Two Roman Sites on the Pipeline from Blyborough, Lincolnshire to Cottam, Nottinghamshire
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Wessex Archaeology undertook a programme of archaeological work in advance of the construction of a gas pipeline from Blyborough, Lincolnshire to Cottam, Nottinghamshire between June 1997 and September 1997. This included a desk-based assessment, geophysical survey, augering, a watching brief and two excavations. This report summarises the results of the excavations. The archaeological work was commissioned by Penspen Limited on behalf of Powergen Plc., who have also provided financial assistance towards the publication of this article. A detailed report containing the results of all aspects of the archaeological work is deposited with the site archive.

Both of the excavated sites were identified through preliminary archaeological work. Site 24, on the Lincoln Edge limestone ridge to the south east of Willoughton, was identified from aerial photographs during the desk-based assessment, and confirmed by geophysical survey. Site 46, situated on the Trent Vale claylands south of Willingham-by-Stow, was identified during the watching brief (Fig.1). Excavation of these sites was limited to areas within the working width of the pipeline contractors. Neither site had been previously investigated archaeologically and both proved to be parts of rural Romano-British farmsteads or settlements.

Site 24. Patchett’s Cliff

Archaeological Background

Site 24 was identified as an area of archaeological potential prior to the construction of the pipeline from cropmarks visible in a series of aerial photographs (Lincolnshire Sites and Monuments Record: SMR 50354) (Fig.2), as part of the archaeological desk-based assessment of the pipeline route (Wessex Archaeology, 1996).

A comprehensive survey of the aerial photographic evidence was undertaken by Air Photo Services. Chris Cox reports that this identified extensive cropmark evidence for a former ditched occupation site and a multi-ditched sinuous feature. This sinuous feature may have been a major former land division or access way. Similar features are seen throughout the Midlands and East Anglia, where they are often associated with later prehistoric settlement areas while others are post-Roman. A strikingly similar example was recorded at Long Bennington in Lincolnshire (Wilson 1982, p.104). At this location a triple ditched boundary is joined by a double ditched feature and a pit alignment. The feature at Site 24 is definitely associated with single sinuous ditches, but is only visible for what must be a short section of its true length. The ditches are of a similar width and appearance to those at Long Bennington. It is likely that this visible portion of the boundary is its terminus, or an intersection with another boundary system at the settlement. One of its ditches exhibits a thickening at the end, as if defining a ditch terminal, and the multiple ditches intersect sensibly with adjoining single ditches.

The remains of the ‘occupation’ site are rather faint, and show as indistinct crop marks. It is not possible to ascertain their contemporaneity with the sinuous boundary. Some of the ditches are likely to form part of settlement or stock penning enclosures and associated small access ways. The ditches and pits are probably considerably more extensive than those seen on the available photographs.

A magnetometer survey of this area was undertaken in order to establish the nature and location of these features. This survey identified a series of negative features visible as strong linear and curvilinear anomalies. It was suggested that one (ditch 5) formed part of an enclosure, which extended north and east beyond the survey area, whilst others were considered sufficiently well defined to indicate internal divisions within the enclosure (Fig.3).

Methods

Topsoil was stripped from a trench (2m by 680m) along the proposed pipeline route, between NGR SK 9355 9215 and SK 9350 9200 (Fig.2). The trench was excavated under close archaeological supervision to the surface of the archaeological remains (consistent with the surface of the underlying broken limestone). The topsoil on either side of the excavated trench was left undisturbed and protected with matting.

Results

Twenty-five features were identified and investigated. All of these were cut into the broken limestone, and had suffered a degree of plough damage. Of these features, four proved to be natural in origin (Fig.3: 133, 168, and 179; not illustrated: 190). Only one of the excavated ditches could be closely related to the cropmarks identified on the aerial photographs. Ditch 169 appeared to be the continuation of the triple ditch feature noted on several aerial photos to the south-east (Figs 2 & 3). Unfortunately, this feature could not be closely dated – the only finds were from the upper fill and included prehistoric, Roman and post-medieval material.

The other archaeological remains lie within the confines of the ‘L’ shaped enclosure identified in the geophysical survey. This flat-bottomed enclosure ditch (Fig.3: 182) proved to be about two metres wide and some ninety-four centimetres deep. Finds from the primary fill included pottery dating to the mid second century; pottery from the upper fill dated from the early to mid third century. A shallow gully (177) ran on a similar alignment and matches the line of an anomaly identified in the geophysical survey (Fig.3). It may have formed part of the same enclosure system. It produced second-century material. The eastern and southern extents of the enclosure were not defined during the course of the fieldwork.

A number of ditches were identified within this enclosure. These appear to represent two different phases of occupation within the enclosure, which correspond fairly closely with the dating recovered from the enclosure ditch. Ditches 174, 187 and 216 contained material dating to the second half of the second century, and appear, therefore, to be contemporary with the earliest use of the enclosure, while ditches 130, 197, 203 and 207 contained material dating to the second half of the third century AD or later. All of these suggest internal divisions within the enclosure, possibly defining areas of different activity.

Oven 201 lay just outside the line of the pipeline, and was therefore not fully excavated. However, the upper layers were cleaned and recorded (Fig.3, inset). The oven consisted of a sub circular wall of mortared limestone blocks with a stoke hole at the eastern end defined by two large limestone blocks pitched on end. The fill of the oven was excavated down to a layer of limestone and mortar, thought to represent the collapse of the superstructure rather than a floor surface. The layer (200)
sealing the oven remains contained pottery dating to the late second and third centuries.

Feature 181 was steep sided, flat bottomed, 3 metres wide and 1.18 metres deep. It was probably a stoke hole for oven 201, although the stratigraphic relationship between these two features was not clearly established. The primary fills contained abundant charcoal and grain chaff likely to be associated with the use of the oven. Pottery from the upper fills was of late second- and third-century date.

The only structural features were a robbed out wall footing and associated post-hole (Fig.3: 193, 199). The robbing of the wall for stone had destroyed the stratigraphic relationship between these two features, although second-century pottery came from the fill of the post-hole.

Most of the finds came from the ditch sections. The pottery assemblage proved to be of particular interest since little pottery of this date has previously been recorded locally (Riley et al. 1995) and it is not comparable with material from outside the region (Darling, personal communication). The pottery from this site and Site 46 is described in detail below. In addition to
Fig. 2. Site 24 location plan showing cropmark evidence and geophysical survey results.
Fig. 3. Plan of Site 24.
Fig. 4. Site 46 location plan.
pottery, ten fragments of ceramic building material (576g) (identified by Lorraine Mepham) were recovered including two diagnostic tegula fragments.

The small animal bone assemblage (206 bones) was assessed by Sheila Hamilton-Dyer, who reports that horse, cattle, sheep, pig, dog, fowl, duck and field vole were present, of which the common domestic ungulates were the most frequent and cattle dominant.

Three samples, from ditches 174 and 182 and stokehole 181 were assessed for charred plant remains by Pat Hinton. Cereals, including spelt wheat and barley, chalk and wild plant seeds were present. The latter are typical field weeds but the assemblage differs from that recorded at Site 46 (below) in that grassland species appear relatively more prominent. The seeds of the Carex sp. (spedges) and Juncus cf articulatus (jointed rush) suggest a background of damp grassland, possibly bordering the ditches.

The charcoal in stokehole 181, examined by Rowena Gale, occurred as a compacted layer on the base of the feature. The charcoal consisted of fairly small fragments of narrow roundwood of Pomoideae (hawthorn etc.), goose-broome (Ulex/Cytisus) and a small fragment possibly of oak (Quercus). The charcoal most probably represents fuel which is likely to have been obtained locally. The use of narrow roundwood here, and at Site 46, suggests local coppicing.

Site 46
Nicholas Cooke

Archaeological Background
Site 46 was discovered during the watching brief on the pipe trench excavation between the villages of Willingham and Stow (Fig.1; NGR SK 8725 8295). A number of archaeological features were identified in section. In order to investigate the extent and character of the archaeological remains within the limits of the pipeline easement, an area (7m by 124m) was stripped of topsoil under constant archaeological supervision. This area lay to the west of the pipe trench (Fig.4). A search of the aerial photographs for the site showed that coverage of this area was particularly poor, and was not helpful in defining the extent of activity beyond the excavated area.

Methods
In view of the amount and complexity of the archaeology, it was not feasible to investigate every feature in detail. A targeted strategy was used, investigating areas likely to provide evidence of the stratigraphic relationship between features. This system of focusing on the stratigraphic relationships has enabled a phased plan to be produced (Fig.5). This largely derives from the relationships between the main ditch complexes, tied in with the dates provided by the finds. The results of the excavation can be broadly split into two phases of activity.

Phase 1: early Romano-British (c. AD 50-200) (Fig.5)
The first phase of occupation was clearly delimited by two roughly parallel ditch complexes running north-north-east to south-south-west across the site. Each consisted of a main ditch, which had slipped up and then been re-cut (Fig.5). These clearly represent the boundaries of a settlement, and may form part of an enclosure.

The easternmost complex consisted of ditch 1588 and its re-cut 1592. Ditch 1588 was substantial, being three metres wide and had a roughly ‘V’ shaped profile. It produced finds of the early second century. The re-cut (1592) consisted of a shallow ditch with a ‘U’ shaped profile on a slightly different alignment (1538). The re-cut ditch produced further, simple, spring-headed, copper alloy brooches with triangular catch plates; the larger retaining its pin. Both are Colchester types (Hawkes & Hull 1947, type III; identified by Lorraine Mepham) typically of the first century AD though occasionally known from later contexts. Here they were associated with quantities of second-century pottery.

Four further ditches, 1508, 1509, 1568 and 1604 were dated to this period. These may represent internal divisions within the ditched enclosure. Ditch 1508, shallow, with a ‘U’ shaped profile, contained pottery of the first century AD and may be the earliest feature on the site. Two small pits (Fig.5: 1517 and 1557) and a slightly larger shallow oval pit (1519) in the northern end of the site also produced quantities of pottery dating to the mid second century.

The latest feature in this phase was a shallow east-west ditch (1573), which cut through the latest fills of 1564. Artefacts from it included a substantial number of sherds from a single grey ware jar, of the later second century.

Phase 2: later Romano-British (c. AD 200-350) (Fig.5)
The second phase of activity on the site is defined by the abandonment of the earlier boundary system and a shift towards features related to agricultural activities and crop processing. A semi-circular area of cobbled (1554) was excavated against the eastern limit of excavation. This continued under the edge of the trench and is likely to represent a more substantial feature, possibly circular or oval in shape. There was a greater concentration of larger, more rounded cobbles towards the centre of the area exposed. The function of this feature is not immediately apparent, although the absence of associated structural remains suggests an agricultural or industrial rather than a domestic function. Similar features have been identified elsewhere in Britain as threshing floors (Morris, 1979, pp.23-28 and see below). Pottery recovered from the cobbled included a few pieces of samian; however, these were all heavily abraded and are probably residual.

Also roughly contemporary with this were two large, shallow, irregular pits (1530 & 1559). The more circular of the two, 1559, lay in the south of the stripped area, whilst 1530, an irregular oblong, lay in the northern third of the site. Both contained high concentrations of charred plant remains, especially of grain (chiefly barley) and small quantities of hulled barley and oats and charred. Pit 1530 also produced small quantities of charred weed seeds and peas/beans (Fig.7).

Pat Hinton reports that the condition of the cereal grains (most of which were damaged or fragmentary) indicates burning at high temperature or in oxidising conditions and suggests that much lighter material was probably destroyed. However, the mixture of grain, probably a roughly equivalent number of glume bases and some weed seeds, is presumably a reflection of the original composition of the deposit before burning. Hillman’s (1981) model, based on the treatment of similar glume wheats in the Near East, demonstrates that such a blend of grains, chaff and weed seeds is found after threshing, raking to remove larger straw fragments and preliminary winnowing, before spikelets are put into store. The spikelets are then parched and pounded to release the grain, an event which may take place either almost daily as grain is required, or at longer intervals to provide a store. The presence of charcoal in this sample suggests that accidental burning occurred when spikelets were being heated. The hulled barley grains would also require similar heat treatment. Associated earthy fragments (identified by Rowena Gale) mostly consist of fairly narrow roundwood and twiggy material from oak (Quercus), members of the hawthorn group (Pomoideae), blackthorn/cherry (Prunus) and dogwood (Cornus).

The interpretation of the context is debatable. Undoubtedly charred components of a later stage of crop processing were deposited here but whether they represent a single episode of burning or the deposition of an accumulation of hearth
Fig. 5. Plan of Site 46.
sweepings is uncertain. It is possible that both functioned as processing areas for crops, possibly as winnowing hollows. The pottery from these features ranges in date from the later second to the mid third centuries.

The latest dateable features on the site are a shallow circular pit (1570), which contained an illegible, fourth-century, copper alloy coin of 'votae' type and nails from a hobnailed boot; and gully 1595, which cut pit 1530. Several unphased features, including ditch 1522, a gully (1579) and various pits and post-holes, were also encountered.

The majority of finds (identified by Lorraine Mepham) came from the ditch sections and pits. The pottery assemblage is discussed below. Thirty fragments (1274g) of ceramic building material of probable Romano-British date were recovered, including one tegula fragment from pit 1559. Also found was a further, unstratified, coin: a late third-century barbarous radiate copy. In addition the base of a square, very pale blue/green, glass bottle of later first- or second-century date came from pit 1505, just beyond the limits of the site. The 252 animal bones present a similar picture to those recovered from Site 24.

Pottery
Rachael Seager Smith
Site 24
A total of 368 sherds weighing 6132g was recovered from the excavated features on Site 24. These sherds are predominantly of mid to late second century AD with smaller quantities of material indicating continued activity into the third and possibly fourth centuries. Two sherds probably belonging within the first millennium BC were also identified, along with four pieces of post-medieval date.

The methods used to analyse the pottery assemblage are described in the Appendix, along with the fabric descriptions and vessel type series. Pottery fabric totals are shown in figure 5.

Finewares
Together, the samian and other fineware fabrics represent four per cent (15 sherds, weighing 153g) of the Romano-British sherds. The two conjoining samian sherds in a Central Gaulish (Lezoux) fabric (Fabric E300) from oven 201 represent the only imported fineware fabric. They derive from a footing base probably from a Drag.38 bowl.

Three British fineware fabrics of known source were recognised: parian type wares (Fabric E169), Nene Valley colour-coated wares (Fabric E176) and South Carlton white wares (Fabric E179). Two other fineware fabrics were also identified; a fine white ware (Fabric Q101) and a fine oxidised ware (Fabric Q104).

The parian type wares (Fabric E169) were represented by a footing base sherd from a small, well-finished bowl from ditch 174 (Fig.9.30), a plain body sherd from a beaker or other small closed form, from stakehole 181 and a base with a moulded foot, probably from a beaker, found in oven 201. None of the characteristic stamped decoration (Corder 1958) was apparent but the fabric and careful manufacture of these sherds suggests that they were made following this tradition, hence their designation as parian type wares. They can be dated to the second half of the second century AD (Corder 1958; Stead & Rigby 1976, p.187; Darling 1984, p.80).

Colour-coated wares were produced in the Nene Valley from the mid second century until the end of the fourth century. Although there are some changes within the fabrics used during this time, all seven of the Nene Valley sherds (70g) are here considered as a single group. Two crisp, fresh, joining sherd from a barbotine decorated beaker that is from the mid third-century AD date were found in stakehole 181 and ditch 212, while another barbotine decorated sherd from a closed form came from the fill of ditch 187. Two sherds from folded beakers, one of early and one of mid third-century date were found in cut 197. It is, however, the bead and flange rim bowl (Fig.9.1) from ditch 130 that takes the activity on this site into
### Figure 7: Comparative Table of Plant Remains from Sites 24 and 46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Site 46</th>
<th>Site 24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hollow 1530</td>
<td>Ditch 1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>3503</td>
<td>3502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample volume (litres)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultivated Plants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Triticum</em> sp. - grains</td>
<td>wheat species</td>
<td>&gt;230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerealia indet. (probably c.92% <em>Triticum</em> spp. and c.8% <em>Hordeum</em> &amp; <em>Avena</em> spp.)</td>
<td>cereal grain fragments</td>
<td>c.33ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>T. cf. spelta</em> - glume bases - glume fragments</td>
<td>spelt</td>
<td>c.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>T. spelta/dicoccum</em> - glume bases - glume fragments - rachis fragments</td>
<td>spelt or emmer</td>
<td>c.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hordeum vulgare</em> L. - grains - rachis fragments</td>
<td>hulled barley</td>
<td>&gt;7(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Avena</em> sp. - grains - awn fragments</td>
<td>oats</td>
<td>&gt;7(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cf. Pissum sativum</em> - fragments</td>
<td>pea</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pisum sativum</em>/<em>Vicia faba</em> - cotyledon fragments</td>
<td>pea or field (broad) bean</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wild Plants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chenopodium album</em> L.</td>
<td>fat-hen</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chenopodium cf. rubrum/polypernum</em></td>
<td>red or many-seeded goosefoot</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Atriplex prostrata/patula</em></td>
<td>spcat-leaved or common rorache</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Stellaria media/neglecta</em></td>
<td>chickweed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Polygonum aviculare agg.</em></td>
<td>knotgrass</td>
<td>5(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rumex crispus</em> L.</td>
<td>curled dock</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rumex</em> sp.</td>
<td>dock</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vicia cf. tetrasperma/hirsuta</em></td>
<td>smooth or hairy tare</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vicia cf. sativa</em></td>
<td>common vetch</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vicia/Lathyrus sp.</em></td>
<td>vetch or vetchling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Trifolium/Medicago sp.</em></td>
<td>small clover or medick</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Plantago lanceolata</em> L.</td>
<td>ribwort plantain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oxotilles vernus</em> (Bellard) Dumont</td>
<td>red bartsia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Galium aparine</em> L.</td>
<td>cleavers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Valerianella dentata</em> (L.) Pollich</td>
<td>narrow-fruitied cornsalad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anthemis cotula</em> L.</td>
<td>stinking chamomile</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Juncus cf. articulatus</em> group</td>
<td>jointed rush</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carex cf. flacca</em></td>
<td>glaucous sedge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carex cf. nigra</em></td>
<td>common sedge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Carex</em> sp.</td>
<td>sedge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Festuca</em> sp</td>
<td>fescue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Poa annua</em> L.</td>
<td>annual meadow grass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alopecurus/Phleum</em></td>
<td>fox- or cat's-tail grass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>cf. Agrostis</em> sp.</td>
<td>bent grass</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bromus hordaceus/secalinus</em></td>
<td>soft or rye brome</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Danthonia decumbens</em></td>
<td>heath grass</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cenococcum geophilum</em> Fr. - sclerotia</td>
<td>fungus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** ( ) = identification uncertain. + = <10, ++ = 11 - 50, +++ = hundreds
the late third or even fourth century. A small rouletted body sherds from a closed form was also found in this feature.

The South Carlton (Fabric E179) sherds, found in stokehole 1, have a thin orange wash on the exterior surface and its poorly-finished interior surface suggests it is derived from a closed vessel. Pottery production in this area occurred between about AD 140 and AD 170 (Webster 1944).

The source of the small whiteware bowl (Fabric Q101; Fig.9.15) found in ditch J74 is unknown but it is probably of mid to late second-century date. The fine oxidised ware (Fabric Q104) flagon/flask rim (Fig.9.17) from this feature, is also unprovenanced but would fit in with the rest of the second-century material from this context.

Costewares

Ten fabrics have been identified among the costewares. Of these, four have the status of 'established wares', while the others have been defined by the range and size of the inclusions present although each of these may include the products of more than one source. These include Dorset Black Burnished ware (BB1) (Fabric E101), Rossington Bridge (Doncaster) BB1 (Fabric E168), Nene Valley grey wares (Fabric E180), Doncaster ware (Fabric E166), sandy grey wares (Fabric Q100), oxidised sandy costeware ware (Fabric Q102), sand and grog-gritted wares (Fabric Q103), sparse shell-gritted ware (Fabric S100) and shell-gritted wares (Fabric S101).

The earliest material is represented by the sherds of Trent Valley wares (Fabric E165) and the early shell-gritted wares (Fabrics S100 & S101). The Trent Valley wares cover a range of relatively coarse fabrics, including one with a very distinctive pimply surface (Fig.9.19 & 21) mostly used to make cooking pots following in the native tradition of Iron Age Lincolnshire. However, evidence from Lincoln, suggests that the fabrics are of early Roman origin (Darling 1984, p.53, fabric 103), probably continuing into the Antonine period (ibid., p.89).

Together, the early shell-gritted fabrics (Fabrics S100 & S101) account for twenty-three per cent of the assemblage. These fabrics again comprise a range of both hand- and wheel-made vessels following in the Iron Age ceramic tradition. In the early groups at Lincoln, the shell-tempered products dominated the market in the first and early second centuries AD, prior to a break in the use of shell as a tempering material until the introduction of Dales ware in the mid third century (Darling 1984, table 3; 1988, p.36). Some of the well-fired sherds of Fabric S101 are very close in appearance to the Dales wares (Fabric E166) although these are generally harder fired. During analysis, some overlap has almost certainly occurred, especially among body sherds of these two groups, resulting in the possible over-representation of Fabric S101 as only very definite sherds were assigned to the true Dales ware group. Only one vessel form was present among the early shell-gritted fabrics (Fabric S101), a lid-seated jar with a moulded rim (Fig.9.20), a type more typically found in Trent Valley wares and known to have been produced in sandy grey ware at the Torksey kilns (Oswald 1937, plv, pp.118-24). Shell-tempered parallels are unknown, but it probably dates from the mid to late second century (Darling personal communication). Sherds of the hard, sparse shell-gritted ware (Fabric S100) mostly derive from a single large cooking bowl (Fig.9.3) found in ditch 130. This vessel has a sooty residue on its exterior surface. The only other recognisable vessel type in this fabric was a large necked jar from an unstratified layer (Fig.9.9), both types are based on Iron Age forms.

The Dales wares (Fabric E166) account for three per cent of the sherds; rim fragments of the 'classic' Dales ware jar form (Fig.9.2) were found in ditch 130, linear 182 and cut 197. These sherds, together with the Nene Valley and other colour-coated finewares, take the activity on this site through into the third century.

Overall, the coarseware assemblage is dominated by the sandy grey wares (Fabric Q100), representing sixty-two per cent of the Roman-British sherds. The range is widely varied, from hard, smooth, wheel-made wares to softer, coarser-grained, often hand-made, fabrics; colours range from pale to very dark grey and include both 'sandwich' and uniformly-fired examples. By far the widest range of vessel forms occurs in these wares (Fig.10). The majority of vessel forms, and other dateable features (such as decoration) suggests that most of this material dates from the mid to late second century, perhaps persisting into the third century AD.

The majority of these wares are probably of local origin, but provenancing them is hampered firstly by the absence of distinctive fabric types, and secondly by our limited knowledge of production sites in this area dated prior to the third and fourth centuries. The nearest known kilns are at Littleborough (Riley et al. 1995), Knaith (Swan 1984, mf.3.445), and at Torksey (Oswald 1937), dated from the early to mid third century although there is possible evidence for earlier production (Swan 1984, mf.3.443-4). Small-scale archaeochemical investigations at Lea (Swan 1984, mf.3.446; Field 1984; Field & Palmer Brown 1991) have indicated pottery production beginning in the mid to late second century, continuing into the mid third century, so the Lea kilns are, at least potentially, a suitable source of the grey wares from Site 24. Further north, grey wares are known to have been produced at Dragomby and Roxby from the Flavian-Trajanic to Antonine periods (Stead & Rigby 1976, pp.136-47). Other appropriate sources may include Lincoln (where numerous kilns have been identified, Swan 1984, mf.3.446-495, although most appear to be later third and fourth century) and Doncaster (Swan 1984, mf.6.706-721), the latter suggested by the small quantities of Rossington Bridge Black Burnished ware (Fabric E168) identified. Doncaster grey wares are also present among the early groups from Lincoln (Darling 1988, p.24, Fig.8.81 and possibly Fig.9.114). The few sherds of Nene Valley grey wares (Fabric E180) too, may hint at a more extensive supply from this source but the Nea Valley fabrics are also highly varied and not readily distinguishable from other grey ware types. However, north Lincolnshire lies towards the
Fig. 9. Pottery from Site 24.
Fig. 10. Pottery from Site 46.

expected limits of the distribution of these wares, so the Nene Valley is unlikely to have been a major supplier.

Other, minor components of the coarseware assemblage include the single rim (Fig. 9.4), from ditch 130, of a distinctive but unprovenanced, 'sandwich'-fired, oxidised sandy fabric (Fabric Q102). This is an unusual form, possibly a bowl copying samian form Drag. 36, or even a lid, but is probably of early second-century date (Darling, personal communication). The use of grog/clay pellets (Fabric Q103) as a tempering material is also an unusual feature in Roman assemblages in Lincolnshire (Darling, personal communication) although it does occur in varying proportions in some of the late Iron Age/early Roman fabrics found at Drakenby (May & Elsdon 1996; Gregory 1996). Only body sherds in this sand and grog/clay pellet gritted fabric were found at Site 24. The sherd of Wareham/Poole Harbour Black Burnished ware (Fabric E101) is derived from a jar form; evidence from Lincoln (Darling 1984, p. 53) suggests a Hadrianic starting date for these wares.

Site 46
A total of 494 sherds, weighing 6602g, was recovered from the excavated features on Site 46. All the sherds are Romano-British and are predominantly of second- to early third-century date. Pottery fabric totals from each phase are shown in figure 8.

Finewares
As at Site 24, samian represents the only imported fineware fabric. Ten sherds (115g) were recognised. Of these, one small rim fragment from a Drag. 18/31 platter, found in pit 1530 (Phase 2), is from Southern Gaul. The remainder are from Central Gaul and of early to mid second-century date. Vessels include Drag. 33 cup rims from the lower fill (1593) of the recut ditch 1592 and pit 1530, and platter sherds, probably Drag. 18/31 types, from pit 1519, cobbled area (1554) and posthole 1601. The base from 1554 is stamped but too abraded to be legible while only the very corner of the stamp survives on the sherd from 1601. A Drag. 37 bowl base was found in the fill of land drain 1583. Although residual, it is of interest because its decoration extends much closer to the base than is usual for vessels of this type. Unfortunately, too little survives for its decorative scheme to be determined.

Two British fineware fabrics, paraisian type ware (Fabric E169) and Nene Valley colour-coated ware (Fabric E176), were identified, each represented by only a single sherd. The paraisian type ware sherd, from a small jar or beaker (Fig. 10.37), was found in post-hole 1557. The Nene Valley sherd, from pit 1530, derives from a closed form. It is this sherd which takes the material from pit 1530 into the third century.

Coarsewares
Six fabric types were identified, all previously recorded at Site 24: Dorset Black Burnished ware (BB1) (Fabric E101), Dales ware (Fabric E166), sandy grey wares (Fabric Q100), sand and grog-tempered wares (Fabric Q103) and shell gritted wares (Fabric S100 & S101). None of the regional ‘established’ wares found on Site 24 are present here and Trent Valley wares are also absent.

The sandy grey wares (Fabric Q100) again dominate the assemblage, accounting for seventy-six per cent of the sherds while the early shell-tempered wares (Fabrics S100 & S101) together represent fifteen per cent. Only two sherds, but including a classic jar rim, of Dales ware were recognised. The sand and grog-tempered sherds (Fabric Q103) are more common.
at this site, accounting for six per cent of the sherds. The majority are wheel-made, suggesting a date in the late first to early second century AD, even though grog is more commonly found as a tempering material in Iron Age fabrics. Only one sherd of Dorset Black Burnished ware, a jar base probably of second- to third-century date (without the surface treatments characteristic of the later vessels) was identified.

A similarly wide range of vessel forms is present, comprising ten of the types recognised at Site 24 with an additional thirteen new forms (Fig.10). A smaller range of decorative motifs has been noted, although all the styles used also occur at Site 24. The vessels are predominantly of mid to late second-century date, perhaps continuing into the early third century, and encompass the full range of large, thick-walled jars and wide-mouthed bowls, smaller jars, beakers, bowls, dishes and even a lid. At both sites, however, the extensive range of forms, and the small numbers of each type present, probably reflect the small assemblage size. Again, few of the forms can be readily paralleled at other sites in the region.

Five semi-complete coarseware vessels were recovered, noteworthy because they represent the only vessels (except for the occasional addition of one or two stray sherds) from the excavated features in which they were found. One, a late first- to early second-century AD beaker rim jar in early shell-gritted ware (Fig.10.39) was found in ditch segment 1564. Another, a barrel-shaped, handled jar (Fig.10.40) was found in the excavated segment of ditch 1573 and probably dates to around the middle of the second century. There was no evidence to suggest that either had been deliberately placed on the ditch bottom and their significance is difficult to interpret given the narrow slice through the site examined.

The deposition of the three other vessels in two features is more likely to have been deliberate, although the reasoning remains obscure. A miniature vessel, possibly copying a dolia (Fig.10.43), and a wide-mouthed bowl (Fig.10.44), both probably of second-century date, were found together in posthole 1517. Not all of the upper part of the larger vessel survived, and both vessels were relatively badly abraded. The small vessel has a thick, off-white, non-calcareous residue in the interior but as traces of a similar material also occur on both surfaces and the broken edges of the bowl, this is probably post-depositional.

The fifth vessel is represented by sherds from the lower part of a large, moderately thick-walled jar. It was found together with a piece of Romano-British vessel glass, in an unphased pit (1505). The vessel is wheel-thrown, in a sand and grog-tempered fabric (Fabric Q103) and is therefore likely to be of later first- or early second-century AD date. The presence of these sherds over-emphasises the importance of this fabric at Site 46; if they are counted as one sherd, the total number of Fabric Q103 sherds falls to eleven, or 2.3% of the assemblage.

The bead rim jar (Fig.10.39) from ditch segment 1564 is also noteworthy for having post-firing perforations, presumably indicating some change in its function, and sooty deposits on its exterior surface. Such perforations occur widely in late Iron Age and early Roman contexts in Britain, including, for example, among the post-conquest Iron Age material from Dragonby (May & Elsdon, 1996, Fig.26, 1134 and Fig.27, 796) although it is not recorded whether these are pre- or post-firing, while all three illustrated examples from the early settlement at Lincoln (Darling 1988, Fig.5.3 & 11, Fig.6.40) are recorded as being pre-firing. An example is also known in an Antonine group from Winterton (Stead & Rigby 1986, Fig.82.57).

Discussion
The discovery of two previously unknown Romano-British sites, one on the limestone ridge of the Lincoln Edge, the other on the Trent Vale claylands, is a significant addition to our knowledge of this area in the Romano-British period.

The results of the excavation and geophysical survey at Site 24 have established the location and date of a small, rural Romano-British settlement and associated enclosure. The pipeline route seems to have sliced through a predominantly second-century AD occupation area. It is not clear if this area or the late first-century AD deposits in the enclosure were used in the fourth century, although the time of occupation does appear to have been cut in the second century but it may have continued in use until the fourth. Most of the excavated features suggest that occupation was at its most coherent during the second century though the enclosure ditch, at least, continued in use into the third century. The presence of small quantities of Dales wares pottery and the various colour-covered finewares also suggests that activity extended into the third century, and possibly even into the fourth. However, a single sherd of Nene Valley pottery in ditch 130 is the only certain fourth-century find. Because of the layout of the excavated area, which was restricted to a width of two metres, any lateral shift in the focus of settlement during the later third or fourth century has not been detectable but is certainly not precluded.

Site 46 appears also to have been a rural farmstead or small settlement. The majority of excavated features date to the second and third centuries, with the alignments of ditches and density of finds suggesting that the main focus of settlement lay a short distance to the north-west. This settlement appears to have been defined by a pair of boundary ditches, both of which were re-cut after initial silting. This ditch system was no longer extant by the third century, at which time a number of features are closely linked with the processing of crops. These features are likely to represent the peripheral features of a rural settlement, with a primarily agricultural emphasis, and may indicate a shift or expansion of the settlement.

The pottery assemblages borrow heavily on the native, Iron Age, ceramic traditions of the area and comprise a full range of fabrics and vessel types suitable for cooking, storage and food presentation purposes. Some features of the assemblage, such as the absence of mortaria and amphorae and the paucity of imported finewares, may be a reflection of small assemblage size or early chronology. However, the presence of such finewares, even in small quantity, may imply a level of ‘Romanisation’ inappropriate for a local population who simply had no need of such vessels. There is no evidence from the ceramic assemblage to suggest that the site represents anything other than a rural ‘native’ farming settlement although the tiny portion of the known archaeological remains examined and the lack of comparable ceramic groups from the area limits the nature of any statements that can be made.

Analysis of the animal bone and charred plant remains supports the suggestion that these sites were rural farmsteads or small settlements based on a mixed farming economy incorporating arable cultivation and animal husbandry. The animal bone from both sites is comparable with other Romano-British rural assemblages in terms of the species and their relative proportions. Cattle are dominant but sheep are also well represented. Horse bones are relatively frequent as opposed to the very low levels found at urban sites. Pig, in contrast, is very poorly represented, and other taxa are rare with little exploitation of wild resources indicated.

The large size of several of the cattle bones from both sites is of interest. Prior to Roman influence cattle in Britain have been found to be small, often no more than a metre high at the withers. Larger cattle (though still small by modern standards) are found at many Romano-British sites, particularly in the areas to the south and east which appear to have been most influenced by the Roman occupation (Malby 1981; Armitage 1982). At Lincoln an increase in size was detected between the first-century AD deposits and those of the third century. None of the measurements here exceed those from Lincoln but most are above the mean values. The beef cattle in Lincoln would have been sent from the local hinterland. The cattle remains here represent part of the population from which these were selected and may include a higher percentage of bulls and plough oxen; many of the cattle sent to Roman towns are thought to be the smaller females (Malby 1993). It would be
interesting to examine a larger sample for comparison of male/female ratios. Butchery is mainly of heavy chops rather than the knife marks typical of Iron Age material.

The plant remains provide evidence for arable agriculture, certainly of wheat, with some barley and possibly oats. Crop processing is indicated by the oven on Site 24 and the probable winnowing hollow(s) on Site 46. Charcoal remains on both sites are indicative of fuel, probably derived from local coppices.

Both sites lie within a short distance of known Roman roads. Site 24 lay to the east of Middle Street, the prehistoric Jurassic Way, which remained an important civilian route way in the Roman period (Whitwell 1992) and also to the west of Ermine Street (now the A15). Site 46 lay to the north of a major Roman road running across the Vale from Lincoln to Bawtry, Doncaster and eventually York (now the A150). The proximity of these sites to Roman roads would have facilitated easy communication to several larger urban centres and it is likely that any agricultural surpluses would have been traded. The presence of a few fine ware pottery vessels probably reflect the contact afforded by the roads. The pottery assemblages are of particular interest in themselves. While being internally consistent, they are unusual in the wider context of Roman Lincolnshire. It seems likely that these differences in ceramic assemblages may reflect different types of sites, with those excavated representing small agricultural and domestic sites in the hinterland which show greater affinity with native Iron Age ceramic traditions than with ‘Romanised’ traditions.

Finally, it should be noted that the presence of relatively large, well preserved pottery sherds suggests that the archaeological resource in this area survives in comparatively good condition and has not yet been extensively damaged by ploughing or other agricultural processes. The potential for the preservation of further settlement evidence is therefore high.
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Appendix

Pottery Recording, Fabrics and Forms
Rachel H. Seager Smith

The assemblages have been analysed in accordance with the standard Wessex Archaeology guidelines for the analysis of pottery (Merris 1992). In addition to the set of ‘established wares’, distinctive fabric types of known provenance (group E), the sherds were divided into two broad fabric groups on the basis of predominant inclusion types; sandy wares (group Q) and shell-gritted wares (group S). These groups were examined using a binocular microscope (x 20 power) and further subdivided into seven different fabric types based on the range and coarseness of the inclusions. Each of the fabrics has been assigned a unique fabric code. The following terms were used to describe the quantity of inclusions present; rare less than 2%; sparse 3-7%; moderate 10-15%; common 20-25%; abundant 30+.

The pottery has been quantified using both number and weight of sherds of each fabric type, and details of vessel form, size, surface treatment, decoration and manufacturing technique have been recorded. Details of surface abrasion, residues and evidence for reuse and repair have also been noted. The dates given are based on comments by M. J. Darling. Pottery fabric totals for each feature are shown in figure 8; percentages of fabrics given in this report derive from sherd count alone. A vessel type series has been constructed and figure 11 summarises the vessel forms represented by rim sherds, present in each fabric. The number of examples of each vessel type shown here has been roughly calculated based on the number of times a particular form occurs in a particular fabric. Single sherds or groups of joining sherds are counted as one ‘occurrence’ but, for example, three sherds of the same form in the same fabric without direct evidence for joining, are counted as three ‘occurrences’ of that form.

Romano-British Fabric Type Series

Fine wares
Fabric F300
Samian
Fabric F160
Parisian type wares (Corder 1938; Stead & Rigby 1976, pp.181-87)
Fabric F176
Fabric F179
South Carlton white wares (Webster 1944).
Fabric Q101
Fine white ware. A hard, smooth, very fine-grained, iron-free fabric containing sparse, well-sorted quartz sand <0.125mm across, and rare red/black ferrous particles <0.5mm across. Off-white with no apparent surface treatments. Wheel-made.
Fabric Q104
Fine oxidised ware. A soft, powdery, iron-rich fabric with rare quartz sand, soft, white calcareous particles and red ferrous particles, all <0.25mm across, and rare-sparse waxy white mica <0.125mm across. Pale orange; surfaces abraded. Wheel-made.

Coarse wares
Fabric F101
Black Burnished ware (BB1) from the Wareham/Poole Harbour region of Dorset (Williams 1977, group 1; Holbrook & Bidwell 1991, pp.85-114).
Fabric F165
Trent Valley wares (Darling 1984; Field 1984; Field & Palmer Brown 1991).
Fabric E168
Rossington Bridge (Dorchester) BB1 (Williams 1977, group II).
Fabric E180
Nene Valley grey wares (Howe, Perrin & Mackreth 1980; Cooper, 1989, p.60).
Fabric E166
Dales ware (Loughlin 1977).
Fabric Q100
‘Catch-all’ fabric group for all sandy grey wares. All contain variable quantities of quartz sand, generally <0.75mm across; other inclusions may include rare ferrous particles, soft, white non-calcereous particles, organic material, shell or grog/clay pellets. Unoxidised. Wheel- and hand-made examples.
Fabric Q102
Oxidised sandy coarseware. Hard, fairly coarse fabric containing moderate quartz and very rare ferrous particles, both <0.5mm. Oxidised surfaces and margins, unoxidised core. Wheel-made.

Fabric Q103
‘Catch-all’ fabric group for all sand and grog-gritted wares. Generally hard, slightly soapy fabrics with sparse to common quartz sand <0.75mm, and grog/clay pellets <3mm across, and rare ferrous particles. Predominantly unoxidised. Manufacturing technology uncertain.

Fabric S108
Hard, sparse shell-gritted ware. Contains rare to sparse poorly-sorted shell <3mm across, with rare quartz sand and ferrous particles <0.5mm across. Predominantly unoxidised. Manufacturing technology uncertain.

Fabric S101
‘Catch-all’ fabric group for shell-gritted wares. Frequency and size (<5mm) of shell fragments apparently related to vessel type - large, thick-walled vessels were more heavily tempered with larger fragments than the smaller bowls, beakers and decorated vessels which contained sparse, finely crushed shell. May also contain quartz, ferrous particles and/or calcare. Predominantly unoxidised. Hand- and wheel-made examples but evidence of the technology used is not always clear.

Romano-British Vessel Type Series

For all fabrics excluding samian, the correlation between vessel form and fabric types are shown in figure 11.

Type R
Used in the archive to denote a tiny rim fragment of unidentifiable form. Not illustrated.
Type R100
Flanged bowl. Bead slightly incurved and marginally higher than flange which has a blunt, rounded terminal. Nene Valley colour-coat. Late third into the fourth century AD.
Figure 9.1; fabric E176; ditch 130.

Type R101
Figure 9.2; fabric E166; fill (198) of gully 197.

Type R102
Cooking bowl. Large, wide-mouthed vessel with a heavy, incurved rim; single incised groove on the shoulder. Forms part of the late Iron Age ceramic tradition of the area - late first to early second century AD.
Figure 9.3; fabric S100; fill (131) of ditch 130.

Type R103
Shallow bowl, possibly copying samian form Drag.36, although the poor interior finish, furnishing on the exterior surface and wavy line decoration on the underside of the rim, suggest it may have been僚 a mould. Probably early second century AD. A similar fragment in low ware fabric, found in an Antonine group at Winterton (Stead & Rigby 1976, Fig.79.16) is illustrated as a lid.
Figure 9.4; fabric Q102; fill (131) of ditch 130.

Type R104
Narrow-mouthed jarr/flagon/jug with a slightly everted rim. Tiny fragment only. Probably early second century AD.
Figure 9.5; fabric Q100; fill (131) of ditch 130.

Type R105
Small jar with a bent-back rim, no neck. Probably second century AD.
Figure 9.6; fabric Q100; unexcavated posthole 165.

Type R106
Bowldur with a short, upright neck. The form could be quite late (third-fourth century AD) but the only examples are very fragmentary and it is difficult to be precise and confident: with so little of the form.
Figure 9.7; fabric Q100; fill (215) of ditch 216.

Type R107
Sharply incurved jar or beaker with a long, sloping neck and a simple, slightly everted rim. Incised groove above the carination. A deformed ‘bellic’ form broadly copying the Cam.120 beakers. Date range extends from the late first to mid second century AD but most common during the second century AD. A common, if variable, type in this area, known to have been made at Driggoby and Roxby during the Flavian/Trajanic to Antonine periods (Stead & Rigby 1976, Fig.64.1 and Fig.66.29-32): also present in the early groups at Lincoln (Darling 1984, Fig.16.94; 1988, Fig.9.6). Figure 9.8; fabric Q100; unexcavated ditch 167.

Type R108
Large, heavy necked jar with a slightly everted rim. Belongs within the end of the late Iron Age ceramic tradition; dates from the mid to late second century AD.
Figure 9.9; fabric S100; unstratified.

Type R109
Large, wide-mouthed, round-bodied open bowl. Thickened, everted rim, sometimes moulded; little or no neck. Mid to late second century AD.
Figure 9.10; fabric Q100; unstratified. Also figure 10.44; Site 46; fabric Q100; fill (1516) of posthole 1517 (phase 1).

Type R110
Straight-sided bowls/dishes with triangular or externally thickened rims. Many slight variations in profile and size; copied from BB2 types (Gillam 1970, Fig.23, 223 and 225). Mid to late second century AD.
Figure 9.11; fabric S100; unstratified.

Type R111
Shallow, straight-sided dishes; ‘dog-dishes’. Rims can be plain and unelaborated, rounded or squared-off, or grooved on the exterior surface giving a beaded appearance - sometimes known as ‘grooved rim dishes’. Also copied from BB1 types. Generally mid to late second century AD.
Figure 9.12; fabric Q100; fill (194) of feature 181.

Type R112
Jar with a triangular rim; probably belongs to a range of vessels, often lid-seated, in fashion prior to the ‘classic’ Dales ware jar forms. Probably mid to late second century AD.
Figure 9.13; fabric S100; unstratified.

Type R113
Shallow dish or platter with a plain, rounded rim, sloping sides and an incised groove on the interior surface at the base of the vessel wall. Probably a local copy of a Gallo-Belgic type. Late first to second century AD.
Figure 9.14; fabric S100; unstratified.

Type R114
Small bowl or cup with a bead and flanged rim; slightly wedge-shaped base. Probably copying samian form Drag.35 or possibly even mortaria. Probably mid to late second century AD.
Figure 9.15; fabric Q101; upper fill (136) of ditch 174.

Type R115
Wide-mouthed bowl with a thin, everted rim, sometimes moulded; no neck. Mid to late second century AD.
Figure 9.16; fabric Q100; upper fill (180) of feature 181.

Type R116
Cultivated flagon/Bask; rim interior slightly cupped. Possibly loosely based on the Hofheim types; would not be out of place among second-century AD material. Tiny, abraded fragment only.
Figure 9.17; fabric Q104; upper fill (136) of ditch 174.

Type R117
Upright, unelaborated but slightly flared rim of a smallish beaker or jar. Probably second century AD.
Figure 9.18; fabric Q100; fill (178) of linear 177.

Type R118
Wide-mouthed bowl/jar with a thickened, everted rim and a very short neck. Form based on the cooking pots of the late Iron Age tradition. Broadly paralleled in shell tempered ware by a vessel of second-century AD date from Lincoln (Darling 1988, Fig.7.56). Mid to late second century AD.
Figure 9.19; fabric E165; upper fill (180) of feature 181.

Type R119
Lid-seated jar with a moulded rim and a long, straight, sloping shoulder. Decorated with closely-spaced horizontal ridging. Parallel forms in sandy grey wares made at Tokley (Oswald 1937, pLV, pp.118-24). Mid to late second century AD.
Figure 9.20; fabric S101; upper fill (180) of feature 181.

Type R120
Thickened, everted rim jar with a short neck; slight variations in detail are apparent. Form based on the cooking pots of the late Iron Age tradition. c. second century AD.
Figure 9.21; fabric E165; fill (134) of linear 182.

Type R121
Beak and flange rim bowl. Probably loosely based samian form Drag.38. Two broadly similar vessels are known from the upper defences at Lincoln in contexts for which a TPG of AD 140 was established from the samian (Darling 1984, Fig.15.45 & 46).
Figure 9.22; fabric E165; fill (134) of linear 182.

Type R122
Straight-sided bowls/dishes with a flat (horizontal) flange. Copied from BB1 types (Gillam 1970, Fig.23. 219 & 221). Mid to late second century AD.
Figure 9.23; fabric Q100; fill (188) of ditch 187.

Type R123
Thickened, slightly everted rim jar with a neat, well-defined moulding on the neck. Based within the late Iron Age tradition of the area but probably of c. second-century AD date.
Figure 9.24; fabric Q100; fill (189) of posthole 193.

Type R124
Jar with a long, straight, sloping shoulder and a simple flared rim. Two incised grooves define the neck/shoulder junction and a burnished wavy line decorates the outside of the rim. Probably late second to late third century AD.
Figure 9.25; fabric Q100; fill (198) of gully 197.

Type R125
Upright or very slightly everted necked jar. Based on the first to early second century BB1 jar forms of the Wareham/Poole Harbour industry (Gillam 1970, Fig.13.119); similar forms were made at Rostersington Bridge (Tytės 1996, Fig.230.1). Mid to late second century AD.
Figure 9.26; fabric Q100; fill (215) of ditch 216.

Type R126
Small, high-shouldered beak-rim jar or beaker. At Driggoby, bead rim ovoid jars are relatively common in the later part of the Iron Age sequence (May & Eldson 1996, type 13); continuing into the early Roman period (Gregory 1996, p515, Fig.201).
Figure 9.27; fabric Q100; fill (215) of ditch 216.

Type R127
Narrow-necked jar or beaker with a moulded, lid-seated, rim. Late second century AD.
Figure 9.28; fabric Q100; context (186), clearance.

Type R128
Jar beaker with a bent-back rim. Finely moulded on underside of rim while the interior detail is a feature found in the Iron Age traditions of Lincolnshire. Probably of later first-century AD date.
Figure 10.31; fabric Q103; fill (1507) of linear 1508 (phase 1).
Nicholas Cooke and Rachael H. Seager Smith

Type R129
Lid with a beaded lip (but could just be a platter in the Gallo-Belgic tradition). Probably early to mid 2nd century. Lids were made at Roxby during the Antonine period (Stead & Rigby 1976, Fig.67.45-48) but none provide precise parallels for this form.
Figure 10.32; fabric Q100; fill (1510) of linear 1509 (phase 1).

Type R130.
Small, comparatively thick-walled, globular vessel with a corrugated shoulder. The rim has been damaged or trimmed. Possibly a ‘miniature’ vessel copying a dolia. Medial date of mid second century AD
Figure 10.43; fabric Q100; fill (1516) of posthole 1517 (phase 1).

Type R131
Open bowl with a D-shaped rim. Probably mid second century AD onwards. A broadly comparable form (and possibly fabric too), but slipped and with white painted decoration, was found in a late deposit at Fluxenage, Lincoln (Darling 1977, Fig.7.126).
Figure 10.33; fabric Q100; fill (1527) of pit 1528 (unphased).

Type R132
Wide-mouthed bowl with an upright or slightly everted rim and a comparatively long neck. Incised grooves often present around the greatest girth of the pot. Later version of Type R109. Third century AD onwards.
Figure 10.34; fabric Q100; upper fill (1520) of pit 1530 (phase 2).

Type R133
Probably a jar (small fragment only) with an externally thickened rim and a corrugated neck. Probably second century AD.
Figure 10.35; fabric S101; upper fill (1535) of re-cut ditch 1538 (phase 1).

Type R134
Small jar with a sharply everted rim; no neck; thickened, pronounced shoulder and a globular groove. Probably Flavian/Tricornic or Triconic.
Figure 10.36; fabric Q100; fill (1547) of ditch 1538 (unphased).

Type R135
Small, fine vessel with a broad rim; incised groove on edge of the sherds probably defined the upper limits of the decorative zone. Second century AD.
Figure 10.37; fabric E169; fill (1556) of posthole 1557 (phase 1).

Type R136
Necked jar with an everted, triangular rim; almost lid-seated but shape is not quite positive enough. Unusual form; date uncertain.
Figure 10.38; fabric Q103; fill (1558) of pit 1559 (phase 2).

Type R137
High-shouldeered jar with an internally thickened, ‘triangular’ beak rim. Closely-spaced horizontal rilling on the shoulder; flat base. Broadly paralleled by vessels from legionary contexts at Lincoln (Darling 1984, Fig.14.2, 29, 30; Fig.15.62, 63 and Fig.16.38). Form based within the late Iron Age ceramic tradition of the area but this vessel is wheel-made, late first to early second century AD.
Figure 10.39; fabric S101; fill (1562) of ditch segment 1564 (phase 1).

Type R138
Jar with a plain, gently everted rim, slightly thickened externally. Straight barrel-shaped body with two small, opposing lug handles applied to the shoulder. Incised grooves decorate the body at the same level as the base of the handles. Well-potted vessel. Reminiscent of some of the Roxby products (Stead & Rigby 1976, Fig.65 or even Fig.68.64) although there are not any exact parallels for this barrel-shaped form with handles. Probably dates to c. mid second century AD.
Figure 10.40; fabric Q100; fill (1572) of ditch 1573 (phase 1).

Type R139
Large jar with a long straight shoulder; the rim has probably been trimmed to its present simple, upright form. Slight corrugations around the ‘neck’. Probably of second-century AD date. The trimming makes parallels difficult.
Figure 10.41; fabric Q100; upper fill (1591) of re-cut ditch 1592 (phase 1).

Type R140
Necked jar or beaker with faint cordons on the neck; uncertain whether the broken edge is curving into the shoulder or another cordon. Date uncertain.
Figure 10.42; fabric Q100; fill (1596) of ditch 1598 (phase 1).

Other illustrated sherds include:

Figure 9.29
Sherd with applied, stab-decorated cord; from a closed vessel; unusual type of decoration for this area, probably early to mid second century AD. Fabric $100; unstratified.

Figure 9.30
Footring base from a small bowl or dish. Finely finished. Fabric Q101; upper fill (1586) of ditch 174.
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