

# barq

## BRISTOL ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH GROUP

C/o City Museum, Queens Road, Bristol, 8.

### BULLETIN

### Contents

Vol. 3. No. 9: December, 1970

- |              |   |                |
|--------------|---|----------------|
| 229          | Officers and Committee: Membership  |                |
| 230          | Editorial   |                |
| 231          | <u>Archaeology in the Seventies: The Challenge,</u><br>by P. J. Fowler  |                |
| 234          | <u>Rescue in the Seventies,</u> by C. Clements  |                |
| 236          | <u>B. A. R. G. in the Seventies,</u> by M. G. Hebditch  |                |
| 240          | Associate Members   |                |
| 240          | <u>Recent Archaeological Accessions in the City Museum,</u><br><u>Bristol,</u> by L. V. Grinsell and D. P. Dawson |                |
| 241          | B. A. R. G. Excursion: Gloucestershire Excavations,<br>by D. Sprague  |                |
| 243          | <u>Cheddar Vicarage,</u> by P. A. Rahtz   |                |
| 246          | <u>Archaeological Material in Local Museums: A Check List</u><br><u>(Part X),</u> ed. P. J. Fowler                |                |
| 238,<br>242, | 239,<br>245   | Notes and News |
| 252          | Reviews and Notices   |                |
| 254          | <u>Calendar of Forthcoming Courses, Meetings and</u><br><u>Lectures</u>   |                |

This bulletin is issued in Spring, Autumn and December

BRISTOL ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH GROUP  
OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE 1969/70

- Chairman: Dr. K. Branigan, Dept. of Classics, University of Bristol,  
Bristol BS8 1RJ
- Hon. Secretary: M. G. Hebditch, Blaise Castle House Museum, Henbury,  
Bristol BS10 7QS
- Hon. Secretary for Associate Members: C. Brain, 53 Hillside Avenue,  
Kingswood, Bristol BS15 2BP
- Hon. Treasurer: A. C. Selway, c/o The City Museum, Bristol BS8 1RL
- Hon. Editor (Bulletin): Mrs. F. Neale, The Knoll, Winscombe Hill,  
Winscombe, Somerset.
- Hon. Editor (Special Publications): L. V. Grinsell, The City Museum,  
Bristol BS8 1RL
- Hon. Fieldwork Adviser: P. J. Fowler, Dept. of Extra-Mural Studies,  
University of Bristol, 20a Berkeley Square, Bristol  
BS8 1HR
- Hon. Auditor: R. R. J. A. Nesbitt, 50 Ashleigh Avenue, Bridgwater, Somerset.

Committee:

- Elected: C. J. Hawkes, 10 Christchurch Road, Clifton, Bristol 8. (1969).  
Mrs. J. M. Popplewell, The Retreat, Westerleigh Road,  
Downend, Bristol (1969).  
M. Ponsford, The City Museum, Bristol BS8 1RL (1970).  
D. Sprague, 10 Manilla Road, Clifton, Bristol 8 (1970).
- Ex Officio: N. Thomas, The City Museum, Bristol BS8 1RL

MEMBERSHIP

The Annual Subscription for the current year is:

- £1 for members aged 18 or over  
£1. 10. 0 (£1. 50) for husband and wife  
5 shillings for Associate Members (aged under 18) (£0. 25)

The subscription is payable on 1st January except for members paying by Bankers Standing Order, who pay on 1st March. Cheques and postal orders should be made payable to Bristol Archaeological Research Group, c/o The City Museum, Bristol BS8 1RL.

EDITORIAL

In this Bulletin, three articles present different aspects of a single theme: where do we (British archaeology as a whole, and BARG as a part) go from here? It is surely not just chance that BARG should be in a self-analytical mood. Peter Fowler sets the national context in what is perhaps the most important, certainly the most challenging, article the Bulletin has ever featured. Nearer home, M5 rolling on is leaving behind, besides an aftermath of report-writing, a desire, - summed up by Colin Clements - not to waste both the teamwork and the lessons we have learned from the whole exercise.

This heart-searching took voice, for B. A. R. G., at the Discussion Meeting of October 14th. While the problems and prospects, outlined by Max Hebditch at first seemed to present only a catalogue of woes - too urgent, too unreliable, too small, too BIG.... when the gloom had talked itself out, the practical possibilities for action which emerged were all capable of being broken down into ideally B. A. R. G. -sized opportunities. Recording: the revival of our Parish Survey Checklist plans, somewhat overlaid by the eruption of M. 5 in 1969. Rescue teams could be a direct legacy of the M. 5 organisation, and form a logical complement to survey work; and proper liaison with Planning departments would be a no less valuable part of advance rescue, as would really effective co-operation with other local bodies having the same interests as ourselves in rescuing our raw material: our environment. On the research front, alongside the need to follow up, properly, our own Survey and Policy, there could be an extension of the highly practical work in which the Associate Members have been setting an example: in processing results and finds - perhaps on an altogether larger scale, with specialist teams.

All these ideas came from the floor on October 16th; and all are ideas that can become B. A. R. G. -size projects. The occasion to present and discuss them is the special meeting on January 13th. These practical possibilities for our programme obviously have as much to offer to the indoor as to the outdoor worker; to the responsible-but-occasional, as to the every-spare-minute archaeologist; to the starter, as to the old hand; there is a need and a job for everybody. But also, without the willing help of members, such possibilities cannot get going at all. The urgency of the situation is such that if you don't come to B. A. R. G., B. A. R. G. will in all probability be taking strenuous efforts to come to you; but it would meanwhile save many postage stamps if you would come, in the first instance, to your meeting on January 13th next.

ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE SEVENTIES: THE CHALLENGE

by Peter Fowler

Archaeology is still young, immature: in years, but more so in its rationale, its techniques and its organisation. It has hardly changed at all in these respects over the last century, until the 1960's, and this is one of the major reasons for the convulsions within the subject and amongst its personnel now, with very wide gaps opening up over fundamental issues and between different types of self-styled archaeologists. This must be clear to anyone who thinks about the why and the how of studying the past primarily through its surviving material remains. To take one obvious example, how do we reconcile the argument that archaeology's prime justification is as public entertainment, with the fundamental belief of most practising archaeologists that ultimately their responsibility is to scholarship?

For me, however, the basic challenge of archaeology in the next decade is not intellectual, but social, moral and personal. A basic choice, it seems to me, faces not only B. A. R. G., not only every archaeological society, but every individual member who presumes to claim an interest in the past. Beyond us, the millions who make up our whole society have ultimately to make the same choice, and the very least we can do is to try and ensure that it is made consciously. For make no mistake about it, during the seventies, and beyond them to 2000 A. D. at the very outside, a sharply-defined issue confronts us as individuals, and our Societies, and our society: do we, or do we not, want a representative sample of our cultural history, as expressed in our formerly rich archaeological heritage, to survive into the 21st century? I cannot see how this question, basic to the future of archaeology and archaeologists in this country, can be sidestepped or ignored.

"What a bore," someone says, "B. A. R. G. has already had enough of the 'crisis of destruction': John Drinkwater on the now largely non-existent Gloucestershire barrows (Bulletin 2. 9, 1967), Philip Barker at the 1970 A. G. M., Fowler on 'The Future of the Past' in the City Museum's 'Conservation' lectures (21 January 1970), and all that M5 drag over the last two years. Can't we now go back to real archaeology?" The answer of course is 'yes' - if you see yourself as an ostrich, B. A. R. G. as simulating Neanderthal Man, and archaeology as having the long-term growth potential of a dinosaur. The facts are that at long last we must recognise archaeology as involving social issues, because it involves people and land; as involving political issues, because it involves money and the 'freedom of the individual'; and as involving moral issues, because eventually you have to decide how you are going to spend your time and money in relation to the case outlined here. It is simply this.

The raw material of Britain's archaeological heritage, the areas and sites, structures and objects left on and in the ground by our predecessors is of finite quantity, and it is unique. It is now being destroyed so widely, so fast and so completely by industry (gravel, sand, stone and peat extraction), by construction (from town development to motorways), and by agriculture and forestry, that little of it will be left intact by A. D. 2000 unless we take positive action now. The 'we' means precisely that: no-one else is going to do the job for us. Assuming that we believe the recording and conservation of our archaeological heritage to be a 'good thing' for the nation and not just a narrow sectional interest, this is where the element of social responsibility must come into our thinking and our archaeological practice. Responsible commitment is what archaeology now and henceforth requires of its practitioners and supporters.

For the situation is in fact much worse. Much more material, many more sites, actually exist than has previously been appreciated. Numerical estimates of density can be multiplied by at least five for most types of site, and by up to thirty in some cases. The present and predictable loss in numbers and knowledge is thus even greater than has been estimated; conversely, encouraging thought, anyone who undertakes to survey an area in detail, or watch a particular piece of development, can be proportionately more certain of contribution to knowledge. Among the far-reaching implications of this recent 'discovery' is the answer to those who proclaim, with regret or satisfaction, as the case may be, that the day of the 'amateur' (sensu part-timer) is over, and to the 'academics' who fastidiously avoid the crisis-in-archaeology cause, arguing that their time is better spent in 'real study' of the available evidence. Ultimately reaction to the known situation is a matter of personal choice; but I would hardly have thought there was much satisfaction or point in completing a cross-word without the 'Across' clues.

Add to the situation a third point - our frustrated awareness of the inadequacy of our present efforts - and the understandable reaction, "I'm going to take up astrology/bee-keeping/yoga: at least that will be fun" becomes hard to counter. But is it enough to do our archaeology for fun alone, when our efforts are inefficient because we are badly organised? In the long run, such a situation is bound to be unsatisfactory, neither a credit to our subject nor fair to our material. We can distinguish two aspects of what is really a management problem: the management of our resources - reorganisation at national level, and co-ordination at regional or local level. Ideally we need a National Antiquities Service embracing the whole range of state activity in archaeology, supported by adequate finances and modern legislation. Since we will not achieve that in the near future, we must set up an independent national organisation - 'Rescue'? - to supplement state efforts. Such an organisation would fill

several obvious gaps in the existing framework: it could be an association of all interested people, offering individual membership; it could be a fund-raising organisation; it could initiate and support surveys and rescue excavations; and it could acquire archaeological areas for permanent conservation. Priorities on the last two aims would have to be established on a national basis. 'Rescue' would have to have its own fulltime staff and an assured annual income, or it would have little justification for existing.

Whatever fortune attends that idea, the backbone of British field archaeology will remain the same: the skilled and dedicated part-timer who knows his own area and the people in it really well. The role of the individual operating under the aegis of a local society is crucial; in fact, it will become more important during the seventies. I do not think anyone will dispute that: the only matter for debate is how we organise ourselves so that our personal contribution through our Society, and that Society's contribution to the common cause, become as effective as possible. We are no longer local antiquarians, studying the local past for its own sake. Our knowledge has practical applications in planning urban and rural development, in education, in amenity, in the leisure and tourist industries, in local politics, and we must make it tell in all these fields. We cannot begin to do that, let alone cope with the actual crisis of destruction, while our organisation remains fragmented. We must literally pull ourselves together, under rejuvenated, reorganised or new units, geared to the needs of the only 'real' archaeology that is going to matter for the next few decades.

I sincerely hope the fragmentation of the '50s and '60s, largely the result of the county societies' failure to adapt to social changes, has ceased and that the M. 5 operation marked the beginning of a new phase of collaboration. Goodness knows archaeology needs it. I believe our subject is about to grow up, as it adds social responsibility to academic discipline. The real archaeological challenge of the seventies is whether we can grow up too.

---

In a contribution to Current Archaeology 23 (Nov. 1970) Mr. Fowler sets the background of archaeological crisis and reaction to it, as described in his important contribution to this Bulletin, and also discusses some further issues arising out of the new ideas which he and his colleagues are putting forward.

---

## RESCUE IN THE SEVENTIES

by Colin Clements

I well remember one desolate, rainy day not long ago watching in despair as a Hy-mac crunched through a newly discovered complex of Late Bronze Age timber structures and a nearby Iron Age site. It was one of those week-ends when the part-timers from local societies were suddenly unavailable - away on holiday, sick, or detained on business. A few willing hands would have made a world of difference, but there wasn't a soul. Somehow or other the job of recording had to be done, and quickly. There was nothing for it but to set to, and slog away until dark. By the time the last rays of sunlight had faded, a job of sorts had been done and the main features were on the drawing board. But there was no comfort in the knowledge that a good team on that job would have salvaged a mountain of evidence.

Situations like this are now commonplace. The Walsh report<sup>(1)</sup> and Mr. Fowler's paper on archaeological conservation<sup>(2)</sup> make abundantly clear that nothing will stem the tide of urban development and mechanised agriculture that, inevitably, will destroy a major part of surviving prehistoric sites, known and unknown, this century. The rate of destruction is already reaching crisis proportions and getting steadily worse. The obvious solution, a massive injection of money, skilled management and labour into rescue archaeology, is likely to be achieved only after many years of sustained campaigning and parliamentary lobbying which, even if successful, would result in help arriving too late. Ironically, the kind of interim measures now being taken, like the appointment of field archaeologists to county planning departments, will result in the discovery of yet more emergencies rather than in resolving them.

In these circumstances it is my firm opinion that the growing numbers of part-time archaeologists who, in total, constitute a national field force of no mean potential, have a key role to play. Given competent leadership and organisation tailored to their own special requirements they could make a decisive contribution.

It is well known that the rescue network operating in Kent (the Council for Kentish Archaeology) is now a mainstay of rescue in the south-east. With their twenty area research groups, a field force of over 300, and an integrated programme of research and rescue, they have demonstrated that remarkable achievements are possible with part-timers. Apart from rescue operations, a long term programme of field surveys has produced scores of hitherto unknown sites which, if fully investigated, would virtually

re-write the history of Kent. But the great value of the field surveys is that, in many instances, rescue ceases to be a frantic, last ditch engagement and is undertaken well in advance of site development as a research excavation. Thus emergencies are turned into opportunities to supplement the overall research programme.

It took ten years to build up the Kent operation, and we cannot wait for every other county to evolve along similar lines. Only by setting up rescue networks covering whole regions will it be possible to command enough resources to contain the situation.

The M5 project has been an object lesson in turning emergencies into opportunities. We have seen the willingness of local societies, A. R. G. 's, evening classes and field groups in the region to co-operate in joint schemes of rescue. But it is common knowledge that the volunteer groups were not yet ready to cope with extended emergencies, and a team of professional archaeologists had to be brought in to see the job through. This is not to impugn the work of the volunteer; many part-timers made brilliant contributions. However, you cannot expect volunteer field teams to emerge ready organised and trained at the first trumpet call. If M5 has demonstrated anything, it is the urgent need for an established network of volunteer field groups, committed to rescue, within the region. To bring this about will involve much hard work and a re-defining of the objectives of local societies in the light of the overall emergency of the seventies.

Nor will rescue end with the motorway. In the seventies we shall see a proliferation of civil engineering and urban re-development. Are we prepared for what lies ahead? Valuable work is being done by a small number of part-time field research groups but we need many more. Every local archaeological society should be encouraged to sponsor a field group, initially for surveillance of ploughland, site development, roadworks, etc., and eventually for participation in rescue excavation. I have found from experience that most part-timers do not like to work more than 30 miles from home, and this would limit most groups' areas to something like 25 x 25 miles. Such areas would not at first be contiguous over the region, but the network would expand in time. Groups in topographically integral areas like the Severn seaboard, the Cotswolds, the Mendips or the Somerset Levels should be encouraged to set up combined research programmes.

Every part-time team working in the field needs frequent access to professional consultants, and, although the museum network provides an indispensable service already in evaluating new sites and finds, there must be a limit to the time they can afford to give. The formation of a panel of professional consultants for the region would be invaluable.



The quality of current local publications is excellent, but is it not time that the region had its own newsheet? Brian Philp assures me that the Kent operation would not continue effectively without their quarterly Review.

Our ranks teem with engineers, architects and specialists of every kind. I would like to see a project designed to tap this reservoir of latent expertise. Why not a working group to research the techniques of rescue archaeology itself? The trowel has dominated our discipline for 100 years. Who else, today, is using the tools of 1870? Rescue archaeology cries out for fresh thinking and new methods.

So let us call upon all those helping in the M4 and M5 emergencies to carry through to its logical conclusion the project they were really starting when they set the wheels in motion. That is, the creation of a regional rescue organisation with a full-time director incorporating all active local groups and committed to a dynamic programme of research and rescue archaeology for the West Country in the years ahead.

Notes:

- (1) Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Arrangements for the Protection of Field Monuments, 1966-1968.
- (2) Conservation and the Countryside: Three Memoranda from the Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society, 1968.

---

B. A. R. G. IN THE SEVENTIES

A report on the B. A. R. G. Discussion Meeting of 17th October, 1970

by Max Hebditch

The chair at this meeting, which took as its topic "Archaeology in the seventies: the future of archaeological research in the area, and the part B. A. R. G. should play", was taken by Nicholas Thomas; initial contributions to the discussion came from a panel comprising Anne Everton, Keith Branigan, Colin Clements and Mike Ponsford. Happily, once the meeting had started there was no shortage of contributions from the 30 other members present. At its foundation, B. A. R. G. accepted as one of its primary tasks the publication of a Survey and Policy for archaeology in the area. The extent to which this has been implemented so far, was surveyed by L. V. Grinsell in his Chairman's address (Bulletin 3. 5, 112-116). This meeting enabled members to say how they saw the way forward. Discussion fell broadly under three heads: record, rescue, research.

Record: It was the view of Anne Everton that B. A. R. G. should concentrate on recording all known antiquities, parish by parish, before it is too late. Members live in 45 of the several hundred parishes in the region, and a direct approach to many of them might show a willingness to co-operate. John Drinkwater reinforced this view, emphasising the importance of having reliable statistics about antiquities before ancient population densities and the like could be worked out. He also stressed how important this information was if the Group was to join with others in promoting the conservation of our man-made and natural environment.

Rescue: Colin Clements outlined the need for a proper organisation for the rescue of archaeological evidence revealed in re-development; his views on the creation of such a body are set out elsewhere in this Bulletin. A great deal of discussion centred around the problems of the training and availability of man and woman power. Mike Ponsford doubted whether enough people could be mobilised in normal working hours to be really effective, and both he and Keith Branigan suggested that increasing government control of archaeological activity through permanently staffed agencies at local and national level, was the only solution. Colin Clements, however, stressed the fact that the problem was immediate, while money and expertise for a professional rescue organisation could only be available in the long term. It was possible to get volunteers into the field on a weekday through the development of proper rotas, and the searching-out of enthusiasts, whether or not they were Group members. It was also pointed out that the preservation of a site by purchase (perhaps at less cost than rescue excavation) was a course which should be considered by appropriate bodies.

Research: It was the Chairman's proposition that no post-war rescue excavation had contributed anything significant to knowledge. This provocative statement kindled heated debate about the value of research digging. Many felt that rescue work was vital. David Dawson pointed out that research into urban archaeology could only take place under rescue conditions. Jim Hancock quoted numerous local instances of the value of published rescue excavations to serious archaeological work. Janet Escritt pointed out how research excavation could become bogged down in minutiae, whereas the discipline of a limited timetable forced rescue digs to concentrate on the essentials of a site. David Blackman stressed the importance of publication of all work, and some time was spent in considering ways in which B. A. R. G. members could assist in the process. The value of the Associate's find-processing group was stressed.

---

Because he was too busy writing notes to be able to take part, the author would like to end by commenting on the discussion. It was unfortunate that members tended to treat the three themes as separate and alternative lines of action; whereas they should all be, in combination, the ways and means of carrying out the Group's Survey and Policy, of which scarcely any mention was made. Our Editor (Bulletin) alone pointed out that the proper formulation of any policies of rescue and research, could only be based on an adequate archaeological record.

What then are the problems to be faced by the Group in deciding what part it should play in archaeology for the next decade? At the present time, B. A. R. G. has a large membership (about 250) of which a high proportion is interested in archaeology as a recreation. The Bulletin, Symposium and Colloquium provide channels of communication for all interested in the archaeology of the area; through general lectures and the Field Guides, B. A. R. G. seeks to interest its own members and the general public in local archaeology. But although the Group has developed this general activity over the last four years, it is not itself stimulating new lines of enquiry into the past of this area. It has perhaps become inhibited in this respect by the professional organisations of the University, the M5 Research Committee, and the Museum, each with relatively large funds and their own objectives. But now that the public relations side of our work has been established, it is surely time that B. A. R. G. turned again to its Survey and Policy, revising it where necessary, defining specific objectives for the next five years (with a matching publication programme) and setting out to achieve them through the co-ordinated work of the professional organisations and the amateur. Record, rescue and research all have a part to play in this; properly organised, such a programme should also serve the recreational needs of the majority of our members. I leave my successor a formidable task.

---

### CRISIS IN FIELD ARCHAEOLOGY

A Public Meeting at the Beveridge Hall, Senate House, London University, Malet Street, London, W. C. 2, on Saturday 23 January 1971, 2.30 - 6.00 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. John Alexander. Speakers include: Martin Biddle, Professor Barry Cunliffe, Peter Fowler, Professor Charles Thomas, Philip Barker.

The archaeology of Britain faces an unparalleled crisis caused by the rapidly accelerating destruction of its sites. This meeting is being called to present the facts of the situation and to discuss ways in which it can be met. From the above list of speakers, and from the foregoing articles in our Bulletin, members will appreciate what an extremely important meeting this promises to be. Please give your support.

THE MALTWOOD FUND FOR ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN SOMERSET

This fund distributes annually grants totalling £1,000 towards the costs of archaeological research in the county of Somerset. All forms of archaeological research are eligible for a grant from the fund - excavation, field and aerial survey, the study and publication of museum, library and record office material - and applications may come not only from professional archaeologists and archaeological organisations but from individual researchers. Any members of B. A. R. G. who are considering making an application for a grant are welcome to discuss their application with either the Chairman or the Fieldwork Adviser. Further details of the fund may be obtained from J. E. Skidmore, Assistant Secretary, Royal Society for the Arts, John Adam Street, Adelphi, London, WC2N 6EZ. As applications are due by 1st January each year, members should contact either of these B. A. R. G. Officers, preferably by October and certainly before December.

K. Branigan

---

NOTICE OF ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

Notice is given that the Annual General Meeting of the Bristol Archaeological Research Group will be held at 2.30 p.m. on Saturday 20th February, 1971, in the Museum Lecture Theatre (entrance in University Road), Bristol 8. Members are reminded that in accordance with rule 10, nominations for officers and members of committee should be received by the Hon. Secretary not less than 14 days before the date of the meeting, accompanied by the names of the proposer and seconder, and the written consent of the nominee. Nominations are required for the following offices:

Hon. Secretary; Hon. Treasurer; Hon. Editor (Bulletin); Hon. Editor (Special Publications); Hon. Fieldwork Adviser; and Hon. Secretary for Associate Members. The retiring holders of these offices are eligible for re-election. Nominations are also required for two elected members of committee to serve for two years. The retiring members, Mrs. J. M. Popplewell and Mr. C. J. Hawkes, are not eligible for re-election.

Note: The Annual General Meeting and elections will take place in accordance with the Rules as altered and added to at the last A. G. M. A copy of the Rules is circulated with this Bulletin.

---

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Calling all Associate Members belonging to B. A. R. G. , who have not been inside the City Museum, Bristol within the last year or so. I hope there is none. Yet it would seem otherwise .....

Perhaps those members I am writing to, have not yet caught the archaeological 'bug': that benevolent disease which draws the 'victims' to all the museums and archaeological monuments they can possibly fit into the space of their lives; the 'bug' that gives the archaeologist the perseverance while doing an unenjoyable job during an excavation; the 'bug' that compels the archaeologist to read everything on his subject that he can possibly lay his hands on; the 'bug' which makes the discovery of a slight green rise of the ground in some ordinary field so exciting; the 'bug' that draws the 'victim' to all the talks and meetings he can possibly attend .....

How can you catch this bug? - you may or may not ask. The answer is simple. First of all, you must come to the Museum and find out what scope there is in archaeology. Browse around the sections devoted to the prehistoric and Roman eras of our region. Note the wealth of remains from these long past times and the richness of their displays. When you look at a find and note to yourself where it was found, if you say to yourself: "I'd like to go there", you are on your way to becoming an archaeologist. If you go to these archaeological sites, and furthermore (and most important) you enjoy visiting them - you're caught! Like reading a subject in school or at university, anything you really like becomes easy, enjoyable, and you do it well. So if you are one of those who became a member just to be 'a member' and nothing more - try and become an archaeologist. I'm sure B. A. R. G. will reward you for your efforts.

Christopher Brain

---

RECENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL ACCESSIONS IN THE CITY MUSEUM,  
BRISTOL.

by L. V. Grinsell and D. P. Dawson

The Museum usually manages to acquire local material of each period annually, and 1970 has been no exception. This note covers acquisitions from late October 1969, to late October 1970.

The Neolithic is represented by a stone axe from Yate Court (Glos.) and a leaf arrowhead found by our member C. J. Hawkes within Uleybury hill-fort. The Bronze Age is represented, probably, by a

well-worked flint knife from the large round barrow at Rowberrow near Dolebury. The Iron Age collection has been strengthened by electrotypes of a gold stater of CORIO from Kingswood (Bristol) and of a gold stater of ANTED found near Tintern Abbey.

The chief Roman acquisitions were fine metalwork and architectural fragments, including an altar to Apollo Cunomaglus, from Nettleton Shrub, excavated by W. J. Wedlake for Bath & Camerton Archaeological Society. Mr. J. H. Butler of Gatcombe Court kindly extended his loan of most of the finds from Gatcombe. The Early Christian collection has been enriched by a mounting of dark-blue glass decorated with three white spirals, perhaps of Irish origin, from Westbury College. Medieval material from the City Museum excavations at Westbury College includes a gilt-bronze pendant. Pottery recovered from Bristol now provides the framework for a well-stratified ceramic sequence from A. D. 1000 onwards. Other accessions included windows from a wall incorporated in the Wheatsheaf Inn, Christmas Street (Bristol), a section of lead water-pipe from Redcliffe, and C14/15 green-glazed kiln-wasters from the foundations of St. Peter's Church. Acquisitions of Post-Medieval finds, mainly pottery, go far to provide a framework for continuing the local ceramic sequence to c. 1820. In addition to material from Rupert Street and Westbury College excavations, good pit-groups have been recovered from Castle Street, Tower Lane, and Castle Green, and smaller groups from other sites. Kiln-wasters and other material of C18 from Broad Plain and Redcliffe Caves have been received from Mr. D. J. Millbank and Mrs. M. Whitting respectively.

Accessions in Bristol Numismatics include a penny of Cnut, moneyer Wynsige; a penny of Edward the Confessor, moneyer Aelfric; casts of the Stephen/PERERIC penny in Reading University; a gold half-ryal of Edward IV (1461-70); a half-groat of Charles I; and a shilling of William III (brockage, with the head reproduced incuse on the reverse).

---

#### B. A. R. G. EXCURSION: GLOUCESTERSHIRE EXCAVATIONS

Saturday 13th September 1970

To me the highlight of the afternoon (apart from a superb tea provided by the ladies of Trinity Church, Stroud) was a visit to a derelict workhouse at Stroud. Not that the visits to Frocester Court, an Roman villa and King Stanley moated manor-house, so ably conducted by Capt. H. S. Gracie and David Evans respectively, were uninteresting -

quite the contrary ; but these excavations will be fully and formally reported elsewhere, whereas the workhouse was something different from the usual visit to an excavation.

A special word should be said about the work facing the curator of Stroud Museum and his volunteer helpers. The workhouse stands above the town in five acres of ground, with views extending to Wales. It was built in 1837 and has just over 30,000 square feet of floor space, covering several stories. There is even a grim cell-block. Stroud Museum plan to take over the building as a 'Museum of Industry and Folklife', complementary to other such museums in the adjacent counties.

Apart from some small alterations in 1899, the building is in its original form; but a colossal task faces the Museum and its helpers in repairing numerous windows, floors and other parts of the structure, and in making the building generally safe. There is some urgency in the work if much of the machinery of the Stroud Valley cloth industry, and of the industries of the Forest of Dean, now lying neglected, is to be salvaged and housed before it is too late. This project may not be classed as 'archaeological research' - but it surely does us good to see some of the problems with which our neighbours are faced. I, for one, would much rather that a B. A. R. G. excursion was to such a place of specific or unusual interest, rather than an afternoon spent leaping in and out of a coach looking at dig after dig.

D. Sprague

---

#### LOCAL EXCAVATIONS, 1970

It has been customary, over the past few years, to include a report of the Row of Ashes Farm, Butcombe training excavation, with which B. A. R. G. has particularly close associations, in the December number of the Bulletin, following a report of another local excavation of interest in the previous issue - this year, Mike Ponsford's account of developments at Bristol Castle in Bulletin 3.8, 214-215. Before, however, this becomes too fossilised a precedent, and because there is so much archaeological work in progress, we are this year surveying three excavations outside Bristol, in one or other of which many B. A. R. G. members have been involved (all this, and M5 too!), including a short notice of developments at Butcombe, and turning the main spotlight onto potentially important results from Cheddar in March of this year.

During the fifth season of excavation at Row of Ashes Farm, Butcombe, further rock-cut features of this Prehistoric/Romano-British settlement, as yet unexplained but probably dating to the 1st century A. D.,

were examined. Half of the late 3rd century stone-based building, main feature of the excavated area, has now been completely dismantled, producing useful dating and structural evidence in the process. The immediately adjacent area has been cleared to bedrock, exposing more early Roman and pre-Roman features, including hearths. Some particularly valuable emergency work during evenings in August, when the rest of the Westmead field was being ploughed, showed that at least one of the several nearby fieldbanks was a substantial medieval wall, presumably associated with the settlement in the north-west corner of Westmead.

At Cadbury, Congresbury in August, the first full three-week research excavation season proved most productive. Part of the inner rampart, and the bank and ditch across the waist of the hill were shown to be of 5th century date, built of stone with a turf and/or timber front, and with a complex contemporary entrance. The total of timber structures now known as risen to eight, including two circular ones c. 15 m. in diameter and a 'long-house' 8m. by 3 m. Imported Mediterranean pottery is prolific and another imported ware, probably Gaulish, is also present. Metalworking is well attested. Neolithic and Iron Age, but little Roman, activity, is indicated. The excavation of a rock-cut ditch provided the deepest section yet exposed on this site, showing the Roman and the imported sherds emphatically separated with a possible non-ceramic phase in between. The relationship of the site to other Roman and post-Roman sites on and near the hill, such as the Henley Wood temple complex, continues to be matter for study; in particular, the lost Woodlands Roman villa site, near Rhodyate, may have been re-located by aerial photography. Reports on Cadbury, Congresbury (the first of which is reviewed elsewhere in this Bulletin) are going to appear at intervals, but not every year; meanwhile a review of the 1970 season's results appears in Current Archaeology 23 (November 1970).

---

CHEDDAR VICARAGE, 1970

based upon the interim report, by kind permission of

Philip Rahtz

The potential interest of Cheddar Vicarage site to archaeologists has long been realised. A substantial Roman building complex near the church has been suspected since the 19th century; while the excavations of the 9th-14th century palaces of the Kings of Wessex and England nearby in 1960-1962<sup>(1)</sup> revealed no traces of the well-documented Saxon minster or religious community of Cheddar, and it was therefore thought that these



sites also should be sought near the present parish church. Excavations in this area were therefore directed not only at finding physical remains of the Saxon religious nucleus, but also to finding out more about the Roman 'villa' and its estate, in the hope that this might throw some light on the origins of the Saxon royal estate as a whole. There was also the possibility of continuity between the Roman remains, the possible Saxon 'monastery' and the present church. A short excavation in 1965<sup>(2)</sup> located Roman and late Saxon features which justified this aim. Building operations in the vicarage garden in 1969 revealed further Roman features, and a two-week excavation was arranged at Easter 1970, in areas not yet built upon, to follow up these features and examine further those found in 1965.

An extensive area of iron-smelting features and ditches, including the substantial foundation trench either of a massive stockade or of one side of a timber building, was associated with quantities of early Roman pottery, including a high proportion of Samian. The coins include one of Vespasian, the earliest coin so far found at Cheddar. This concentration of early Roman material supports a long-held theory that there was some association between Cheddar and the Mendip lead mines which were also flourishing at this period. Close by the Vicarage is the former highest navigable point on the River Axe: the nearest point (c. 6 kms.) to the lead mines from which lead might be transported by water to the Bristol Channel.

A cutting in an outhouse adjoining the Vicarage located white plaster and two 4th century coins within one very small area, and suggests that the 'villa' extends under the present Vicarage building, while numerous late coins continued to support the 1965 evidence of a late Roman date for this building complex. The cobbling found in 1965 is now interpreted as a roadway leading into the villa area from a westerly direction, from the river.

The most important results of this 1970 excavation, however, were to show that the light stone foundations partially exposed in 1965 in fact represent part of a probably mainly timber structure, built upon this roadway. A second layer of cobbling on the road led only as far as the foundations. The two superimposed roadways suggest some continuity in usage of the area; while the later cobbling and the building it served may, it is suggested, be of post-Roman date. This is supported not only by its stratigraphy above the earlier roadway; but also by the rarity of Roman pottery (limited to a dozen or two undistinguished sherds) and, by contrast, a remarkable number of amphorae sherds (14 sherds of 10 amphorae) stratified between the two cobbled surfaces and in the building foundation. These amphorae sherds are of undistinctive appearance, and would have

been accepted as Roman in an assemblage of other Roman pottery; but in the marked absence of such pottery from these levels, they provide a strong suggestion of post-Roman, or dark age date. One late Saxon sherd sealed among the cobbles of the upper roadway, raises the possibility of an even later date for the upper road and building, but the single sherd can hardly bear the weight of so much attribution safely. Other late Saxon sherds were found in the upper levels of other cuttings.

This excavation has thus been very informative about both the Roman and post-Roman aspects of the Cheddar Vicarage area. It has gone a long way towards indicating the probability of continuity between the Roman site and the Saxon religious community. Is the link a pre-Saxon (Celtic Christian) religious site? It is regrettable that the whole area could not have been properly excavated before building took place, since this would have provided a far clearer answer. But the areas, including the whole villa area and probably the nuclei of later settlements, which have not been excavated or destroyed by building are reasonably safe under fairly deep soil cover in the gardens of the new houses, or effectively sealed by the church and vicarage buildings.

Members from B. A. R. G. and other local groups joined students from the School of History, Birmingham University on this excavation. It is expected that the report will be published in a future issue of Somerset Archaeology and Natural History.

Notes:

- (1) Medieval Archaeology 6-7 (1962-3); Proc. S. A. N. H. S. 108 (1964)
- (2) Proc. S. A. N. H. S. 110 (1966)

---

#### B. A. R. G. SYMPOSIUM

The sixth B. A. R. G. Symposium, was held on Saturday 21st November, was perhaps one of the best that the Group has seen so far, for the variety of papers presented, and the diversity of periods and types of work they covered - all by members of the Group, ranging from those of many years' standing and experience to more recent members making a first venture into describing their work. This surely is what our Symposium is designed to be, and proved a most satisfying afternoon. Brief summaries of the papers will, as usual, appear in the next issue of the Bulletin.

---

ARCHAEOLOGICAL MATERIAL IN LOCAL MUSEUMS: A CHECK-LIST

(PART X)

edited by P. J. Fowler

UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL SPELAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

U. B. S. S. Museum,  
University Road,  
Bristol.

Part (i)

Of all the smaller Museums covered in this series of checklists, the University of Bristol Spelaeological Society's collection is archaeologically the most important, particularly with reference to the prehistoric period. Most of the material comes from north Somerset, where the Society's fieldwork has been concentrated. Unfortunately, much of the material was destroyed or damaged as a result of enemy action in 1940, affecting in particular the material from Cheddar (Sun Hole), Read's Cavern, Rowberrow Cavern, Symond's Yat (King Arthur's Cave), and Tynning's Farm Barrows T. 10-14. Unlike many of the collections already listed, this collection is also remarkable in that much has already been published in Proc. U. B. S. S.; indeed, in many cases the pre-1940 records there now provide the best or only surviving evidence. The Site Index and Author Index published in the Jubilee Proc. U. B. S. S. 12. 1 (1969) provide a useful guide to the material. Again unlike other collections, the museum has an up-to-date MS catalogue on the premises, which will form the basis of a forthcoming publication in Proc. Som. A. N. H. S. (K. 8), (M. 41), (T. 14) etc. are the U. B. S. S. site and barrow references. Abbreviations are as in Bulletin 2, 9, 124.

---

Geological and Fossil collections, mostly local

Foreign and Ethnographic Collection: stone implements ranging from Pal. to modern and inc. some modern forgeries, from: Egypt, India, Kenya, Palestine, Pennsylvania U. S. A., Somaliland, South Africa, and unloc.

Prehistoric

Pleistocene fauna:

Avon Gravels: various mammalia

Banwell Bone Cave (M. 15): ox

Bath River Gravels: ox, rhinoceros, mammoth, elephant

Bleadon: reindeer antler

Brean Down: arctic fox, reindeer, horse, rodent, shells

Burrington, Aveline's Hole: lynx, giant red deer

U. B. S. S. cont'd.

- Cheddar, Gough's Old Cave: arctic fox, beaver, reindeer  
Cheddar, Longwood, Rhino Rift: hyena  
Cheddar, Sun Hole (M. 5): wolf, wild cat, reindeer  
Crook Peak, Picken's Hole (M. 30): reindeer, arctic fox,  
ox, wolf, brown bear, horse, hyena, woolly  
rhinoceros, cave lion, mammoth, rodents, dog  
Olveston Bone Fissure: cave lion, hare, fallow deer, ox,  
hyena, wolf  
Symond's Yat, King Arthur's Cave (W. 2): bear, pig  
Symond's Yat, Merlin's alias Great Doward Cave (W. 1):  
arctic fox, stoat, weasel, rodent, fish, birds  
Thames River Gravels: elephant  
Tynning's Rift: rhinoceros and other mammalia  
Uphill Caves: various mammalia (University Geology Dept.  
Museum)  
Whatley Quarry: mammoth, horse, glutton (gluto sp.)  
Wookey Hole, Hyena Den (M. 35): rhinoceros, horse, mammoth,  
red deer, hyena, bear (jawbone showing wound inflicted),  
and other mammalia  
Wookey Hole, Rhinoceros Hole (M. 41): horse, ox, red deer,  
rhinoceros, hyena, bear and other mammalia
- Pal: Large coll. implements from the Bristol Avon Gravel Terraces:  
flint and chert implements, inc. handaxes, pointed tools,  
bifaces, ovates, cleavers, etc., flakes and cores from:  
Brislington House, Chapel Pill, Ham Green Farm,  
Kelston, Kingsweston Park, Pill, Portbury (Sheepway),  
Saltford, Shirehampton, (general loc., Cotswold Estate,  
Hendon Grove, Meadow Grove, Old Barrow Hill,  
Woodwell Road).  
See also University Geology Dept. Museum.
- Brean Down: bones worked and split by man  
Burrington: Aveline's Hole; human remains inc. worked bones;  
fossil specimens associated? with ceremonial burials;  
worked and incised bone; flint blades  
Cheddar, Gough's Cave: 4 flint blades  
Crook Peak, Picken's Hole (M. 30): human teeth; frag.  
stalagmite polished by hyenas' feet; flint frags; ..  
lump of chert used as hammerstones (publication 1972)  
Wookey Hole, Hyena Den (M. 35): ? bone frag. with incised  
lines (from disturbed levels; publication 1971); soil samples

U. B. S. S. , cont'd.

- Wookey Hole, Rhinoceros Hole (M. 41); bone scraper;  
frag. polished bone (excavation in progress)  
Coll. non-local flint and chert implements, and unworked  
nodules, flakes etc., from: Berks (Sonning),  
Devon (Kentisberg), Dorset (Broca Pits), Kent  
(Crayford, S. Foreland, Swanscombe), Norfolk  
(Grimes Graves), Surrey (Epsom), Sussex (Cromer),  
Thames Valley, Wilts. (Aldbury, Knowle Farm  
Savernake, Queenfield nr. Christian Malford), and  
unloc.; also examples from France, and unloc.  
foreign.
- Pal/Meso: Symond's Yat, King Arthur's Cave (W. 2): Creswellian  
flint implements, flakes, microliths; utilised  
pebbles.  
(Proc. U. B. S. S. 2. 3 (1926), 3. 2 (1928))
- Meso: Buckland Warren, nr. Faringdon, Berks.: many flint  
microliths and cores  
Burrington, Aveline's Hole: few microliths  
Chew Magna, Moorledge Farm (M. 40) ST. 58916212:  
flint nodules, flakes and chips; piece brown chert  
Ireland, Co. Antrim, Larne: Larnian culture flint  
implements.
- Meso/Neo/BA: Buckland Warren, nr. Faringdon, Berks.: many flint  
implements, flakes, burnt flint frags; hammerstones
- Neo: Binegar (ST 61394968): flint and chert implements, flakes  
Buckland Warren, nr. Faringdon, Berks.: sherds  
rusticated ware; butt of polished stone axe; plano-  
convex flint knives; scratched frag. rib-bone;  
scratched pebble  
Cheddar, Sun Hole (M. 5): potsherds; bowl of pottery  
spoon; flint implements inc. leaf-shaped arrowhead.  
(Proc. U. B. S. S. 8. 2 (1928))  
Kingsweston Roman villa site: refashioned frag.  
polished stone axe  
Rowberrow Cavern: modern copy of Ebbsfleet ware bowl  
Rowberrow Warren, Mendip Lodge: 2 polished flint axes  
Winterbourne (Glos.), Bury Hill Camp- macehead  
non-local: Ireland, Co. Antrim: polished stone axe;  
cushion mace-head with incomplete perforation  
(Ballymena);  
flint implements and flakes (Larne);  
unloc.: perforated macehead; polished stone implements.

U. B. S. S. cont'd.

Neo/BA: Large coll. flint implements, flakes, cores and nodules, all surface finds, mainly from two areas:

Bath area: general, Charlcombe, Charmy Down, Claverton, Combé Down, Farley Down, Fern, Flock Down, Freezing Hill, Hartley Farm, Holts Down, Kelston (Round Hill), Lansdown (general, and Derby Point), Upper Langridge Farm:

Mendip area: general, Banwell Camp, Blackdown (and Barrows T. 5-8), Blagdon, Burrington (general, and Burrington Camp, and Hill Cottage, and U. B. S. S. Camp), Charterhouse (and Barrow T. 21), Compton Martin, Dolebury, Draycott, Ellick Farm, Harptree (and Barrow T. 19), Lulsgate Bottom, Mendip Farm, Mendip Lodge Wood, Piney Sleight, Priddy (general, and Ashen Hill), Redhill, Tynings Farm, Ubley (general, and Nordrach), Wookey (Atkins Mount)

and also from: Baggeridge nr. Wellow, Som.; Brean Down; Clevedon (Walton, and The Warren); Dundry; Durdham Downs (Barrow T. 20) Failand-Portbury area; Kingsdown; Long Ashton (Beggars Bush); Sea Mills; Shirehampton; Tresham, Gos.; Tyntesfield, Gos.; Wick, Gos.; Winterbourne, Gos. (Bury Hill); Wraxall.

Similar coll. of flints from non-local sites: Berks (Wayland Smithy), Devon unloc., Ireland (Co. Antrim, Larne), Kent (Ash nr. Sevenoaks, and Folkestone), Norfolk (Grimes Graves), Sussex (Cisbury), Wilts (Avebury, Chanctonbury Ring, Hackpen Hill, Windmill Hill), unidentified sites ("L. Lane", Henley Hill, Hume, Ombersley, Wyatt), and unloc.

Bos Swallet (M. 25): flint implements, ? microliths, fine cutting flakes, fire-cracked flints, cores  
Buckland Warren, nr. Faringdon, Berks; flint implements, flakes, cores

Cheddar, Sun Hole (M. 5): potsherds; upper Creswellian flint implements inc. typical Cheddarian blades; ? microlith; (Proc. U. B. S. S. 8. 2 (1928))

U. B. S. S. , cont'd.

- Compton Martin, Fernhill Barrow (T. 15):  
flint implements, antler
- Gorse Bigbury: plain and decorated late Neo. and  
Beaker sherds (punched and pricked patterns;  
reed, bird-bone, and finger-nail impressions);  
flint implements and flakes, cores; hones,  
stone rubbers, utilised pebbles; human and  
animal bones; charcoal
- Kingsweston Hill Barrows T. 1, 2 & 3: potsherds;  
flint implements and flakes; bone; charcoal
- Little Solsbury: flint implements
- Rowberrow Cavern: flint implements, flakes; flint  
nodule and "spalls"; frags chert
- Tyning's Farm Barrows: T. 14 Central Barrow (primary  
barrow): potsherds inc. Beaker; flint  
implements inc. 6 arrowheads (for secondary  
burial see BA).
- BA: Blackdown Barrow T. 5 (primary early Beaker cairn):  
bell Beaker (restored); flint implements inc.  
scrapers, blades, flakes; butt of polished ORS  
adze; part bone; stone rubber; burnt and  
unburnt frags bone;  
(T. 5 secondary cremation cemetery): collared  
urn (restored), small biconical urn (restored),  
potsherds, frags. urns; flint implements inc.  
scrapers, blades, flakes; MBA bronze razor;  
piece of lead; burnt and unburnt frags bone;  
burnt hammer-stone; stone rubbers, pot-cover
- Bos Swallet (M. 25): frags. 3 decorated Beakers, inc. 1  
handle
- Brean Down: potsherds of "B" Beaker (Proc. U. B. S. S.  
9. 2, (1961); rest of U. B. S. S. Brean Down  
material is in Weston-super-Mare Museum:  
see Bulletin 3. 6)
- Buckland Warren, nr. Faringdon, Berks. : flint  
implements, flakes, cores
- Burrington, Barrow T. 7: pygmy cup, Abercromby type 7  
(associated with cinerary urn)

U. B. S. S. , cont'd.

- Corston Quarry, Bath: 2 flat cist graves containing  
(i) Beaker (restored) and hone-stone; (ii) Beaker  
(restored); also frags Beakers, flint, bone  
Kingsweston and Lawrence Weston: flint implements,  
cores and flakes; animal bones
- Tyning's Farm Barrows (T. 10-14):  
Publications: Proc. U. B. S. S. 2. 2, 4. 2, 6. 3  
and forthcoming
- T. 10, North Barrow: biconical urn with finger-tip  
decoration; degenerate biconical urn (both  
restored); 3 pygmy cups; potsherds; frag.  
stone macehead; small crinoidal limestone ball
- T. 11, South Barrow: potsherds, inc. sherd with  
impressed cord-decoration; biconical urn,  
collared urn, and food vessel (all restored);  
flint implements, flakes, chips and cores
- T. 12, East Barrow: small slate hone with biconical  
perforation at one end (? MBA)
- T. 13 West Barrow: small urn (restored) with un-  
perforated lugs and grooved decoration; sherd  
from beside barrow; model by Dr. H. Taylor
- T. 14 Central Barrow (primary barrow, see Neo/BA):  
secondary burial: LBA sherds, 2 flint arrowheads;  
model of barrow by Dr. H. Taylor.



REVIEW

P. J. Fowler, K. S. Gardner, P. A. Rahtz, Cadbury Congresbury, Somerset, 1968: An Introductory Report (Dept. of Extra-Mural Studies, University of Bristol, 1970), 48 pp., 15 figs., 4 plates, 10s. (50p.)

The reasons which led the excavators of Cadcong to produce, in a mere 20 months or so, this handsome report on their first (1968) season as a special publication instead of issuing a shorter interim in a national journal will be known to some. Not only West country archaeologists, but archaeology in general, has profited from this decision. The report, modestly described on the title-page as 'introductory', is an exemplary paper, crammed with information, fully documented, and profusely illustrated - it even contains aerial views by Jim Hancock. At the grotesquely low price of 10s., this should be bought by anyone interested in any aspect of field archaeology who has anything to do with B. A. R. G., and it should be bought at once to give all possible support to the excavating team.

The 1968 results were digested, and discussed widely with colleagues all round Britain, before a second season took place in the autumn of 1970. The preliminary results of 1970 are now being orally disseminated. The rest of my review will therefore explain why this is so important a site.

Post-Roman, pre-Saxon sites in south-west Britain have to be dated mainly by the occurrence of imports, particularly of imported wheel-made pottery made on the Continent or in the eastern Mediterranean. In Cornwall, which has no Saxon finds to speak of until the c. 1000 Launceston coinage, there is another sequence resting on the fact of a continuous native pottery series, but on the Bristol Channel shores we have at least two pre-Saxon centuries in which - apart from a scatter of the still mysterious 'pre-Saxon grass-tempered ware' - tremendous reliance must be placed on this imported pottery. Today, thanks in large part to John Hayes' work in the Mediterranean, we can give pretty useful dates to be imported class A (dishes, (which I showed some years ago to be late Roman B and C of the Mediterranean) and class B (various sorts of amphora). We know that practically none of this class A or B reached south-west Britain before about 480, and class B is nearly all 6th century.

The import trade is, as we should expect, coastal. This means that the South Cadbury ('Camelot') finds cannot be primary imports; still less, and not by any conceivable syllogism, can they indicate the activities of 'Arthur'. We have very few points of primary importation, and

Tintagel in Cornwall, perhaps Bantham Ham in South Devon, are the only candidates. In Somerset, the Glastonbury, South Cadbury and alleged Ilchester finds are all inland. One has inferred that a north-coast primary spot must exist, and Cadcong turns out to be that spot. Like Tintagel, it possesses a wide and massive range of these wares.

These indicate external trade contacts in the 6th century in the life of persons occupying a substantial defensive settlement. My personal view is that this is more likely to be the citadel of an Early Christian Dumnonian kinglet than any form of monastic establishment. What the excavators have now shown is: (a) by means of a superb ditch clearance, a sequence which must take us back through the 5th century to late Roman times, and this is across a non-pottery phase covering (say?) 420 to 480 A.D.; and (b) the existence of a variety of house-types, with evidence for stock-breeding, agrarian pursuits, and cottage industry, the full future examination of which should shed more light on Early Christian life in the south-west than any post-war site yet examined. This is a vital site, very fortunately in the hands of some of the most skilled and experienced settlement-excavators in the country; and we are indeed privileged to be able, for a paltry fifty new pence, to have this excellent first-season report to chew over. I am writing these words, not in this case as a personal friend of the excavators! - but as one who has been involved for many years in the archaeology of this period and region. I mean every word of this review, and I do most strongly urge all who read it to support, now and in the future, the Cadcong venture.

Charles Thomas

Note: The address of the Department of Extra-Mural Studies, University of Bristol, from whom this Report can be obtained, is 20a, Berkeley Square, Bristol BS8 1HR.

#### NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS

A particularly welcome addition to the Bristol City Museum's range of Information Sheets is the recently produced sheet on the Tormarton Bronze Age Skeletons, discovered and excavated by B. A. R. G. members in 1968. It is well illustrated and includes the long-awaited radio-carbon date of Skeleton II, which gives a result of about 977 B. C.

L. V. Grinsell's Archaeology of Exmoor has reached the bookshops shortly before we go to press, and it is planned to review this volume in the next issue of the Bulletin.

The C. B. A. has issued a Consolidated List (Part I: Undergraduate Theses) of archaeological theses planned or in preparation in British Universities during 1970-71. It may be useful to B. A. R. G. members to know who is working, on what subjects, relevant to our area:

A descriptive and analytical study of the Roman villa at Park Farm, Aylburton, Gloucestershire, by M. J. Watkins, University College, Cardiff (1970-1972);

Roman bronzes (excluding brooches) from Caerwent, Mon., by D. Jones, University College, Cardiff (1970-1972);

A comparative study of artefacts of shale, wood and bone from Silchester, Hants., and Caerwent, Mon., by A. Lawson, University College, Cardiff (1970-1972)

Roman settlement on the Cotswold scarp in the neighbourhood of Birdlip Gloucestershire, by M. Hall, University College, Cardiff; (1970-1972);  
The techniques, organisation, extent and duration of leadmining in Roman Britain, by Miss H. Jennings, University College, Cardiff (1969-1971)  
The pre-Conquest estates of Glastonbury Abbey: the historical, topographical, and archaeological evidence, by Miss L. Watts, Birmingham University, 1970-1971

If members have relevant information of this kind, from other sources, on "work-in-progress", this is a feature which might usefully appear in the Bulletin. It can only be helpful to know what subjects or areas are, or are not, currently being studied by someone else. Perhaps this is something we should apply to ourselves as a Group? There have from time to time been suggestions that B. A. R. G. should work out a list of "jobs needing to be done" - suggestions that may be renewed if some of the points made by contributors to this Bulletin and to recent discussions on future policy, are taken up; and this information would be the natural complement to such a list.

---

### CALENDAR OF

### FORTHCOMING COURSES, MEETINGS AND LECTURES

January - March 1971

#### Abbreviations:

..... A. S. ;	Archaeological Society
B. G. A. S. :	Bristol & Gloucestershire Archaeological Society
G. D. A. R. G. :	Gloucester & District Archaeological Research Group
..... L. H. S. :	Local History Society
S. A. N. H. S. :	Somerset Archaeological & Natural History Society
University:	University of Bristol Dept. of Extra-Mural Studies, 20a Berkeley Square, Bristol BS8 1HR,
Wells N. H. A. S.	Wells Natural History and Archaeological Society

January

- 8 THE VIKINGS, by Mrs. E. Fowler. Course of 10 meetings at The Technical College, Avon St., BATH, 7.30 p. m. University.
- 8 ANCIENT EGYPT by M. Davies. Banwell Society for Archaeology. Methodist Church Hall, BANWELL, 7.30 p. m.
- 8-10 MARINE ARCHAEOLOGY by D. Blackman. W/e course at Rodney Lodge, BRISTOL. University.
- 9 MENDIP LEAD by D. Elkington. Wells N. H. A. S. The Museum, WELLS, 5.30 p. m. Non-members 1s. 6d.
- 11 SOMERSET ARCHAEOLOGY by E. K. Tratman. Course of 10 meetings at Arts Centre, BRIDGWATER, 7.30 p. m. University.
- 11 INDUSTRIAL ARCHAEOLOGY OF R. CHEW, by Mrs. J. Day. Course of 12 meetings inc. 2 field meetings, at Wellsway School, KEYNSHAM, 7.30 p. m. University.
- 11 SYMPOSIUM: RECENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL WORK IN BRISTOL REGION by L. V. Grinsell, M. W. Ponsford, M. Hebditch, D. P. Dawson and P. Elkin. B. G. A. S. City Museum, Bristol, 5.45 p. m.
- 12 CADBURY CONGRESBURY EXCAVATIONS 1968/1970, by P. J. Fowler. Bath & Camerton A. S. Assembly Hall, BATH Technical College (Old Building), 7.15 p. m. Visitors 2s. 6d.
- 13 THE B. A. R. G. RESEARCH PROGRAMME FOR 1971:  
Meeting with Speakers City Museum, BRISTOL, 7.30 p. m.
- 15 BRISTOL: STUDY OF A CITY'S HISTORY by F. Neale. Course of 6 meetings at Penscot, SHIPHAM, 7.30 p. m. University.
- 15-17 ARCHAEOLOGY & BONE EVIDENCE by Miss B. Noddle & R. Chaplin. Second part of non-res. w/e course at Gloucestershire College of Education, Oxstalls Lane, GLOUCESTER. University.
- 20 HISTORY OF WELLS by Dr. R. D. Reid. Course of 10 meetings, The Museum, WELLS, 7.30 p. m. University.
- 20 GEOLOGY & SCENERY OF THE WYE VALLEY by D. E. Evans. City Museum Winter Lecture, Museum Lecture Theatre, BRISTOL, 7.30 p. m.

January

- 21 THE DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY, BRISTOL CITY MUSEUM, by P. Elkin. Keynsham & Saltford L. H. S., SALTFFORD Church Hall, 7. 30 p. m.
- 23 CRISIS IN FIELD ARCHAEOLOGY: A Public Meeting at the Beveridge Hall, Senate House, London University, Malet St., LONDON W. C. 1. 2. 30 p. m. Panel of speakers: see page 238
- 28 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of the Clevedon and District A. S. Community Centre, Sunhill Park, CLEVEDON, 7. 30 p. m.

February

- 11 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of Wells N. H. A. S., with talk by H. Kenney on Photography from the Pen Hill Mast. The Museum, WELLS, 5. 30 p. m. Non-members 1s. 6d.
- 15 M. 5 FIELDWORK. G. D. A. R. G. Queen Street Hall, GLOUCESTER, 7. 30 p. m. Non-members 2s. 6d.
- 19 HANHAM ABBOTTS, by G. Dando. Keynsham & Saltford L. H. S. Ellsbridge House, KEYNSHAM. 7. 30 p. m.
- 20 B. A. R. G. ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING with Address by D. J. Smith on THE ROMAN MOSAIC INDUSTRY IN SOUTHWEST BRITAIN. City Museum, BRISTOL, 2. 30 p. m. Tea tickets, 4s. 0d.
- 27 FARLEIGH CASTLE by Mr. Chancellor Perks. Wells N. H. A. S. The Museum, WELLS, 5. 30 p. m. Non-members 1s. 6d.

March

- 2 BATH BEFORE THE GEORGIAN EXPANSION by P. J. Greening. Bath & Camerton A. S. Assembly Hall, BATH Technical College (Old Building) 7. 15 p. m. Visitors 2s. 6d.
- 5-7 FIELD ARCHAEOLOGY: D. J. Bonney, P. J. Fowler, C. C. Taylor. Res. w/e course at Urchfont Manor, DEVIZES. Applications to Warden.
- 6 DONYATT POTTERY by R. Coleman-Smith and I. Morley. S. A. N. H. S., Wyndham Hall, TAUNTON Castle. 2. 30 p. m.
- 6-7 ROMAN ROADS, W. G. Putnam and panel of speakers. Non-res. w/e at County Museum, DORCHESTER. University; apply for programme.
- 10 CANNINGTON by P. Rahtz. B. A. R. G. Winter Lecture. City Museum, BRISTOL, 7. 30 p. m.

March

- 13-14 ROMAN TECHNOLOGY IN THE WESTERN PROVINCES.  
Panel of lecturers. W/e school, BRISTOL area. University;  
apply for details
- 17 FUTURE DEVELOPMENT IN THE SEVERN VALE by N. R.  
Collins. City Museum Winter Lecture, Museum Lecture  
Theatre, BRISTOL, 7.30 p. m.
- 18 TOKENS OF BRISTOL 1652-1662 by R. H. Thompson. Bath  
& Bristol Numismatic Society, City Museum, BRISTOL,  
7.15 p. m.
- 19 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING & MEMBERS' EVENING,  
Keynsham & Saltford L. H. S. Ellsbridge House,  
KEYNSHAM, 7.30 p. m.
- 25 ROMAN COIN HOARDS IN THE BRISTOL AREA by M. G.  
Hebditch. Clevedon & District A. S., Community Centre,  
Sunhill Park, CLEVEDON, 7.30 p. m.
- 27 SOMERSET CHURCH TOWERS by P. Pointz-Wright.  
Wells N. H. A. S. The Museum, WELLS, 5.30 p. m. Non-  
members 1s. 6d.
- 27 MEDIEVAL GOLD COINAGE OF BRITAIN by P. J. Seaby.  
S. A. N. H. S. Wyndham Hall, TAUNTON Castle, 2.30 p. m.
- 27-28 ARCHAEOLOGICAL AIR PHOTOGRAPHY, by P. J. Fowler,  
& J. E. Hancock. Non-res. w/e course inc. flying, based  
on WESTON-SUPER-MARE Airfield. University.

Advance Notice:

- April 10 IRON AGE POTTERY: B. A. R. G. COLLOQUIUM, City  
Museum, BRISTOL, 10.00 a. m.
- May 7-9 PALAEOOLITHIC & MESOLITHIC IN BRITAIN. Panel of  
lecturers. W/e course at Rodney Lodge, BRISTOL.  
University.

---

REMEMBER: SUBSCRIPTIONS DUE 1ST JANUARY (BANKERS  
ORDER 1st MARCH)  
PLEASE PAY YOURS PROMPTLY