under existing topsoil, they are most likely to have been deposited under the coastal conditions which existed in the later Roman or early medieval periods.

Another major change since the Roman period has been the erosion of the east coast of Lincolnshire. It is uncertain how much land has been lost, but a possible Roman site which now lies nearly a mile out to sea is the ‘castle’ at Skegness which Leland tells us was washed away by the sea. This site may be identical with the ‘Chesterland’ of the Ingoldmells Manor Court Rolls, last referred to in 1422, since Skegness lay within that minor

(cf. Whitwell 1970, 51–2; we are indebted to Mrs E. H. Rudkin for drawing our attention to the Ingoldmells Manor Court Rolls).

The overall picture, then, is of major change in Horncastle’s setting since Roman times. Even if we are not clear about the details, the site seems to have been more closely in contact with the sea than today seems apparent. This gives the strategic position of the late Roman walled area a particular significance, since there is an obvious similarity to other late Roman coastal fortifications (for example, Bradwell, Bitterne, Burgh Castle and Portchester Castle: Johnson 1976; see discussion below), but it may also explain the earlier importance of the unwareled site as a point where land-based joined water-borne communications. This suggestion is supported by looking at what we know at present of the Roman land communications in the area (Margaray 1967; Whitwell 1970, 44 ff.). Horncastle lies at the southern end of the Caistor High Street, a prehistoric ridgeway which must once have been a major route between the Wash and Humberside (May 1976, 8–9). Despite a probable reduction of its importance by the building of Ermine Street northwards from Lincoln, the High Street would have continued to be the main link between the Wolds and the salt-making sites of the Wash area, or indeed the sea. Water-borne transport seems to have been the most effective means of movement through the marshy areas south of Horncastle (no Roman road has so far been found in this area), and the same looks to be true of the route westwards from Horncastle to Lincoln. As now known, the journey by Roman road from Horncastle to Lincoln is circuitous, first northwards along the Caistor High Street, then westwards and finally south-westwards on the Lincoln—Burgh-le-Mars road, presumably because the Witham valley west of Horncastle was marsh. The Witham would almost certainly have been navigable as far as Lincoln, so that
2. THE WALLED AREA

The walled enclosure is situated in the angle formed by the confluence of the Waring and Bain. Like the Bain, the Waring flows southwards from the Wolds and about 1 km. from the junction of the two rivers turns sharply westwards to join the Bain. From the recent excavations it appears that until post-medieval times the Waring flowed immediately south of the south wall and that the Bain ran just north of the north wall near the north-west corner of the circuit in Manor House garden. In Stukeley's time, and probably until the late 18th-century canalisation of the Bain, its course lay c. 170 m. to the west of the wall. Stukeley himself (1724, 28) thought it may formerly have been even closer to the wall (see below).

EVIDENCE FOR THE CIRCUIT OF THE WALL (Fig. 3)

Parts of the south and west sides and the north-east corner of the walled circuit have never been lost to view, so its general line has not been in question. No detailed survey of its line has ever been carried out before, however, and the plan resulting from the present survey has small but significant differences from all previously published plans.

In all cases the material used for the wall and its bastions appears to be the local Spilsby sandstone, probably from the quarry at Holbeck Manor 6 km. to the north-east of Horncastle. It was used both as freestone in a mortor rubble core, where it is roughly coursed and pitched (eg. Fig. 4), and as the finely cut ashlar facing of the inside of the wall (eg. Fig. 10).

No. Address
1-11: south wall (from east to west)
1 Site of Vine Tavern (1960s)
2 Branch library, Wharf Road
3 Wharf Road, Dock Tyres
4 Wharf Road, Fosters, picture framers
5 Ground east of Church Lane, 1968
6 Church Lane (1930s)
7 Telegraph pole, west of Church Lane (1960s)
8 Church Walk (1960s)
9 1 St Mary's Square
10 St Mary's Square
11 6 St Mary's Square
12-19: west wall (from south to north)
12 Health Centre grounds, 1968
13 6 St Mary's Square
14 Health Centre (garages demolished 1968)
15 North wall of cemetery, adjacent to community centre
16 Community Centre (old Infants' School)
17 Wall of Manor House Garden, Manor House Road, 1968
18 Manor House garden
19 Manor House paddock, 1968
20-28: north wall (from west to east)
20 Manor House Drive, 1979
21 Manor House garage, boundary wall at rear of 5 Bridge Street
22 5 Bridge Street, 1965 and earlier
23 10 Bridge Street/6 Market Place
24 Passage between 7 and 8 Market Place
25 Market Place, passage west of Post Office (1960s)
26 Post Office Yard
27 12 and 14 St Lawrence Street
28 14 St Lawrence Street, Dog Kennel Yard
29-32: east wall (from north to south)
29 Telegraph pole south of barn (1960s)
30 Demolished sheds behind 12 High Street
31 14 High Street (1960s)
32 9 High Street (1960)

PREVIOUS DESCRIPTIONS OF THE WALL

The wall in 1722 (as recorded by Stukeley 1724, 28):
"...the inscouchall stone wall, whose vestiges are manifest the whole compass round, and in some places pretty high, as three or four yards, and four yards thick. It serves for sides of gardens, cellars, outhouses etc., as chance offers, enclosing the market place, church and a good part of the town. It's a perfect parallelogram composed of two squares, at the angles have been square towers, as they report, the gates were in the middle of three sides, and I suppose a postern into the meadows called the Holmes at the union of the two rivulets. I suspect originally the river Base ran nearer to the wall in that part [ie. the west] and behind the manor house [to the north, as confirmed by excavation], the garden there has been heightened and the river push'd farther off, and turned with a larger bow to favour the people who live in Far Street [modern Bridge Street], and especially the tanners who are very numerous there..."

The wall in 1858 (as described by Revd E. Trollope 1858, 201): "Of the south wall about 120 yards may be seen on the south side of the churchyard [no. 11 on Fig. 3], and another portion in Mr Johnson's coal yard [Branch Library, Wharf Rd]. Of the east wall a piece exists in Mr Heald's yard [High St], and another longer portion in the White Swan yard [St Lawrence St], extending to the north-east corner of this old stronghold, which appears to
have been flanked, not by a square turret, as Stukeley reports, but by a small circular one [Dog Kennel Yard]; although it is now difficult to trace its original form, the whole of the facing having long since been removed, so that a portion of the interior work alone now remains. Of the west wall, a piece (about 100 feet long) stands on the property of J. Banks Stanhope, Esq., M.P. [the Manor House], besides another smaller fragment; and of the north wall a considerable portion may be seen on Mr Holdsworth's grounds [Bridge St]. Some of these fragments are as much as 12 feet high; but nowhere can a single original facing stone be seen, nothing but the usual rough work of the interior consolidated by the hardest possible grouting now being visible. About six feet from the ground, however, there are evidences in several instances of a considerable reparation of the walls having taken place, but quite in a different style to the lower masonry, consisting of large blocks of sandstone: this, very possibly, may have been the work of the Saxons after the departure of the Romans.
Stukeley’s map (1724) shows another crossing of the Waring from the south-eastern part of the circuit, leading from the present St Mary’s Square to Cagthorpe south of the river, some way west of the central point in the walled circuit (which would be close to the line of modern Church Lane). A Roman south gate would imply that then also there was a crossing of the Waring south of the circuit.

To conclude then, no remains of gates have been exposed in the recent work; Stukeley suggests there were four gates in the circuit; the behaviour of the east and west walls points to gates on these sides; from general topographical considerations, entrances on the north and east seem desirable, the main gate perhaps being situated on the north; and we have too little information to judge about a south gate.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE WALL

Camden (1610, 541c) refers to ‘... Horne Castle, which belonged in times past to Adelia of Conis, and was laid even with the ground in the reigne of Stephen ...’. It is not clear whether this meant a general sifting of the Roman wall of Horncastle or something less: as Weir (1820) puts it, ‘What may have been the extent and nature of the structure possessed as the mansion of Adelia is not now discoverable, no traces being to be found; but its strength most probably consisted in a restoration of the walls of the Roman fortress, which encircled some convenient and less durable edifice, gave to the place of her residence the security of a castle.’

In describing the construction of the wall, Weir remarks that above the remnants of Roman masonry which survived to six or seven feet above the ground the construction is marked by masses of larger dimensions than the lower parts; a circumstance evincing that another structure of a different period has been erected on the original foundation...’ and in the engraving which serves as the frontispiece to his book a stretch of the south wall near the south-west corner is illustrated, showing large blocks placed in a regular course above the small mortar rubble core of the Roman wall. Trollope makes the same observation of the core in his description of the wall half a century later (p. 49, above). This variation in the building can still be seen but it is probably simply a variation in material used for the core of the wall. Mortar samples nos. 4 and 5 below provide no evidence of different constructions.

Mortars from the Roman Wall (Fig. 3)
By Malcolm Fenton

Five mortar samples were taken. 100 g. of each sample was digested in 50% hydrochloric acid.

The mortar aggregates (i.e. the undigested material) were all of the same type, although the proportions of the various minerals present varied slightly. However, such variations, and the variations in the weight percentages of undigested material are only to be expected in different mortar mixes using the same basic aggregate.

All the mortars contained numerous fragments of flint, the maximum size of the fragments varying from 10 to 40 mm. across in the samples examined. Large amounts of poorly-sorted, clean, angular to sub-angular quartz sand, maximum grain size 1 mm., were also present. In addition, small and varying quantities of sub-rounded fragments of amorphous orange-brown minerals (4 mm. across) and small (1 mm.) rounded grains of dark brown minerals were found in each sample. These last were probably iron minerals.
Table 1 Analysis of Mortar Samples from the Roman Walls, Horncastle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mortar sample no.</th>
<th>Weight % digested material</th>
<th>Weight % undigested material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Manor House Paddock, N. wall facing (Fig. 3 no 12)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Health centre car park, W. wall core (Fig. 3 no 16)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Health centre car park, W. wall core (Fig. 3 no 16)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 6 St Mary's Square, S. wall core, upper courses (Fig. 3 no 11)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) 6 St Mary's Square, S. wall core, lower courses (Fig. 3 no 11)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population standard deviation: 5.23

The mortar aggregates were almost certainly derived from the flint-bearing glacial gravels and sands found near Horncastle.

EXCAVATIONS ON THE LINE OF THE WALL

Wharf Road: site of Lincolnshire County Council Branch Library (Fig. 3, no. 2; Figs. 4–7)

Before the site was developed in 1968 a stretch of the wall 18 m. long was visible to a height of 1.2–1.5 m. above existing ground level on its south (external) side; the top of the wall lay just below ground level on the north side, having been covered by the floor and south wall of a late 18th-century warehouse which had previously occupied the site (Fig. 4).

The excavations for the then Ministry of Public Building and Works took place for a month from March to April 1968 and had as their aim to examine the Roman defences and test the site for other archaeological remains. Two trenches were dug through the bank and construction levels on the inside of the wall (trs. I and III) and a trial trench and two further small excavations on the outside of the wall (respectively trs. II, IV, V: Fig. 5). Here the site is dealt with as a whole in chronological order.

Pre-wall levels

The only features of this period were a V-shaped gully aligned at an angle to the wall and a post-hole, both in tr. III (III 12). They were both sealed by a layer of gravelly dark loam (III 9 = I 12), which elsewhere overlay the natural gravel to a thickness of 0.2–0.3 m. and was covered or cut by all features associated with the wall’s construction. This layer was compacted and its upper surface was horizontal even where it sealed the gully, suggesting that it was formed a long time prior to the wall’s construction. The only material from it was a few scraps of Roman pottery datable to the second century (p. 62, below).

The construction of the wall and bank

In both trenches on the inside of the wall the dark stony loam described above was cut by the wall’s foundation raft of chalky boulder clay with flints. The raft had a total width of not less than 3.5 m., its outer face being eroded by the Waring; its depth was only tested at its outer edge where it was c. 0.5 m. (cf. Manor House Drive, below). On the inside its upper surface was some 0.4 m. below the surface of the pre-wall loam (perhaps because the contemporary ground level sloped down on the outside of the wall). Directly above the foundation raft on the inside of the wall, a layer of flint and sandstone chippings (from stones used in the wall) had formed a hard concretion and at the same level there were also large unused blocks of sandstone (I 13 = III 10). One such block had a chamfered edge, suggesting the wall may have had an external chamfered plinth.
Spreads of redeposited natural gravel and dark loam (I 10 = III 7, 8) covered the sandstone and flint layer and formed a tip up to 0.9 m. thick against the inner face of the wall, thinning to 0.02–0.3 m. as they spread out northwards over the undisturbed dark loam layer. They in turn were covered by a distinctive layer of crushed chalk and mortar (I 9 = III 6), which sloped down from the inner face of the wall (Fig. 6) and dipped into a small mixing pit in the north of tr. III. Above this level, there were further tips of redeposited gravel and loam, interleaved with thin bands of white puddled or crushed chalk (I 6–8 = III 3–5) beneath, and cut by, modern layers (I 1, III 1–2). In this the relationship between all except the lowest of the redeposited layers and the wall was destroyed by the collapse of the wall and cutting of a pit to insert a post-medieval barrel-well (I 2–5 were fills above the barrel; Fig. 7).

The building of the wall was thus combined with the construction of a bank or rampart on its inside, the layers forming the bank probably being deposited as building progressed. This was confirmed by the excavation in Manor House garden. There the maximum thickness of the wall was also established as slightly over 4 m.; on the Wharf Road site its full thickness was nowhere intact because of the river erosion on the south.

As there were no finds from any of the layers in the bank, the only material evidence for dating the wall is the few sherds from pre-wall levels, which give a second century terminus post quem. The stratigraphical indications that their deposition preceded the construction of the wall by a long period of time have been noted above.

Later periods The layers of the bank within the wall were cut by two post-medieval pits and the levelling and brick foundations for the warehouse built across the northern part of the site in 1799 (the south wall of this building lay above the Roman wall; Fig. 5). On the outside, the face of the wall and adjacent layers had been eroded away by the Waring at an unknown date prior to the 17th century (in tr. II dirty river gravel with large flints, 12, was beneath black silt containing organic remains, 11; in tr. IV dirty river gravel was beneath two layers of black silt with organic remains divided by a lens of gravel, 5–7). This erosion was probably the reason for the collapse of the stretch of wall in tr. I. Above the silted river bed, a line of post pits forming the north–south wall of a timber structure just entered the west side of tr. II near its south end. West of this wall was a puddled chalk floor (6) and cast of it was a surface of coarser chalk rubble with some
brick (8). Both these layers sealed the post pits of the structure (as 7) and a substantial layer of brown grey loam above a lens of puddled chalk (9, 10) which rested on the black river silt, 11, already referred to. It seems probable that this structure was in use at the same time as the barrel-well to its north cut through the remains of the wall. Preliminary examination of the pottery sealed by the floors of the building gives it a terminus post quem of 1699-1700 (p. 72, below). Above the chalk surfaces was a deposit of loam and fragments of tile and chalk containing 19th-century pottery and clay pipes (II 5), with sandstone, brick and chalk rubble (2–4; 2 being mainly derived from the destroyed wall) above it. The topmost layer was coal dust and trampled coal (1) recalling the 20th-century use of the area as a coalyard.

In tr. IV stony loam (4) lay above the black silt and beneath a thick deposit of crushed sandstone with pieces of flint (3) beneath modern grey loam (2) capped by concrete (1) in the north-west part of the trench and coal dust and building rubble elsewhere.

**Manor House Paddock** (Fig. 3, no. 19; Figs. 8–10)

An excavation to examine the north-west corner of the walled circuit was carried out by Boston Archaeology Group in 1965–6. The west wall, much damaged by a post-medieval cellar, was exposed and a section cut across
the north wall and internal and external stratification. With the encouragement of Miss P. Wheatley, the director of the Boston group’s excavation, it was decided in 1968 to complete the section through the bank inside the wall, exposing the junction between the two stretches of wall and searching for a bastion (tr. XI).

Both the structural characteristics of the wall and bank and their stratigraphy correlate closely with the Wharf Road site.

Pre-wall levels A ground surface of dark brown loam above natural gravel was recorded over a small area to the south of the Roman north wall (XI 10). This surface sloped down gently towards the north. Except for the relative thinness of the loam layer (0.08 m, as opposed to 0.2–0.3 m.) these layers appeared to be of identical character to the pre-wall levels at Wharf Road.

The construction of the wall and bank The wall was set on a foundation raft of chalky boulder clay with flints similar to that at Wharf Road. The width of this raft beneath the north wall was 6.55 m.; its depth at its outer edge was c. 0.5 m. On the inside of the north wall, the upper surface of the raft was set some 0.4 m. below the level of the pre-wall ground surface (as at Wharf Road), presumably to accommodate the slope in the ground (pre-wall levels, above).

The layers above the foundation raft on the inside of the north wall were: redeposited gravel c. 1.2 m. thick against the wall’s inner face thinning to 0.2 m. at the edge of the excavation c. 3 m. away (XI 9); above it a thin layer of white crushed chalk with a spread of mortar similar to that used in the wall’s construction (XI 8); then further spreads of gravel, crushed chalk and loam (XI 6–7). The bank formed by these layers survived to a maximum height of c. 1.5 m. above the wall foundation raft, its top being truncated by a layer of dark stony loam (XI 4: post-wall levels, below). A trench or pit of recent date (fill of gravelly loam; XI 5, just over 0.6 m. wide from the inner face of the wall, had been dug to a level of 1.2 m. from the present ground surface and so had destroyed the relationship between the upper layers in the bank and the wall, but there is no question that the lowest thick layer of gravel, XI 9, extended up to the wall face and covered its foundations. As this layer was covered by a spread of mortar similar to that used in the construction of the wall, XI 8, wall and bank are again proved to belong to a single phase of construction.

The wall core in the northern and western stretches survived to a maximum thickness of 3.6 m. and at the southern edge of the Boston Archaeology Group’s excavation the external facing of the west wall was exposed, showing its width at base to be 4.01 m. At the corner the core of the wall extended outwards forming an irregular stump giving a maximum width of 7 m. across the angle. There must therefore have been a solid bastion similar to that at the north-east corner of the circuit (Dog Kennel Yard, see below) and another can be inferred for the south-west corner (Lincolnshire C.C. Health Centre site, see below). Although, as in the other two cases, the remains were insufficient to show its size decisively or to confirm or refute Stukeley’s statement that ‘at the angles have been square towers, as they report’, a combination of the evidence from this site and the south-west corner suggests bastions 8 m. wide with parallel sides and rounded ends (Figs. 8, 11). There was, however, no doubt that the construction of the bastion at this site was integral with that of the wall: the foundation raft extended outwards to allow for the bastion; the masonry of both wall and bastion was identical; and a crack which extended diagonally across the corner from the inside of the wall to the outer surviving edge of the bastion (Fig. 9) can be interpreted as the join between two working parties or stages in construction. It may be noted that the inner face of the wall at the corner was rounded in playing-card fashion, as in 1st and 2nd century A.D. military defences.

The inside of the wall was finished in fine ashlar masonry, which like other aspects of the wall’s construction matched that at Wharf Road (Fig. 10).

Post-wall levels At the eastern edge of the excavation 4thcentury pottery was recovered by Boston Archaeology Group from the layer of dark stony loam overlying and

Fig. 10 Manor House Paddock: inner face of wall looking north, 18th-century well in the foreground cutting foundation raft
truncating the bank on the inside of the north wall (XI 4: Whitwell 1967, 37), but as the upper limit of this layer was a post-medieval deposit of white mortar with stony grey loam containing post-medieval tile above it (XI 2, 3) it may itself have been of post-medieval date. Similar considerations apply to a shallow V-shaped cut beneath the general loam layer filled with similar loam and some gravel (also XI 4). Further west, an 18th-century well had destroyed much of the stratification inside the wall (Fig. 10). West of that, a post-medieval brick cellar, probably an ice-house, had cut away most of the Roman west wall (excavated by Boston Archaeology Group; Whitwell 1967, 37).

On the outside of the wall, water-laid silts and gravels of medieval or later date lay directly over the foundation raft and against the outer surviving edge of the north wall; and a disturbed layer containing post-medieval building materials covered the remains of the bastion (Boston Archaeology Group’s excavation: mention of a gently sloping ditch in Whitwell 1967, 37, is an incorrect interpretation: cf. section, Fig. 7).

Manor House Drive (Fig. 3, no. 20)

By Naomi Field

In September 1979 a hole about 2 x 2.5 m. and 2.7 m. deep was excavated by machine for the insertion of a new sewage pipe junction. The hole cut through the core of the north wall and the chalk raft was exposed to its full depth of 0.55 m. The raft consisted of 3 layers, two of rammed chalk lumps with a layer of large flint nodules, varying in size from 12–20 cm., in diameter, sandwiched between. The raft sat on the natural sands and gravels. It was visible only in two faces of the hole because of later disturbances including a post-medieval sandstone lined well and an earlier wood-lined pit.

Site of Lincolnshire C.C. Health Centre, Manor House Road (Fig. 3, no. 12; Figs. 11, 12)

By Henry Hurst

It was impossible to determine whether the walled circuit was surrounded by a ditch on the Wharf Road and Manor House Paddock sites because the Roman stratification had been destroyed by the rivers Waring and Bain; and in any case it can be supposed that the defended circuit was placed deliberately to make use of the two rivers. But this question seemed worth examining in the area to the west of the wall, where there is a triangular piece of land bounded by the wall and the two rivers. The proposed development of the south-eastern part of this area as a Health Centre for Lindsey (now Lincolnshire) County Council made it desirable to carry out this work as part of the 1968 programme. In the limited time available three trenches (VI–VIII) were dug; the stratigraphy could be correlated fairly easily between them and so is described in a single sequence.

Pre-wall levels The bastion foundation of large sandstone blocks and the chalky clay layer, which capped it and spread outwards from it (VIII 8 – VI 6), were later than a series of silts apparently filling an earlier watercourse or ditch (VII 7, 9, 10 = VI 7–10). The north side of this feature, which was aligned approximately east–west, was defined by a thick gravel layer (probably natural, but not certainly) which appeared to have been cut regularly to give a slope of about 45°. Within the cut, a fine grey silt overlain by a gravel layer was observed (VII 10 = VI 10). The latter was traced southwards until cut by the possible late Roman ditch (see below) at a distance of c. 17 m. from the sloping northern edge of the feature (layers equivalent to VII 7, 10 were exposed in tr. VIII: see Fig. 12).

Above the gravel, and probably cut into it (so perhaps appreciably later in date), was a further series of silts. The

Fig. 11 Lincolnshire County Council Health Centre: outer face of wall and edge of foundation reconstructed as in Fig. 9 (H. Hurst and R. Turner)
lowest of these was a black clay containing organic remains (VII 9 = VI 9). It was overlain by a silt free of organic remains (VII 7 = VI 8). Above this there was a coarser brown sand (VII 6, VI 7) sealed by gravel (VII 5) and the chalky clay of the bastion construction. In trench VII the more substantial foundations of the bastion proper (as opposed to the chalky clay spread) just reached the west section and were recorded in it as an isolated fragment apparently beneath 6 and 5, but this is misleading because further east this lump joined up with the horizontal chalky clay spread above 5; 8 thus cut 5, but only a bulge towards the bottom of the cut reached this section.

The only find came from the black clay and was an unabraded second-century stamped mortarium rim (below, p. 62, Fig. 17.1).

The regular northern edge of the feature containing the silt and gravel suggests that it may have been a ditch rather than a natural feature; against that is the very limited area examined and the fact that no trace of a southern edge was found.

Construction of the wall. The chalky clay which occurred in all three trenches, together with the sand layers found directly above and below it, appear to indicate the level of the wall’s construction. In tr. VII the clay covered unmortared blocks of Spilsby sandstone, some of which had been cut square and measured up to 0.5 m. on each side. These seem likely to have belonged to the foundation of a robbed bastion and so their plan may indicate limits for the bastion’s extent (Fig. 11; cf. comment on reconstruction of bastion plans, Manor House Paddock, above).

The possible late Roman ditch. Some 4.3 m. to the south-west of the bastion foundation, the stratification just described was cut from the top of the sand layer (construction, above) to make a slope of slightly over 30° falling to the south-west and continuing beyond the limits of the excavation. Within the feature thus formed there were successive sittings, graduating (from bottom upwards) from a coarse brown gravel layer to a fine bluish-grey clay beneath a yellow-brown clay (VIII 3-5). Above 3 was a thick layer of stony loam (VIII 2A), which extended up to modern levels. Fourth century pottery (below, p. 63) was recovered in 5; and up to the loam 2A, there was no indication of a post-Roman date.

Later levels. In tr. VII a substantial layer of rubble from the wall’s destruction (2) covered a layer of stony dark loam (3) up to 0.5 m. thick above the construction levels of the bastion. The loam sealed or filled a pit cut into the construction levels at the south-east edge of the bastion foundation; and a comparable loam layer in tr. VI (2; probably the same layer but not sealed by the rubble as in VII; also probably = VIII 2A) sealed or filled a similar pit (VI 3). The rubble layer VII 2 lay beneath modern levels.

As the loam and rubble were mechanically excavated there was no dating evidence. All other features and layers—two land drains, a cinder path, rubble hardstanding and top soil (VI 1; VII 1, 1A; VIII 1, 2)—were modern.

Dog Kennel Yard (Fig. 3, no. 28; Fig. 13)

By Naomi Field

A small trench was dug outside the wall at the north-east corner in 1978, in order to obtain further evidence of its construction. The upper levels were disturbed by medieval and modern robber trenches and rubbish pits which were cut into a heavy brown clay containing quantities of medieval pottery. The clay may have been deposited by an earlier course of the River Bain or flooding.
Fig. 14 27 High Street: 1978 excavations showing Roman features (M. Clark)

Fig. 15 27 High Street: 1978 excavations showing medieval and later features (M. Clark)
A chalk foundation raft was located (as elsewhere on the wall) some 2 m. below the present ground surface and sealed by the brown clay. The raft curved outwards to accommodate the protruding bastion, confirming that the bastion was of one build with the wall. No facing stone remained and the coursed rubble core was continuous between the wall and bastion. No Roman pottery was recovered.

THE AREA WITHIN THE WALLS
The absence of casual finds of Roman objects or structures within the wall (below) is in marked contrast to the abundance of material which has come from outside it. As there have been fairly frequent building and services excavations over the last century, this looked, prior to the excavations at 27 High Street, like significant negative evidence, perhaps indicating timber buildings and short-lived occupation.

Earlier reports of possible Roman remains within the wall. Some sandstone foundations reported in the cellar of Houldens the tobacconist's, no. 19 High Street (information Mrs M. Vincent) could be of any pre-18th-century date; and apart from that there are a number of wells, which Walter called Roman: 'In a cellar, south of the High Street, at a baker’s shop, and close to the eastern wall of the castle, is a Roman well; there is another close to the north-east angle of the castle walls, in what is called Dog-Kennel Yard, and a third just within the western wall, near the present National Schools' (Walter 1908, 6). In the absence of associated Roman finds the Roman date is to be doubted. Another note on the well (perhaps the same as that referred to by Walter) on the site of the National Schools is more assertive, though again produces no evidence: 'In preparing the foundations of the National School here, in 1873, which in part is built upon the remains of the Roman Camp, a well was discovered in the north-east part of the enclosure. This well was found to be in part beneath and within the masonry, and clearly coeval with the wall itself . . .'

27 High Street (Figs. 3; 14–16)
By Naomi Field
In 1978 the opportunity arose to excavate prior to re-
### Table 2  27 High Street, contexts and pottery finds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth</th>
<th>Diam.</th>
<th>Length x breadth (cm.)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>R-B</th>
<th>med.</th>
<th>post-med.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>well pit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>contains F1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>mortar pit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200 x 100</td>
<td></td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>brick wall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>160 x 94</td>
<td></td>
<td>modern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>post hole</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72 x 72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>soakaway</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>650 x 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>pit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54 x 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>160 x 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80 x 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>241 x 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>post hole</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>pit</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26 x 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38 x 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>post hole</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35 x 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35 x 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50 x 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>animal hole</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50 x 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26 x 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>268 x 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>332 x 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44 x 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>animal hole</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>pit</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>pit</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Depth (cm.)</th>
<th>Diam.</th>
<th>Length x breadth (cm.)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>R-B</th>
<th>med.</th>
<th>post-med.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>pit</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cut by F50, 64; cuts F68</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>cuts F50; cut by F49</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cuts F46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>road surface</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>780 x 340</td>
<td>cut by F51, 52, 49, 63, 82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 x 22</td>
<td>runs into baulks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>400 x 170</td>
<td>cuts F73, over F94</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>— 70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>cut by F72, over F94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>lens</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>lens</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>lens</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>lens</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>lens</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79 x 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>lens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>lens</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>lens</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>382 x 68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>pig skeleton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79 x 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>? posthole</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>gully</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>lens</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>lens</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>lens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>168 x 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>lens</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1180 x 85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>168 x 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1180 x 85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>ditch</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>animal hole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>280 x 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>posthole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>324 x 389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roman remains (Fig. 14) All but three of the Roman features were cut into Layer 4, the others cutting through from Layer 3. A series of gullies and post-holes representing the remains of wooden buildings were recovered (Fig. 14) but the confined excavation area made it impossible to identify any structure in its entirety. A small number of roof tiles was found but no other building materials such as stone.

F22 and F24 were two shallow gullies, U-shaped in cross-section, running east-west and parallel to one another. They were possibly for drainage. Two deeper ditches (F37 and F70) were similarly orientated and 25 m. apart. They were V-shaped in cross-section and were of very similar dimensions and fill. They may have been plot boundaries.

The largest feature discovered, F94, was a gully lying immediately south of F70 and parallel to it. It then turned 90° southwards for 11.80 m. before disappearing under the east limit of the excavation.

A metallised surface (F68) with ill-defined edges seemed to be orientated N.W.—S.E. Its constituents were crushed sandstone and chalk lumps laid to form a camber (clearly visible in cross-section) and its estimated width was 4 m. (see Fig. 16). There was no flanking drainage ditch. Although the surface was cut by Roman (and medieval) features, the recovery of only a few Roman sherds gave no firm terminus post quem. As the metallising appeared to have a markedly different alignment from that of the wall, and was traced to within 6 m. of the wall's inner face, at a point where the bank associated with the wall might be
expected to have been present (cf. Fig. 7), it is possible that the metallurgy pre-dated the construction of the wall (cf. Wharf Road, above and Fig. 5 for a pre-wall gully aligned at an angle to it; also Health Centre site, p. 58 and Fig. 11). Alternatively it may have joined an intrarural road running parallel with the wall.

Medieval remains. (Fig. 15) Due to disturbance the only evidence for medieval structures was a number of postholes containing a few medieval pot sherds. Despite a central position fronting the Market Place, the plot was cleared of buildings at some time after the 16th century, and used for cultivation or pasture until c. 1800 when a double-fronted town house was constructed. It collapsed in 1971.

The latest stratified material from below Layer 2 came from a pit (F63) cut into the metallised surface (F68): which contained the skeleton of a young pig, two pieces of wood (F76 and F77) and two almost complete pots dating to the late 16th century (p. 72 below, Fig. 22, 64 & 65). Clearance of the site must have taken place at some time after this date.

Medieval pottery ranging in date from the 9th–16th centuries was found in Layer 2 (together with Roman and modern pottery). One of the more interesting artefacts discovered was a Saxon small-long brooch (see below).

Post-medieval remains. (Fig. 15) The rubble and topsoil contained quantities of unstratified post-medieval pottery. A few features were cut into Layer 2. At the north end of the site was a well (F1), the exposed part being constructed of shaped sandstone blocks. It was contained within a large pit (F2) which presumably was so large because of the instability of the surrounding sand. Neither pit nor well was fully excavated for this same reason. The site is shown on the 1886 OS Map of Horncastle and pottery found inside suggests that it was filled in soon afterwards.

The foundations of two sandstone walls (F44 and F41) which had been strengthened with brick facings were found associated with a thin spread of chalk-leeked soil (F98 and F99), the remnants of a floor surface. To the south of these walls lay a spread of red mortar overlying regularly shaped chalk blocks (F38). F38 may have run over the whole area of F99 and F97 leaving the traces of chalk when removed. Only three postholes cut through this feature but contained only a few sherds of residual Roman pottery.

FINDS FROM THE EXCAVATIONS

(a) Roman pottery

(i) 1968, Wharf Road, Manor House Paddock, Lincolnshire County Council Health Centre (Fig. 17).

By Pamela V. Clarke with a report on the stamped mortaria by K. Hartley.

As the amount of stratified pottery obtained was very small, only 24 vessels being represented, it is described sherd by sherd according to stratigraphical contexts.

Group 1 — Sitting of possible early Roman ditch (tr. VI 7–9).

1. Fig. 17, no. 1: a mortarium in fine, hard, cream fabric with some white and pink quartz, opaque red-brown and clinker-like tempering; the triturated grit consists of quartz, pale brown (probably chlorite) and red-brown material. D. c. 32 cm. The poorly impressed, retrograde potter's stamp is from one of at least seven dies used by Iotaagus who worked in the Mancetter-Hartshill potteries in Warwickshire. Five of his stamps have been recorded from Antonine deposits in Scotland and fifty-four from sites throughout England and Wales excluding thirteen from the pottery-making site at Mancetter (Mandleshuddum).

Iotaagus has a fairly typical distribution for a Mancetter potter working in the Antonine period. Some of his mortaria show pre-Antonine characteristics in the rim-forms and the type of trituration grit used, and a date of A.D. c. 130–160 would fit his work well.

Group 2 — Ground surface beneath gravel bank associated with construction of wall

(a) From Wharf Road (tr. III 9).

2. Fig. 17, no. 2: probable black-burnished ware dish or bowl, in a hard sandy fabric, with a light grey core, and with a brown skin below the internal surface, burnished inside and out with coarsely-hatched decoration. The sherds have suffered burning, weathering or some other mishap giving an uncharacteristic whitish appearance and a harsh feel.

3. Fig. 17, no. 3: narrow-necked jar in a hard uniformly grey sandy fabric.

4. Sherd from the shoulder of a jar in a hard slightly sandy light grey fabric, with black internal and external surfaces.

5. Fig. 17, no. 4: thin-walled rusticated jar in a hard fabric, with a dark grey core, white margins, and light grey internal and external surfaces.

6. Sherd from a large jar, in a hard sandy fabric, with a light grey core, whitish margin and light grey internal and external surfaces (darker than the core).

7. Two sherds from similar vessels, probably jars, in a hard sandy fabric, with a light grey core, thick brown margins and dense black surface; one of the sherds has a lightly incised cross-hatched decoration on its external surface.

Fig. 17 1968 excavations, Roman pottery. 1, 9–13, LCC Health Centre; 2–7, Wharf Road; 8, 16, Manor House Paddock. Scale 1:4 (H. Humphries)
by Samuels (below) the Nene Valley products are very similar in form but were produced in a slightly different fabric.

(d) The colour-coated wares are all forms within the Swanpool and Nene Valley range (Webster & Booth 1947; Howe, Perrin & Mackreth 1982).

(e) The one red-ware vessel may also have been colour-coated and is again a form within the Swanpool/Nene Valley range.

Dating for Groups 2–3 The pottery forms within this group suggest that it is unlikely to date before the second half of the 3rd century, although the rusticated sherd no. 5 may be earlier. The absence of Samian or mortaria in the group makes it difficult to suggest occupation earlier than this, although the small amount of pottery recovered cannot be taken to offer conclusive evidence that there was no earlier occupation.

(ii) Roman pottery from 27 High Street (Figs. 18–20)

By J. R. Samuels

The bulk of the pottery came from Layer 2, a disturbed make-up layer also containing medieval pottery. A smaller quantity came from features which often had no stratigraphic relationship to one another and on a few occasions also contained later pottery (see Table 2). All of the material has been treated as a single group rather than by individual features although the context for each illustrated vessel is given.

Dating evidence is slight with ten late 3rd to 4th-century coins from the site (see A. White below), only three of which were in undisturbed contexts. Any attempt to date the pottery and identify its sources must be based upon kiln groups and better stratified material in the county. Horncastle is one of only a few places in Lincolnshire outside Lincoln with material from this period which has been studied.

The Swanpool kilns at Lincoln (Webster & Booth 1947) were probably the main source for the mortaria, grey wares and colour-coated pottery. Sources for the shell- gritted wares and probably some of the straight-sided bowls are, at present, unknown. The nearest known pottery kilns to Horncastle are 11 miles away at Claxby and Walesby. Only one, in the Claxby group, has been excavated (Bryant 1977) and none of its products has been identified in any of the material from Horncastle.

There is some overlap between the regional distribution of products from the Swanpool and Nene Valley kilns. Whilst the grey ware products are readily distinguishable, close examination of the colour-coated wares from both sources has revealed no discernible difference between the two fabrics. It is possible then that some of the colour-coated wares may have come from the Nene Valley and not Swanpool.

Many of the forms and fabrics published here can be paralleled with a well-dated 4th-century group of pottery from the Park, Lincoln (Darling 1977). This detailed report also considers many of the wider aspects of late Romano-British pottery production and distribution in the region and obviates the need to look at these problems here. Several sherds of Oxfordshire ware were found at Lincoln and show an interesting overlap in markets; while Swanpool and the Nene Valley were producing good quality colour-coated wares there was apparently still a market for the finer wares from Oxfordshire. A sherd of Oxfordshire ware (no. 50), with its distinctive fabric and decoration (identified by Chris Young) confirms the proposed general date for the Horncastle
group as late 3rd–4th century and suggests that it shared a similar market with Lincoln.

A site in Lincoln cannot answer all the questions relating to the Hornscombe material and there are some differences in the assemblage; the occurrence of Dalesware, as distinct from Dalesware type, and of some of the grey ware jars suggest an earlier starting date for the Hornscombe material.

A very distinctive sherd, no. 64, has a fabric similar to the vessels produced at the Bourne kilns (Samuels, forthcoming).

The pottery is described in 11 main categories the largest of which are the bowls and dishes and the wide-mouthed jars. As most of the mortaria, grey wares and colour-coated wares may be paralleled with the Swanspool products only the exceptions are noted in the text. Practically all the drawable pottery has been illustrated here because of the lack of published sites in Lincolnshire with similar assemblages. The total quantities of fabric types in each context are given in Table 3. Not illustrated are three samian sherds, one of which is a rim, Drag. 10/31 of Central Gaulish origin and slightly burnt. The other two sherds, also burnt, were plain body sherds and thus unidentifiable.

Mortaria
4. White slip on grey sandy core at rim becoming red further down body. Black trituration grits. F.70.

Straight-sided dishes
1. Soft black heavily shell-gritted fabric with very occasional small quartz grits. Surfaces pitted where shell has been leached out. F.96.

Lipped dishes
1. Black surfaces with grey core. Slightly burnished on rim and burnished decoration. A few quartz grits, max. diam. 1 mm. L.2.
6. Hard, gritty grey fabric. Heavily quartz gritted and peppery surface where smaller grits have gone. F.73.

Flanged dishes and bowls
2. Grey surfaces with lighter grey core. Hard, heavily gritted fabric, some quartz grits up to 3 mm. diam. Many of the smaller grits have gone leaving a peppered surface. Burnished decoration and some burnishing on rim. L.2.
4. Orange-brown colour-coated surfaces on a dense white fabric with very small quartz grits and occasional red grits. L.2.
10. Dark grey surfaces, abraded on exterior with grey core. A hard sandy fabric with very small quartz grits and a few very small crushed shell inclusions. F.37.

Miscellaneous dishes

Beakers
Fig. 19 27 High Street, Roman pottery. Scale 1/4 (J. R. Samuels)
Wide-mouthed jars

56. Dark brown to grey surfaces with red-brown and grey sandwich core. Hard, gritty fabric with very small quartz grits. F.79.
64. Red-brown surfaces with black core. Soft sandy fabric with small crushed shell inclusions and very small quartz grits. Most of the shell has been leached from the exterior surface leaving a pitted surface. The fabric is very similar to that produced in the Bourne kiln although there is no exact parallel for the form. F.99.
73. Brown to dark grey surfaces with a red-brown and grey sandwich core. Hard fine fabric with very small quartz grits. An unusual sherd in this group; it would fit in better with earlier material. There is a similar sherd from the Drill Hall excavations. Unstrat.
74. Dark grey surfaces with lighter grey core. Hard smooth fabric with very small quartz grits and occasional fragments of crushed shell. Slightly burnished on rim and shoulder. L.2.
75. Light brown surfaces with grey core. Hard, slightly sandy fabric with small quartz grits. F.60.
78. Black surfaces with lighter grey core. Soft fabric containing much crushed shell, some of which has leached out. F.40.
79. Black surfaces with sooty patches on exterior; dark red-brown core. Soft fabric containing a little crushed shell and some fragments of chalk, 1-3mm. diam. L.2.

Lid-seated jars

80. Hard, gritty grey fabric with quite large quartz grits, max. 3mm. diam. Blackened on rim. L.2.
82. Hard, light grey fabric densely gritted with very small quartz grits but also containing some larger quartz grits. 3mm. diam. L.2.
83. Hard, grey gritty fabric containing many quartz grits, 1-3mm. diam. Many of the smaller grits have been eroded leaving a peppy surface. Same fabric as no. 20. L.3.
85. Hard, light grey fabric containing small quartz grits but also with occasional larger grits, 3mm. diam. Same fabric as no. 82. L.2.
88. Grey gritty fabric containing many quartz grits, smaller than usual, max. diam. 1mm. L.2.
91. Grey, hard gritty fabric containing many quartz grits, 1-2mm. and a few fragments of crushed shell. Slightly burnt on rim. F.90.
92. Dark brown to black surfaces with light grey and brown core. Hard fabric containing crushed shell and some small quartz grits. F.70.
93. Light brown surfaces with grey core. Hard gritty fabric containing many quartz grits (1mm. max.) and some small chalk fragments (1mm.) and occasional crushed shell. L.2.
94. Soft black fabric with brown patches on exterior surface with soot adhering to the lid-seating. Fabric contained much crushed shell and small quartz grits with a few larger grits, 2mm. L.2.

Fig. 20 27 High Street, Roman pottery. Scale 1/4 (J. R. Samuels)
Table 3  27 High Street, analysis of Roman sherds by fabric and context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>GREY WARES</th>
<th>SHELL GRITTED WARES</th>
<th>STONE GRITTED WARES</th>
<th>COLOUR COATED WARES</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rims</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td>Bases</td>
<td>Rims</td>
<td>Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstrat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer 2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 b + c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 167 500 63 77 124 21 37 71 5 17 19 6 54

GRAND TOTAL - 1241
from the 8th or 9th centuries. Unfortunately, due to early disturbance of the deposits, no reliable groups of stratified material remained; therefore the pottery, although identified by context, is described according to fabric type. Each fabric is discussed in turn, in broad chronological order, according to the currently accepted date range established largely from the excavated sequences of pottery from Lincoln (Coppack 1980). Individual vessel descriptions are included in the full archive with the pottery in the City and County Museum, Lincoln. On the vessel drawings, straight lines indicate a wheel-thrown or wheel-finished product, whereas uneven lines represent hand-finished surfaces. All identified coil marks are indicated on the drawings.

(i) Coarse wares

Gritty fabric (G) nos. 1–4

A hard sand-and-grit tempered fabric with surfaces of a rough to harsh texture and a haggly fracture. Vessel surfaces are oxidised orange-red to red-brown or buff-brown with cores usually reduced to blue-grey or black. All are coil-built with varying degrees of wheel-finishing. Pitcher no. 1 and cooking pot no. 2 have applied rims which are a common feature of the medieval sand-tempered cooking vessels of East Yorkshire and North Lincolnshire, in contrast to the entirely coil-built shell-tempered wares (Hayfield 1980, 29–31).

Their similarity to Torksey and Lincoln grey wares forms suggests a late Saxon date although comparable gritty fabrics in East Yorkshire and North Lincolnshire continue through the 12th century.

Nos. 1, 3, 4 are burnt and sooted; for nos. 2 and 3, cf. Lincoln, Flaxengate, Pit 13 (Coppack 1973, 89).

Shell and sand-tempered fabric (SS) (unillustrated)

A coarse, rough-textured fabric, tempered with crushed shell, sand and small grits, representing a variation on gritty fabric (G). Most sherds are coil-built and wheel-finished, oxidising to red-browns and grey-browns with reduced grey-black cores; some are reduced black internally. Elsewhere in Lincolnshire, similar fabrics are late Saxon or early medieval (Hayfield 1983, 635).

Torksey-type (T) (unillustrated)

A hard, reduced, sand-tempered, late Saxon fabric which is more fully described elsewhere (Barley 1981). It was distributed widely across Lincolnshire, although usually as a minority fabric to the more numerous local wares.

Smooth-textured, shell-tempered fabric (S) nos. 5–10

Similar in appearance to the Lincoln ‘finely shelled fabric’ (Adams 1977, 2; Coppack 1973, 88), the shell particles are generally 1–2 mm². Surfaces are usually oxidised dark red to red-brown or orange-buff. Cores, and occasionally surfaces, are reduced to grey-black or black. All vessels are coil-built and wheel-finished with the exception of no. 5 which also contains larger shell particles up to 5 mm². Pierced-lugged bowls such as no. 5 characterise middle-Saxon assemblages in Lincolnshire (Addyman & Whitwell, 1970, 96–102). Vessels 6–10 are cooking pots; all except no. 10 have oxidised surfaces and are burnt and sooted (cf. Lincoln Saltergate, groups 57 and 118, Coppack 1980). Similar forms persisted into the 12th century (Adams 1977).

Rough-textured, shell-tempered fabric (R) nos. 11–35

Shell particles range in size up to 3 mm² and surfaces are rough to smooth in texture but lack the soapyness of the S
Fig. 21  27 High Street, medieval pottery. Scale 1/4 (C. Hayfield)
fabric. Surfaces are usually oxidised red-brown, orange or orange-brown or, occasionally, reduced like their core to grey-black. Most vessels are coil-built and wheel-finished but some, such as nos. 11–12 are hand-finished. Coppock has described this as a 'Normanby Le Wold' type fabric ranging in date from late Saxon to early medieval and common across most of central Lincolnshire (Coppock 1980). Cooking pots, 12, 14, 17–20, 23–4 and bowls 25–7, 31 and 33–4 are burnt and sooted.

**Coarse-textured, shell-tempered fabric (C) nos. 36–8**
A rough to harsh textured cooking-vessel fabric containing shell particles up to 4mm²; vessels are coil-built and wheel-finished with body walls up to 10–12mm thick. Surfaces are usually oxidised grey-buff to buff with hard, grey cores of hackly fracture. The fabric and forms of these vessels are comparable with wasters from the Potterhanworth kiln site near Lincoln (Healey 1974). Their distribution ranges across central Lincolnshire and they date from the 11th or 12th century to the late 14th (Hayfield 1983, 635). Bowl no. 38 is burnt and sooted.

(ii) Fine wares

**Stamford wares (St)** (unillustrated)
A common fabric throughout Lincolnshire (Kilmurley 1980, 153–170); both sherds from this assemblage are of smooth to soapy texture with watery, light green glazes and are probably late Saxon in date.

**Lincoln wares**
(a) Splashed glazes (LS) nos. 39–40
A hard, sand-tempered fabric of rough texture and hackly fracture, oxidising on most surfaces to orange or red and reducing in cores to grey and blue-grey. These vessels have bright orange or green splashed glazes which occur in Lincoln from the early medieval period, being superseded by suspension glazes during the second half of the 12th century (Coppock 1980). They have a wide but sparse distribution across central Lincolnshire (Hayfield 1983, 723–4).

(b) Suspension glazes (L) nos. 41–7
A similar fabric to LS, differing only in the method of applying the glazes which are usually olive-green or brownish-green, often mottling at the lower margins. Fabric surfaces are usually oxidised red, orange or buff, reducing in cores, and occasionally inner surfaces, to blue-grey or silver-grey. Most vessels appear wheel-thrown although some thicker sherds reveal coil marks. Jugs 41–6 demonstrate a variety of decorative designs which were also common to a number of other fabrics within the county. Lincoln wares were probably in production until the 14th century (Hayfield 1983, 721).

**Toynoton fabric (TY) nos. 48–55**
A similar fabric to Lincoln ware and originally part of the same potting tradition (Hayfield 1983, 721–40); a hard, sand-tempered, rough-textured fabric with a smooth to hackly fracture. Oxidised surfaces vary from buff to orange or red, whilst reduced surfaces and cores are usually a bluish-grey. Their suspension glazes are generally green or greenish-brown, often with a light surface pocking reminiscent of the earlier splashed glazes; this feature was particularly common on the late-medieval products from this source. The pottery industry at Toynoton-All-Saints developed in the 13th century and...

---
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Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fabric codes</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>St</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>TY</th>
<th>RS</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel totals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% totals</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

probably survived until the later 15th century. The examples from Horncastle cover the full range of production. Jugs 49–54 have applied iron-wash decoration.

Regional strata (RS) nos. 56–63
A category embracing all unprovenanced English vessels from the site; each is individually described.

56 Jug Orange outer surface and orange/light blue core. Olive-green glaze with orange-yellow margins.

57 Jug Red outer surface, pale orange inner and pale blue core. Thick apple-green glaze with faint orange-yellow margins.

58 Jug Orange outer surface and orange-blue-grey core. Apple-green glaze with bright orange margins. Handle was attached to the rim top, a characteristic of early-medieval jugs in the county (Hayfield 1980, 33–4).

59 Jug Orange surfaces and pale blue-grey core. Bright apple-green glaze.

60 Jug Red outer surface and red/blue-grey core. Bright apple-green glaze with bright orange margins.

61 Cistern Pale reddish-grey outer surface and grey/pale grey core. Splashes of yellow glaze.

62 Cistern Pale blue core. Bright olive-green glaze on surface.

63 Cistern Pale purple outer surface and buff/pale blue core. Dark olive-green glaze.

Nos. 62 and 63 are probably 16th century.

Imported vessels (I) nos. 64, 65

64 Dutch tripod pipkin, pinkish-red, rough textured surfaces and a hard orange core. Orange splashed glaze. Charred deposits extend over scar of missing handle suggesting continued use despite damage. Internal white salts deposit may indicate secondary use as urinal.

65 Type II flask (Hurst 1966). Smooth-textured, orange-red outer surface and a hard, smooth fractured, blue-grey core. The inner surface varies from blackish-purple to pale orange-purple.

Both nos. 64 and 65 come from Feature 63 and belong to the 16th century.

Discussion
Although this assemblage illustrates a wide range of fabrics and forms of Saxon and medieval pottery, the sample (Table 4) is too small to assess their relative importance. However, it is of interest to note the low percentage of Torksey wares (9 miles [12km] from Horncastle) compared with that of the Lincoln wares (23 miles from Horncastle). This discrepancy might arise from methods of pottery marketing or an imbalance in the chronological representation of the assemblage. Dating of most South Lincolnshire fabrics still relies almost entirely upon the ceramic sequences from Lincoln and there is clearly a need for material from stratified sites elsewhere in the county before a better understanding of the local pottery is possible.

Post-medieval pottery from Wharf Road and 27 High Street

By Andrew White

The 1968 excavation in Wharf Road produced a quantity of interesting post-medieval pottery. Trench I Layer 3 contained six sherds of Bourne 'D' ware (Whittewell & Wilson 1969, 108–9), dating from the 16th/17th century, but a group of layers in trenches II (9, 11 and 12) and IV (3 and 7) provided the greatest number of sherds. This group, associated with the final silting of the River Waring also includes a number of 17th century leather shoes. Apart from a few residual medieval sherds and one sherd of pearlware this forms a coherent group with a terminal date of c. 1690–1700. Imports include three sherds of Westerwald stoneware and two of Frechen stoneware. The latest pottery represented consists of 15 sherds (c. ten vessels) of iron-glazed stoneware, principally straight-sided mugs, and three sherds of slipware cups, both types first appearing in the late 17th century. The largest amount of pottery consists of East Lincolnshire fabrics, probably produced at the Bolingbroke kilns (Coppack 1976, 6–24). Clay pipes in this group include seven stamps by the maker SV (Davey 1979, 163, fig. 1) of late 17th century form. A fuller account of this group will be published at a later date.

Though the excavation at 27 High Street produced much more post-medieval pottery, little was in any stratified context or large group. Its interest lies mainly in the evidence it provides for sources of supply and trading contacts.

Twenty-one contexts produced post-medieval pottery but three of these were totally unstratified while several others were from features which contained quantities of earlier material. F63 contained four sherds of East Lincolnshire type pottery associated with seven sherds of a Martincamp flask (Hurst 1977, 156–7), see description No. 65 and Fig. 22, and two sherds of Midlands yellow ware. F49 contained an identical mixture of late 16th to mid-17th century pottery. One sherd of Weser slipware from an unstratified context has already been published (White 1980, 90) and is of some interest as an import of German earthenware.

Fuller descriptions are available in the site archive at the City and County Museum, Lincoln.

Small Finds (Fig. 23, 1–6)

27 High Street, by A. J. White and P. Everson

Roman

1. (Fig. 23.1) Layer 2
Fragment of a bronze bracelet of oval section with continuous incised spiral-moulding interrupted by a smooth inner face. cf. Bushe-Fox, 1928, fig. XXII, no. 59.
2. (Fig. 23.2) Layer 2
Fragment of a thin bronze bracelet of rectangular section, decorated alternately with rectangular projections and groups of three 'teeth'. Late 4th cent. cf. Kenya, 1948, fig. 83 no. 3 and Gunliffe, 1975, fig. 112 no. 42. A group of similar bracelets was found with a burial at Homington, Lincs. in 1867 and is in the City and County Museum, Lincoln, acc. no. 241–5.99.

3. (Fig. 23.3) Layer 2
Fragment of a gilt-bronze bracelet, with remains of slot for fastening. It is of flat rectangular cross-section, decorated with a series of incised mouldings divided by transverse grooves. Straightened and cut to a taper in antiquity, perhaps for a secondary use. cf. xxxxxx, pl. VI no. 25.

4. F79
Three fragments of a bronze strip decorated with intermittent incised grooves, either representing a straightened-out bracelet or the stem of an unguent scoop from a toilet set.

5. Layer 2
Five fragments of a similar bronze bracelet, very worn.

6. Layer 2
Lower end and point of a bronze hairpin. The head being the main distinguishing feature of date this may be Roman (cf. Price 1972, fig. 34, nos. 59–61) or late Saxon (cf. no. 18).

7. F13
Small plain bronze pennular ring of circular-section wire.

8. Layer 2
Two tiny fragments of a plain pennular bronze finger ring, the surviving terminal being plain and flattened.

9. Layer 2
Bronze nail of square section with an oval head. Presumably of Roman date cf. Stead 1976, fig. 112, 121.

10. Circular fragment with slightly eccentric perforation, cut from the wall of a small grey-ware jar. It is probably a spindle whorl, but the difference in thickness across the diameter, due to the shape of the parent vessel, would cause it to rotate in an eccentric fashion.

11. F79
Fragment of glass folded to create rim or base. The edge is cut flat, not bevelled, so may be a base.

12. (Fig. 23.4) Layer 2 (by P. Everson)
Small-long brooch. Width of head-plate 26mm. (original approx. 30mm.), length incomplete; thickness 2mm.; height of bow approx. 10mm.

Fragment of head-plate and half the bow of small-long brooch, copper alloy. The head-plate is of trefoil-headed form (Leeds 1945, 8–14) with the two lobes broken off; its surface is tinned, and there are fine random striations but no division or decoration. The bow has a pair of incised cross lines, but no medium groove. A corroded lump on the back of the head-plate represents the pierced lug to support the spring and shows no trace of iron in the corrosion. 6th century. (Leeds 1945, 88–92 with references) cites Lincolnshire examples of this, the most numerous and widely distributed category of head-plate form, from Stadford (2 examples), Bracebridge (LM2.2?) and South Ferriby. Two further examples have been catalogued at Fonaby, Gr. 32 no. 6 and unstratified find no. 17 (Cook 1981, 34 and fig. 11, 55 and fig. 25), and another from the Foss Dyke near Lincoln (Everson 1977).

In the two places where lobes are missing, a fracture is clear in one instance, and possible beneath corrosion in the other. While, given the brittleness of cast bronze, it is conceivable that this could occur through severe mishandling in use or deposition, it seems at least likely that the lobes were deliberately removed, perhaps as raw material for later bronze-working. (I am grateful to Kate Foley and Robert White for discussing this idea with me.)

13. (Fig. 23.5) Layer 2
Bronze strip-end with bifurcated top pierced by two rivet-holes. The lower end has a debased zoomorphic decoration. A sunken rectangular panel in the centre was probably for champlevé enamel, which does not survive. 9th century. cf. Peers & Raleigh Radford 1943, fig. 11; Wilson and Blunt 1961, pp. 122–2; Waterman, 1959, fig. 10, no. 1.

14. Fig. 23.6) Toposal
Late medieval
15. (Fig. 23), F21 Copper alloy lace-tag or pin-holder of late 16th to mid 17th century date. A large number of these, containing up to three pins, were found in the Mowbeck at Grantham c. 1900-30 (unpublished).

Layer 2
16. Dorned head of small bronze tusk.

Layer 3
17. Glass bottle seal in dark green metal, stamped 'T. Friskenay'. This type of seal applied to a wine bottle implies a more expensive and socially rather higher usage than the type with separately applied initial stamps. It is more likely to have stayed in the owner's possession, so 27 High Street may have been Friskenay's house. Hornsby's Parish Registers (Hudson 1892) record the birth (1730) and death (1777) of Thomas Friskenay. At the latter date he is described as 'Merchant'. This seal presumably belongs to the period c. 1750-77.

Roman coins from 27 High Street
By Andrew White
2. F60 AE 3 of Gratian (period 367-75 A.D.)
   num illeg. prob. Arles cf. RIG* 15 = LRBC* 503 s.
3. F71 AE 4 of Constantius (period 341-46 A.D.)
   num TRP = Trier LRBC 161.

Layer 2 (unstratified)
4. Antoninusianus of Allectus (293-6 A.D.)
   num CL = Colchester RIC 79
5. AE 4 House of Constantine (period 357-41 A.D.)
   num illeg.
6. AE 4 Constantius (period 357-41 A.D.)
   aed (CONSTA NS PA(VG)
   dr, diad, bust r.
   res GOR IAEXER GIVIS

Table 5  The number of bones from each species represented on both sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site, date and bone</th>
<th>27 High Street: Late Roman-British features</th>
<th>Medieval features</th>
<th>Post-medieval features</th>
<th>Wharf Road: Post-medieval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site, date and bone</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skull</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxilla</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacarpal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelvis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femur</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcaneum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metatarsal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalanx 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalanx 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phalanx 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of bones</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum no. of animals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also: Dog front halves of two, radius 2, pelvis R, metatarsal 4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval features</td>
<td>Total no. of bones</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-medieval features</td>
<td>Total no. of bones</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6 (+ skeleton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharf Road: Post-medieval</td>
<td>Total no. of bones</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddled Chalk</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other layers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
goats was seen but it is possible that there are goat bones among those identified as sheep.

Though the number of bones from deposits of late Romano-British date is small, it is clear that cattle were of greater importance than sheep, and that pigs were relatively insignificant. Most of the cattle bones were from adult animals, though a few were from animals less than two years of age, and one was from a small calf. Similarly, few of the sheep bones were from animals of less than three years of age, suggesting that both cattle and sheep were kept not only for meat but also for milk, wool production, draught purposes and for breeding, while most of the pigs had died between the ages of about six months and two or three years, at an age when they would have attained a useful size. Both of the dogs seem to be partially disturbed burials; the one from F46 is a medium sized animal with some wear on its teeth; the other, from F45, is a short-legged dog, possibly similar to a small terrier, and though it was an adult, was not an elderly animal.

There are too few bones in the medieval and post-medieval deposits at 27 High Street for any useful comment to be made, except to note the presence in F63 of the skeleton of a piglet, almost complete, and of less than one month old.

On the Wharf Road site all the bones are from post-medieval deposits, mainly from two: the silting-up of the river bed during the 17th century, and a slightly later chalk floor. It seems reasonable to assume that both groups represent refuse. Nearly all of the bones from

Fig. 24 Area between Boston Road (top) and River Bain (foreground) looking east, 2 July 1976, showing cropmarks of unsealed settlement (cf. Fig. 26) (© Cambridge Univ.)
cattle and sheep are from skeletally mature animals, while most of the pig bones are from young animals of less than one year. The dog bones are derived from several different animals, mostly of medium or small size, though at least two very large animals are represented.

Flints from 27 High Street
By Varyan Denham
42 worked flints, including 18 blades and blade tools, 21 flakes and flake tools, 3 cores and associated material, were found during the excavation. Typologically they do not represent a homogeneous assemblage, but although they were clearly in residual contexts, the material is of intrinsic interest.

The material seems mainly surface derived, although the quality and colour of the flint is extremely variable, comprising fairly fine, dark flint, several coarser grades and some natural flakes which have been utilised.

A conical core, two core trimming flakes, a medial graver, a microlithic point and several retouched, notched and utilised blades and flakes all appear to be Mesolithic in character with possible affinities with industries from Star Carr (Clarke 1971, 97–114), Kilham Long Barrow (Manby 1976, 133–8), and Brigham (Manby 1966, 213–25). Some pressure-flaked waste flakes and a projectile point roughout could possibly derive from a later period, perhaps Neolithic in date, although the paucity of finds and indistinct nature of the material makes further identification difficult. Most of the flints appear to be of Mesolithic date and the site was possibly close to a settlement which existed some time during the 8th to 5th millennium B.C.

THE UNWALLED SETTLEMENT: A SUMMARY OF THE EVIDENCE
With the spread of 19th- and 20th-century Horncastle, evidence has come to light of Roman occupation and cemeteries over a substantial area south of the river Waring, originating at a pre-Roman date and continuing into the late 4th century and probably beyond. Discoveries have been recorded or material kept from each of the three major waves of building activity—in the Cag thorpe area (S of the walled site) in the early 19th century, in the Queen Street—Foundry Street area (SE of the walled site) in the mid and late 19th century and since the 1960s further south beside Boston and Mareham Roads.

These finds were sufficient to move the focus away from the walled site, which had traditionally dominated our picture of Roman Horncastle, and they gave the first clues about the scale and nature of the extramural site as a nucleated settlement showing some urban characteristics (cf. Discussion, below). Cropmark air photographs taken in 1976 of the fields just east of the Bain and west of the Boston Road developments of the 1960s (Fig. 24) show that the western part of the settlement consisted of a series of ditched enclosures, presumably small fields, related in the southern part of the area to two lanes running along the river valley in a loosely planned arrangement (e.g. there seem to have been at least five rectangular enclosures c. 40m. wide fronting the lane.
nearest the river). More than one period of features is represented in the air photograph, as is only to be expected from the date range of the finds picked up in the eastern part of the settlement.

In the following sections an attempt is made to assemble all the evidence for the extramural settlement before leading to a general discussion of Roman Horncastle.

AIR PHOTOGRAPHS
There are two sets of air photographs: those taken in 1976 and already referred to, and a photograph taken in 1948 of fields 340-1 to the east of the Roman settlement.

1. Boston Road area (Figs. 24, 26)

The main cropmarks have been plotted on Fig. 26 together with modern features. The reasons for believing that the cropmarks represent features predominantly of Roman or Late Iron Age date are: (a) the cropmarks lie immediately west of the Late Iron Age–Roman settlement as revealed from finds made on building sites, and some of the Roman features recorded in the building sites, for example the ditches (nos. 9, 28, p. 78, below) would give rise to the type of cropmarks shown in Fig. 24; (b) there is no evidence for significant post-Roman occupation in this area until modern times; (c) the type of settlement revealed in the photograph can be paralleled in
Roman contexts throughout lowland Britain (the Fenland and Upper Thames Valley, for example).

(2) Marcham Road (Fig. 23)

An isolated quadrilateral enclosure divided into two parts, or two enclosures, measuring c. 55 m. x 135 m. overall, is shown in Fields 340-1 some 200 m. to the east of the nearest recorded Roman finds (Residential College, no. 44, below). A Roman date for this feature again seems likely in view of probable Roman parallels, including a number of unpublished sites in North Lincolnshire (for example, Ovemby or Waddingham). Careful fieldwalking was carried out by members of Boston Archaeology Group in c. 1970 in the area between this cropmark and the eastern edge of a known Roman settlement at the Residential College. This produced no Roman finds, but as the area has more recently received persistent attention by users of metal-detectors, it seems likely that yielding finds (perhaps from below the general cultivation level) If the cropmark is of Roman date, it suggests an outlying enclosure beyond the main nucleus of settlement (contrast Fig. 24).

LIST OF FINDS IN THE UNWALLED SETTLEMENT (Fig. 26)

Findspots in the list are arranged geographically.

Abbreviations used: (LM) = Lincoln Museum Parish File
(MV) = Information Mrs M. Vincent

Address and date of discovery Finds and reference
West of South Street/Boston Road (from N. to S.)

   Pottery (LM)

2. W. end of The Wong, 1947
   Pottery: 3rd-4th cent. grey ware (LM)

3. High Dependency Unit, The Wong, 1982
   Five cinerary urns, scatter of later pottery (p. 79, below)

4. Cattle Pens, W. side of South St., 1990
   Two skeletons (LM; reported in Holtcastle News)

5. Just N.W. of Town Hall, 1968
   Cinerary urns (MV), several inhumations—one with jet bracelet, two with bronze braclets [Whitehill & Wilson 1969, 103]; two large V-shaped ditches aligned N.E.-S.W. seen in services trench to S. of burials (MV)

6. N. of Town Hall, 1968
   Abundant pottery (MV)

7. Town Hall—Sellowood Gardens, 1968-9
   Sherd of Late Iron Age pottery; quern, coin of Togati, Flavian and Antonine samian and o ther 1st. 2nd cent. pottery; four 3rd-4th cent. coins; bones, including skull juxta S. of Town Hall (LM); Whithell & Wilson 1969, 103; Wilson 1970, 10)

8. Warden's bungalow, Sellowood Gardens (more precisely located part of above site), 1968-9
   Floor of crushed chalk and daub (with Roman pot above it), 'coarse plaster', one reading tile (Whitehill & Wilson 1969, 103; plan in LM)

9. S.W. of Town Hall, 1968
   N.-S. ditches, 20 and 15 ft. wide, c. 6 ft. deep samian in fill (info. L. Keen: sketch plan and section of 15 ft. wide ditch in LM)

10. Sunnymoor, Southfield Place, 1960s (?)
    Coin of Constantius (LM)

11. Churchill Ave. (1960s)
    Roman coin (MV)

12. N. side, Churchill Ave.
    Skeleton, human

13. W. end of Churchill Ave., 1960s
    Cinerary urn, found when water main was laid

14. Stafford Gardens, 1960s
    Coin of Constans, pottery N. and S. of road (MV)

15. Boston Road, E. side (from S. to N.), and Marcham Road, S. side (from W. to E.)
    Observation of builders' excavations produced no finds (N. Field)

16. Tennyson Gardens, 1960s
    15 coins of 3rd-4th cent., incl. coins of Constantius II, Diocletian, House of Constantine and Valens, pottery (LM)

17. Police House, 1975
    Coins of Constantius II (RIC 591) and as Constantinepolsi (LM)

18. Grounds of Banovallum School, 1960s
    Large late Iron Age jar

    One sherd Iron Age, 3rd-4th cent. Roman pottery (LM)

20. Banovallum School, 1967
    Coin, Gloria exercitus, probably Constantius II (Whitehill & Wilson 1968, 28)

    Romano-Saxon pot (Marjoram 1974, 22)

22. Opposite Churchill Ave., 1967
    Bronze core of Cotidian statue (Whitehill & Wilson 1968, 21)

From opposite Churchill Avenue northwards to junction with Marcham Road

    Coins of Vespasian and Trajan, samian and other pottery; coin possibly of Gallienus, coins of Constantine and 4th cent. unidentified, 3rd-4th cent. pottery (Whitehill 1963, 6)

24. Boston Archaeology Group's excavations, 1963-4
    Building with sandstone walls and 'cement' floors, one room measuring 17 ft. 10 in. E. W. (Whitehill 1964, 66 = May 1964, 8 and letter by Miss P. Wheelie in LM)

25. Boston Archaeology Group's excavations, 1967
    Walls of Sibbald sandstone, layers of 'cement' and flint. Coins of Vespasian/Domitian, samian and other pottery (Whitehill & Wilson 1968 24; the walls etc. probably belong to the same building as that exposed in 1963-4; a sketch plan by Mrs. E. C. Peacock in LM shows a Roman Causeway extending southwards to this building from Marcham Road parallel to Boston Road)

26. Junction of Marcham Road and Boston Road, S. side, 1962
    Coin of Gallienus (Whitehill 1963, 6)

27. 4 Marcham Road, 1962
    Coin, urs Roma type (Whitehill 1963, 6)

28. 46 Marcham Road, 1969
    Coin, Gloria exercitus (Wilson 1970, 10)

E. of South St., N. of Marcham Road

28. Just N. of Marcham Road, at junction with Boston Road, 1968
    Two flat-bottomed ditches seen in service trenches running N.W.—S.E. (2.3 ft. deep, 3 ft. and 3 ft. 7 in. wide at base, 5 ft. apart; P. Wheelie)

29. Bryant Close/South Street, 1962
    Constantine and Constantinopolis issues. coins, sherd of Castor ware. One skeleton (Whitehill, 1963, 6)

30. Bryant Close/South Street, early 20th cent.
    Human bones found in this area displayed in a tent (LM)
**30. Bryant Close/South Street, N. side, 1960**

Skeletons (LM)

**31. 13 Marcham Road, 1960**

Coins of Tetricus I, Constantine I, Gratian and Theodosius I (Peach 1961, 20)

**32. 1 and 2 Bargate Lane, 1968**

East-west wall of Spilsby sandstone traced for 60 ft. 1st/2nd cent. coin, pottery (LM)

**33. New Jerusalem Chapel, Croft Street, 1872**

Three lead coffins (Walter, 1908, 6)

**34. Croft House, 34 Queen Street/Garden Cottage, The Gardens**

Six inhumation—five adults, one child—aligned E.-W. and N.-S.; unaccompanied except for mehen head at neck of one burial (Whitwell 1964, 63–6; pottery)

**35. Croft Street, 1960s**

Bones (? human) reported (LM)


Crushed chalk floor with straight edge seen for 3 ft. beneath drive (MV)

**37. The Hollies, Queen Street**

Beehive quern, pottery, including one shard of samian (MV)

**38. 89 Queen Street, c. 1962**

Sandstone foundation; pottery—grey ware (May 1964, 8)

**39. Queen Street, near junction with Croft Street, 1970s**

Human bones reported when sewers laid (MV)

**40. Between South Street and Queen Street (19th cent.)**

Urns (MV)

**41. 120 Foundry Street, 1976**

Coin, as follis, Constantius LRBC 140a (LM)

**42. 73 Foundry Street, 1949–50**

Coin, as Constantius II (LM)

**43. Garden of Mr W. J. Smith, seedsman, 1896 (within 100 yards of no. 33)**

Two lead coffins aligned E.-W., possible gypsum burials (Walter 1897, 1908, 7)

**44. Union Workhouse (now Lin. C.C. Welfare Centre), 1858**

Pottery 'for the most part' cinerary urns (five from this site illustrated by Trollope 1868, fig. facing p. 199); stamped mortarium, decorated samian, samian stamp—ILIANI, querns, fluitan, bone pins (Trollope 1858, 202).

Ordnance Survey record note 24 cinerary urns found in 1838, but this seems to be a mis-quote from Walter 1908, 7: 'The present writer has two jars, or bottles, of buff coloured ware [flagons?], of which about a dozen were dug up when the foundations of the workhouse were being laid in 1838'

Cinerary urns (Trollope 1858, 202)

**45. Vicarage, 1858**

Cinerary urns (Trollope 1858, 202)

**46. Mr Clitheroe's premises [now Fire Station, Foundry Street], 1858**

Careful fieldwalking produced no Roman finds, but more recent interest by users of metal detectors (p. 78, above)

Cropmark (p. 78, above)

**47. Fields, 327, 342, N. of Marsham Road, 1970s**

Many fragments of cinerary urns (two illustrated: Weir 1820)

'Marsham Road (TF 261981), 1959

Coin: Antoninus of Carausius (Peach 1961, 20)

Just south of Marsham Road (TF 265090), 1963

Coin of Claudius II, Constantine and Valens (Whitwell 1964, 11)

Impressively located finds (not marked on plan)

Fields on S. side of the town before 1820

'Marsham Road (TF 261981), 1959

Just south of Marsham Road (TF 265090), 1963

Roman Burials at the Wong (Fig. 27)

By Andrew White

In August 1982 a group of Roman jars was found during trenching operations by contractors on the new High Dependency Unit. The pottery first encountered by workmen consisted of at least two cremation vessels (Fig. 28, 3...
& 4) 600 mm. apart. Other vessels of which No. 5 in Fig. 28 was the most complete, were present but their relationship to the cremations is not clear. Only a small mixed sample of cremated bone survived the initial discovery. (See report below.)

Topsoil from the intended south-east trench (Fig. 27) was removed by machine and the remainder excavated by a team from the City and County Museum, Lincoln. I should like to acknowledge the help of Maggi Solly, Naomi Field, and Graham Watson during the excavation. A partly surviving cremation in a wide-mouthed bowl (Fig. 27.2) which had been overturned and damaged in antiquity, was found 3.7 m. from 3 and 4. Lying 1.7 m. east of cremation No. 2 in orange-brown, sandy subsoil was a complete jar (Fig. 28.1) containing a cremation which, though undisturbed included a considerable mixture of sand and gravel distributed evenly through the fill. Some of the cremated bone was heavily concreted together and at the bottom of the jar was the proximal end of a femur, obviously placed there deliberately before the rest of the bones. Also in the fill of the jar was a coin, an Antoninianus of the 3rd century, the obverse of which was worn smooth. This might represent a grave offering consistent with 3rd century cremations recorded elsewhere in Lincolnshire. One such example, found in the last century, was in a stone cist at West Firsby and contained a coin of Claudius Gothicus (268-70 A.D.) (Jarvis 1849, 400). However, positive association between the Horncasttle cremation and coin is not confirmed, as the position of the coin in the jar was not recorded and might be a later intrusion, in view of the early date of the jar. (See below.) It was evident that the cremation vessels had been buried at different levels and over a long period of time, which perhaps accounts for their varying states of preservation.

Two parallel U-shaped ditches were found running north-north-east to south-south-west about 3 m. from Cremation 1. They were dug into the subsoil and were approximately 1 m. deep and 1.20 m. wide. The fill was a dark loam, similar to topsoil and in the bottoms were small pebbles and peat. The northernmost of the ditches contained sherd of samian ware, part of a small beaker, coarse wares and animal bones. The ditches did not appear to be associated with the cremations and could be similar to ditches recorded elsewhere in the town (see above). A small area of burnt sand was found 8.08 m. south of the ditches at the southern end of the trench, and seemed to be the remains of a further, disturbed, cremation but no bones were found.

Previous to these building operations the site had been an open area of common land for many years and it is very probable that the cemetery extended over a large, as yet uninvestigated, area.

Quantities of domestic pottery were found in topsoil throughout the area of excavations and around the new building suggesting that the cemetery fell into disuse in the later Roman period.

The pottery (Fig. 28)

By J. R. Samuels

1. Jar; complete vessel
   Brown exterior surface, darker on shoulder and rim where it is also soot blackened. Black interior surface. Soft fabric with fragments of crushed shell and possibly chalk, max. diameter 3 mm. Incised groove below shoulder; uneven rim possibly hand-made. cf.
Fig. 29 Roman pottery from the unwalled settlement. Scale 1/4 (J. R. Samuels)
Old Winteringham (Stead 1976, 155) no. 19, and Dragonby (unpublished) contexts 715 and 1682.

2. Wide-mouthed bowl
Dark grey abraded exterior surface with traces of burningish, grey interior surface and core. Hard fabric with sparse, small rounded quartz grains, occasional angular fragments of flint and limestone and peppered with brown mineral, possibly ironstone. Traces of burningish on rim and exterior surface and burned wavy line decoration. Base may have been added after vessel turned, a practice noted on jars from the Market Rasen and Bourne kilns (unpublished reports). cf. Market Rasen nos. 97, 100, form only.

3. Jar

4. Jar

5. Wide-mouthed bowl

None of the fabrics can be identified with those of any of the known kiln sites in the region, although forms of four of the vessels can be compared with material from the kiln site at Market Rasen (Boyle, Elsdon & Samuels, forthcoming) where associated finds indicate a date in the region of A.D. 150-200. The jar no. 1 is an unusual form and although similar forms and fabrics have been noted from late 1st to mid 2nd century contexts this vessel has a more sharply moulded rim and the parallels are not close. The associated 3rd century coin is problematic.

The cremations
By Mary Harman

Jar 1
This deposit, weighing 480 g., contained some fairly large pieces, the maximum dimension of the largest piece being 62 mm. No skull vault fragments were noted though there is one petrous temporal. Most of the axis is present, and another cervical vertebra body. There are many long bone shaft fragments and some epiphyses including the proximal end of the humerus, olecranon process, and proximal and distal ends of the femur. At least some of these epiphyses are not fused. There are also several pelvic fragments, showing the iliac crest not fused. There is nothing to suggest that more than one person is represented. The remains are those of a person of less than twenty-three years, the size of the bones indicating that the age was probably between seventeen and twenty-three, and that the person may have been male.

Jar 2
A small incomplete group, weighing 50 g. The pieces recovered include several fragments of skull vault, part of the alveolus, and long bone shaft fragments. The bones are from an adult or young adult.

Uncertain association
This small group, probably incomplete and a mixture of bone from at least two cremation deposits, weighs 120 g. There are a few recognisable fragments: parts of a petrous temporal, four vertebral bodies, pelvic fragments and pieces of long bone shaft. These were all from adult or adolescent persons.

HORNCastle: THE ROMAN POTTERY FROM SOUTH OF THE TOWN (Figs. 29, 30)
By J. R. Samuels

In order to gain a fuller picture of the Roman occupation in this area it was felt that an examination of the pottery recovered south of the town walls might be of use. This material which is now in the City & Country Museum, Lincoln, was collected over the past twenty years during building work on various sites and from nearby gardens in the Boston Road area. All of the pottery was examined but because little of it was recorded from archaeological deposits only the more unusual pieces are discussed here.

Some of the material from the Town Hall site (Fig. 26) has already been published (Whitwell & Wilson 1969, 103) where it is also mentioned that Flavian and Antonine samian was found, as well as coins from the later 1st to the 4th centuries. The coarse pottery also covers this period; several vessels are either later Iron age or early Roman, both wheel-made and hand-made, e.g. nos. 123, 135, 142 and 143.

Rusticated jars, a shard of Parisian ware, no. 139 and some of the grey wares are probably of 2nd-century date. Dales ware and grey ware forms nos. 144-54 reflect later 2nd- to 3rd-century activity and the shell-girted and stone-girted lid-seated jars carry the group into the mid 4th century, although this material is more scarce. Only a few Swanpool and Nene Valley colour-coated vessels were seen and the frilled grey ware jars nos. 157 & 158 and grey ware flanged bowls are probably of Swanpool origin. The main impression, in contrast to the material from 27 High Street, is of fairly early Roman-British activity with less later material, perhaps tailing off around the end of the 3rd to mid 4th century.

123. Handmade. Brown burnished exterior surface and rim, grey core and dark brown interior surface. Soft fabric containing much crushed shell, generally small but a few fragments 3 mm. diam., much quartz grits and possibly some chalk fragments.
125. Hard grey smoothed surfaces, dark grey core.
128. Hard grey smoothed surfaces, dark grey core.
130. Grey surfaces, smoothed on exterior. Light grey core.
131. Black surfaces, grey core. Smoothed on top of flange and rim. Hard gritty fabric containing a few float fragments and quartz grits, 5 mm. max. and a fragment of ironstone, 4 mm. x 2 mm.
Fig. 30 Roman pottery from the unwalled settlement (J. R. Samuels)
140. Soft grey fabric containing much crushed shell and some chalk fragments.
141. Dark grey surfaces, black core. Smoothed on exterior surface with slight silvery sheen. Very hard, slightly gritty fabric. The rim of an indented jar with the beginnings of the indent just visible at the break.
145. Light brown exterior surface, grey core and interior surface. Traces of smoothing on rim.
146. ? Light brown surfaces with black core. Traces of a black exterior surface. Some shell gritting.
150. Dark grey shell-girted fabric.
155. Hard, dark grey surfaces with red core.
156. Fine grey fabric, burnished on neck and shoulder.
159. Red-brown surfaces, grey core. Fabric contains quartz grits, some crushed shell and fragments of limestone.
160. Dark grey gritty fabric.

165. Dark grey, hard gritty fabric containing some flint fragments, 2 mm. max., and some limonite and chalk.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

LATE IRON AGE AND EARLY ROMAN (pre A.D. c. 250)

The settlement of the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D. was situated on river terrace gravels forming the east side of the Bain valley a little way south of the confluence of the Waring with the Bain. Sufficient Late Iron Age material has been recovered in the same area to suggest that occupation originated before the conquest and continued into the early Roman period. Horncastle thus falls into a familiar class of pre-Roman to early Roman river-terrace settlement; the general development of undefended Iron Age settlements in the area has been discussed recently by May (1976b) and Whitwell (1982, 23–6).

Possible indicators of the extent of the early Roman settlement are the cemeteries with cremation urns on the north and north-east (unfortunately the early reports of finds in these areas are vague about the location); the single find of a ‘bead-rim cremation urn’ (and possibly the undated inhumation) and the general tailing out of early finds in the Tennyson Gardens–Stanhope Gardens area on the south; and the ditched enclosures besides the

Table 6  Some Roman nucleated settlements in Lincolnshire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Estimated open settlement area (ha)</th>
<th>Late Roman defended area (ha)</th>
<th>Pre-Roman occupation</th>
<th>Early Roman military occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caistor High Street and related sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horncastle</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2 (new site)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludford</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caistor</td>
<td>more than 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirmington</td>
<td>20–25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Ferriby</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also Ulecy and Burgh-le-Marsh (no information available)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ermine St. Sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaster</td>
<td>25–30</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navenby</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>poss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owningby</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibaldstow</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winteringham</td>
<td>12–16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleaford</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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river on the west. The eastern limit is possibly defined in the area of the Residential College along Mareham Road (see above). The settlement and enclosures as revealed so far cover some 54 hectares (135 acres). Discoveries from the walled area suggest that it too was occupied or under cultivation for at least some of the time before the building of the wall. A measure of urbanisation is shown by (1) the separation of burial areas from the dwelling areas in successive periods and (2) the existence of buildings with stone foundations and painted wall plaster. When discovered in 1968 the ditches on the Town Hall site, measuring c. 6 m. and 4.5 m. wide and c. 2 m. deep, raised the question of defences, but this now seems less likely in view of the air photographic evidence for numerous boundary ditches, some quite substantial (Fig. 24).

Information recently collected by Whitwell (1982, 164) and updated by N. Field enables a comparison to be made with other Roman nucleated settlements in the area between the Wash and Humber (from Ermine Street eastwards). (Table 6.)

Probable or definite traces of stone buildings are known from all these sites except for S. Ferriby; but beyond that, with the exceptions of Ancaster (Todd 1975, 1981) and Hibaldstow (Smith 1978), we have a dearth of information about the level of urbanisation reached in these settlements (whether there was a formally defined urban area, the degree of planning within it, function of buildings, etc.; the existence of cemeteries, for example, is known only for Ancaster and Horncastle and possibly Hibaldstow and Winteringham). The little knowledge we have nevertheless places Horncastle close to the top of the league, both in terms of its inhabited area and the signs of urban organisation mentioned above, and thus suggests it ranked as one of the leading settlements in the Lincoln area.

Almost inevitably Horncastle has been considered as a possible site for an early Roman fort on the strength of its early Roman finds and strategic situation (Whitwell 1982, 44). Against that suggestion are the following points: (1) the early finds are accounted for in the Late Iron Age–Early Roman settlement explanation given above; (2) no military finds have been recorded among the large quantity of material picked up; (3) unlike most early Roman forts, Horncastle is not (on present knowledge) tied into the Roman land communications system, since the road running east from Lincoln to the coast passes some way to its north. As things stand, therefore, the onus is on those who would postulate a fort to produce positive evidence.

LATER ROMAN

At some date not earlier than the late 3rd century A.D., a walled enclosure of 2 hectares (5 acres) was constructed less than 1 km. north of the open settlement, in the confluence of the rivers Bain and Waring. All the indications are that the open settlement continued in use during the lifetime of the walled enclosure.

As the excavations were unfortunately not able to establish the precise date of construction of the walled enclosure, both that and its function are a matter for discussion, but two points are clear:

(1) The walled enclosure includes external bastions constructed in the same build as the curtain wall showing it to belong to the late third century — say the 270s A.D. — or later, when this type of military architecture was introduced.

(2) The small area of the walled site and its placing in a naturally defensible spot across the river from an existing settlement suggest that it was constructed to meet wider strategic requirements than the needs of local defence: in other words that it was a military installation.

Three further points may be added:

(3) The best positive indication of the date of the walled area so far is given by the Roman finds made in the excavations at 27 High Street. No direct association was made with the wall, but as the Roman features on this site produced basically one group of finds dating from the late 3rd to mid-4th century it would be surprising if this was not related to use of the walled area.

(4) In its situation at or near to a point which, it is reasonable to suppose, could be reached by sea-going vessels, Horncastle has a comparable position to that of certain other late Roman coastal fortifications around the shores of England, the evident purpose of such a situation being to protect against riverborne invasion. Horncastle would have lain about 16 km. up river from the Wash coastline as reconstructed by Simmons for the late Roman period. Comparison can be made with Burgh Castle, overlooking the river Waveney, a tributary of the Yare, now about 6 km. from the sea (in Roman times probably further); or with Bitterne, set in a bend of the river Itchen over 3 km. from the point where it joins Southampton Water, which in turn extended for a further 10 km. before opening out into the Solent; or with the late fortification at Lancaster, some 8–9 km. up the Lune.

(5) The massive walls and insubstantial nature of the intramural features accords with the picture produced by excavation within known Saxon Shore forts such as Portchester.

Table 7 summarises the typological relationship of Horncastle and two other sites to be discussed, Caistor and Brough-on-Humber, with (a) neighbouring walled ‘civilian’ sites and (c) forts in the Saxon Shore series, including Bitterne. Without labouring the point it will be apparent that in terms of the area defended and the scale and nature of its defences Horncastle inclines towards group (c).

Thus there is a case for the walled site at Horncastle being a late 3rd century or later military installation connected with coastal defence. The question of its strategic context therefore calls for closer consideration.

Horncastle has often been linked with Caistor (Lincs.) as a fortified site of a similar type. Both sites were walled enclosures covering a small area which takes advantage of a naturally defensive position: Caistor is a contour site while Horncastle lies between two rivers. At Caistor there is also evidence for extramural occupation covering a longer period than that of the fortifications, although not yet for the substantial settlement we know to have existed at Horncastle. Caistor is situated high on the Wolds close to their western scarp, a position which at first sight seems very different from that of Horncastle and to have little relevance to coastal defence. Less is known in this area than in South Lincolnshire about changes in estuarine and river configurations since Roman times, but it seems safe to say that even if the Ancholme was navigable to a point due west of Caistor (as Johnson speculates: 1980, 101) this would have been not less than 9 km. away and 120 m. below the town. Caistor’s situation dominates the Ancholme valley, however, and any movement of people in the valley could have been observed. It also was directly on the High Street running along the west of the Wolds, providing a link between the Humber at South Ferriby and the Wash (via the Bain from Horncastle). So, despite
Table 7  Roman defended sites: a comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area fortified (ha)</th>
<th>Thickness of wall at base (m)</th>
<th>Bastions of same build</th>
<th>Contemporary bank</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Nearby 'civilian' (excluding Lincoln)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaster</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>c. 250–80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gt. Casterton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>early 3rd cent. or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margidunum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no (earlier)</td>
<td>late 3rd cent. later?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorpe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>late 3rd cent. or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Horncastle, Caistor and Brough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORNCastle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>late 3rd cent. or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caistor, Lincs.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>yes?</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>late 3rd cent. or later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brough-on-Humber</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>270 + (?270–90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Saxon shore forts (after Johnson 1976)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brancaster</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1st half of 3rd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgh Castle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes?</td>
<td>late 3rd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>yes?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradwell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes?</td>
<td>late 3rd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reculver</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes?</td>
<td>225–30 (inscript.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richborough</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>273 +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>no?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>late 3rd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lympne</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>yes?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>late 3rd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pevensey</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>335 + (one coin; or late 3rd cent.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portchester</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>late 3rd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitterne</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>340s or later</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the physical differences in its situation from Horncastle's, its strategic significance looks to be similar, as a check on regional communication lines. (Whitwell's recent suggestion [1982, 77] that Caistor might have been a fortified collection point for the annona has no evidence to support it, and Caistor's defended area was some seven times that of the suggested parallel site of Velhida in Raetia.) Horncastle and Caistor, then, were local strongpoints, but also effective points to base mobile defensive forces aiming to obstruct any form of coastal entry between the Humber and Wash (cf. Johnson 1976, 126, on the tactical purpose of the Saxon shore forts).

It therefore seems likely, as Johnson (1980, 101) has suggested, that these two sites, together with the possible lost fort on the coast at Skegness (and probably other installations), fit within an overall scheme of East Coast defence extending northwards from the main series of Saxon Shore forts. This raises the question of how Caistor and Horncastle may have related to the naval base at Brough-on-Humber, as well as to the main Saxon Shore series of sites. Wacher's excavations at Brough suggest that it was militarily active from the 2nd to the mid 4th century, with its main period of stone fortifications having a terminus post quern of the 270s (Wacher 1969). A further potential link between Horncastle and Brough is the apparent similarity of design of the east and west gates of Horncastle and the east gate of Brough (p. 49, above).

A total view of coastal defence in the Wash–Humber area must, however, also take into account 'civilian' walled sites. By the time the latest walled circuit was built —perhaps as early as the end of the third century (or by whatever later date Caistor and Horncastle were walled) —entry on all major rivers or estuaries was obstructed: Brough guarded the Humber; access from the Wash via the Witham would either lead directly to the walls of Lincoln or via its tributaries, the Bain to Horncastle, and the Sea to Ancaster. Thus all known defence-building in the area fits into a recognisable strategy of coastal defence; and to this extent there is a blurring in function between 'military' and 'civilian' defences (as indeed applies generally to late Roman fortifications: Johnson 1976, 124–5, on the coastal defences of N. Gaul and ibid., 132–7, on British west coast defence; cf. Webster 1975, for another case from Roman Britain, which erodes the rigid distinction between 'walled towns' and 'forts'). Nevertheless we would stress the 'militariness' of Horncastle's defended area in contrast with, say, Ancaster's on two grounds (for Ancaster see Todd 1975; 1981): the spatial relationship between defended site and existing habitation area (in both cases a very small defended area relative to the settlement, but also a separate site at Horncastle implying the presence of a separate military
group); and the structural nature of the defences (an ambitious one-off fortification at Horncastle as opposed to a sequence at Ancaster). According to these criteria, uncertainties still surround Caistor, since we do not know the relationship between the walled area and settlement as a whole and we need further confirmation of the building sequence for the defences; with Brough-on-Humber Warburton argued that the nature and sequence of defence building were best explained as those of a military site (Wacher 1969), though we have to remember Brough's dual functions as capital of the civitas of the Parisii and as a possible naval base.

Given that this was the strategic framework into which Horncastle fitted, we will resist the temptation to argue from that towards a more precise date for the construction of its defences, since present knowledge makes it perfectly reasonable for Wash–Humber coastal defence to have reached this form at any date between, say, the 280s and the 370s. We have noted above that present evidence inclines towards the earlier end of the range, and we now await a more likely placed excavation within the walled area.

The coin list in the extramural settlement shows that occupation there continued throughout the 4th century, and the presence of unaccompanied inhumations in the cemetery areas shows that these (and the formal division of space that they imply) continued into the 4th century, perhaps with a Christian element in the population at that date (cf. the possible gypsum burials, p. 79, no. 43). Inhumations in lead coffins also show wealthy members of the Late Roman population. The occurrence of inhumations on parts of the Town Hall site which seem to have been built up in the earlier Roman period (and also possibly in the Queen Street–The Gardens area) is of particular interest in showing a reduction or shift of the inhabited area away from the walled enclosure while that was in use.

Finally, the presence of two Saxon warrior burials in the vicinity of the Roman walled area may be noted (White 1981, 71; cf. Todd 1973, 134–6 for comparison), though nowadays there is less urgency to regard all such burials as evidence of federate barbarians or Germanic mercenaries.
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