

barq

BRISTOL ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH GROUP

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

BULLETIN

Contents

Vol. 4 No. 9

December 1973

242	Officers and Committee: Membership
243	Editorial
244	<u>Cadbury Congresbury, Somerset. A Summary Interim Report on Excavations, 1968 and 1970-3</u> , by P. J. Fowler, K. S. Gardner and P. A. Rahtz
250	<u>Square or Long? Some notes on prehistoric houses</u> , by P. Dixon
254	Somerset Windmills
254	RESCUE by Bill Solley
255	New Members List
256	<u>Butcombe</u> by Peter Fowler
255, 256	Book Notes
	<u>Parish Survey Unit</u>
257	Additional abbreviations and sources
258	Brockley Parish by J. M. Pullan
259	Checklist for Brockley
262	<u>From Advertising to Archaeology: a RESCUE Scholarship completed</u> , by M. C. Batt
263	Post-Medieval Pottery Symposium, March 1974
263	<u>Recent Archaeological Accessions in the City Museum, Bristol</u> , by Dr. J. J. Taylor and D. P. Dawson
264	Notice of Annual General Meeting
264	<u>Associate Members</u> , by Stephen Cogbill
265	Reviews
268	Calendar of Forthcoming Courses, Meetings and Lectures

This bulletin is issued in Spring, Autumn and December

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE 1973/4

Chairman: C. Browne, 30 Walden Road, Keynsham, Bristol BS18 1QW
Tel: Keynsham 3116

Hon. Secretary: R. J. Dexter, 9 Weetwood Road, Congresbury, Bristol BS19 5BN
Tel: Yatton 832177

Hon. Membership Secretary: R. G. Jackson, 52 Cote Park, Bristol BS9 2AD
Tel: Bristol 682165

Hon. Secretary for Associate Members: S. Cogbill, 4 Ellbridge Close,
Bristol BS9 1BU

Hon. Treasurer: A. C. Selway, Flat 1, 25 Combe Park, Bath BA1 3NR

Hon. Editor (Bulletin): Joyce Popplewell, 7 Westerleigh Road, Downend,
Bristol BS16 6AD Tel: Bristol 561686

Hon. Editor (Special Publications): N. Thomas, City Museum, Bristol BS8 1RL
Tel: Bristol 299771

Hon. Fieldwork Adviser: M. W. Ponsford, City Museum, Bristol BS8 1RL
Tel: Bristol 299771

Hon. Auditor: R. R. J. A. Nesbitt, 66 Kenilworth Road, Knowle, Solihull, Warwicks.

RESCUE Liaison Officer: T. W. J. Solley, 7 Downfield Close, Alveston,
Bristol BS12 2NJ

COMMITTEE

Elected: D. Bromwich, The Vicarage, Banwell, Weston-s-Mare, Somerset
BS24 6BN (1972)

O. J. Kent, 5 Carnarvon Road, Bristol BS6 7DP (1973)

W. J. Wedlake, Meadgate, Camerton, Bath, Somerset (1972)

Ex Officio: Dr. K. Branigan, Dept. of Classics, The University, Bristol BS8 1RJ
P. J. Fowler, Dept. of Extra Mural Studies, The University,
Bristol BS8 1HR

Dr. J. Taylor, City Museum, Bristol BS8 1RL

Co-opted: Elizabeth Adams, 95A Whiteladies Road, Bristol BS8 2NT
(Co-ordinator, Parish Survey Unit)

Pauline Belsey, Appleacre, Queen Charlton, Keynsham,
Bristol BS18 2SJ. (Co-ordinator, Bulletin Production Team)

MEMBERSHIP

The Annual Subscriptions for the current year is:

£1.00 for members aged 18 or over

£1.50 for husband and wife

£0.25 for Associate Members (aged under 18)

The Subscription is payable on 1st January except for members paying by Bankers Order, who pay on 1st March. Cheques and postal orders should be made payable to Bristol Archaeological Research Group. All subscriptions should be sent to the Hon. Membership Secretary.

EDITORIAL

The final Bulletin in Volume 4 provides a vantage point from which to review recent progress in archaeological reorganisation, and to evaluate its effect on the future of local archaeology in the B.A.R.G. area.

A fundamental decision has been taken at the Department of the Environment, in consultation with C. B.A. and RESCUE, to reorganise, on a regional basis, its response to the demands of rescue archaeology. In addition, the Secretary of State has announced the provision of considerably increased funds for this purpose, and the creation of a new post, that of Under Secretary (Archaeology) in the hierarchy of the D. o. E.

In our own area, C. B.A. Group 13 (South West) has established a new Rescue Archaeology Unit for the three counties of Avon, Gloucestershire and Somerset which seem to be generally acceptable as a suitable 'Regional Unit Area' in the West Country. Peter Fowler and Mike Ponsford are Chairman and Secretary; their unrivalled local knowledge of present needs and future contingencies ensures that maximum advantage will accrue from this potentially more flexible structure. This Committee, formed with D. o. E. encouragement, is intended to formulate policy, submit estimates and handle D. o. E. grants within a regional framework; it is hoped that what could become a very influential body will have a democratic basis with all archaeological interests in the region able to participate, so that no-one need envisage archaeological redundancy.

Disappointingly, formal inauguration of Avon Archaeological Council had to be postponed because of a minor problem of timing; by the end of the year, however, this will be resolved and, we hope, A. A. C. successfully launched.

Our last issue was much concerned with different aspects of our City's history, almost to the extent of becoming a Bristol Bulletin. This time, current research on hillforts is the dominating theme. We are tremendously fortunate to have two major articles with which to close Volume 4. Peter Fowler, Keith Gardner and Philip Rahtz have written many times for Bulletin; never more effectively than in this first interim report of five years' work at Cadbury Congresbury, where solid information and mental stimulation are finely balanced. Philip Dixon's article incorporates his latest interpretations of house plans from Crickley, in the mid-Cotswolds; so that from sites at opposite ends of B. A. R. G. territory and with an impressive time span from the Mesolithic to the Medieval period, we have a rare opportunity to appraise the latest available information at the earliest possible moment.

Articles of this high calibre require an increased allocation of space. Inevitably some curtailment elsewhere has been necessary. 'Notices of Recent and Forthcoming Publications', with great regret, has been held over until the Spring issue.

CADBURY CONGRESBURY, SOMERSET

A Summary Interim Report On Excavations, 1968 and 1970-73

by P. J. Fowler, K. S. Gardner and P. A. Rahtz

INTRODUCTION

Cadbury Hill, Congresbury, lies c 16 km. SW of Bristol, now in North Somerset but, from 1 April, 1974, in the southern part of the new county of Avon (ST442650). The whole of the hill-top is contained within banks and ditches of diverse preservation and some complexity, forming what is conventionally called a 'hill-fort'. Excavation of parts of the site has taken place in three separate stages: minor trial trenching by the Clevedon Archaeological Society in 1959: a preliminary, small area excavation in 1968; and four consecutive seasons, each of 4-5 weeks in 1970-73. The 1968 and 1970-73 work has been carried out under an ad hoc Cadbury Excavation Committee for administrative reasons; essentially the work has been promoted by the School of History, Birmingham University, and the Department of Extra-Mural Studies, Bristol University, operating with the fullest co-operation of the joint Parish Councils of Congresbury and Yatton which together own the western half of the hill where the excavation has been concentrated. Without the practical help of Cadbury Country Club (Mr. T. Joyner) and Mr. and Mrs. **Organ** in providing camping facilities, the work could not have taken place. The main non-University financial support has come from The Maltwood Trust, Bristol City Museum (where the excavated material will probably be deposited) and the Society of Antiquaries of London. Total cash expenditure over the five main excavations has been only c £3000 since practically all the work has been done on a voluntary basis, the main item of expenditure being the hire of plant.

The academic background to the work and the detailed results of the 1959 and 1968 excavations have already been published (Cadbury Congresbury, Somerset: an introductory report, published by and obtainable from the Department of Extra-Mural Studies, Bristol University, (50p)); more popular accounts have appeared in Current Archaeology (1968 and 1970), while further background dealing with the site in both its local and wider aspects is discussed in Fowler (ed.), Archaeology and the Landscape (1972), 187-221.

THE EXCAVATIONS

Apart from the 1959 trenches, a roughly rectangular area of c 1200 sq m has been stripped about halfway along the N side of the hill-fort where it is bisected by a cross-bank. The excavations have now involved c 15% of the hill-fort interior but at the moment we do not know whether this sample is typical. The area produced structural evidence from the pre-Roman Iron Age, the later Roman period, the mid-5th to the mid-6th centuries A. D. and the late/post-medieval period. Artefacts found dated from the Mesolithic (?), the Neolithic, the early and late pre-Roman Iron Age, and the first six centuries of the 1st millenium A. D., with a few from later centuries.

The main phases of activity, however, can be defined as the Neolithic, the pre-Roman Iron Age, and 450-550 A.D.

The method of excavation used since 1968 has been that of area stripping ('open plan') controlled by an increasingly refined recording system designed to produce maximum data.

Prehistoric

All activity earlier than the PRIA was represented only by artefacts. The quantity of flintwork, including flakes, was considerable.

The pre-Roman Iron Age

The northern edge of the excavated area clipped the back of a stone and timber rampart, sealing a buried soil containing fragments of PRIA pottery. Most of the rampart appeared to have fallen away down the steep hill-slope, but a trench excavated down the rock scarp uncovered the massive base of a stone revetment, fronted by a rock-cut ditch. Behind the rear revetment, surviving for only two courses high at most, was a complex of mainly shallow quarries covering more than half of the area excavated. In only a few places could an actual 'occupation level' be defined, always on top of the quarry fill. In one case it lay inside a rectangular timber structure; in another it was associated with a complete saddle quern and rubber in situ. Parts of at least one circular structure, defined by a rock-cut palisade trench, probably belong to this phase. Only one pit occurred (1968 Rpt., p. 18, F30), though the deepest feature on the site was, originally, a hole 2 m deep and 5 m across. In the absence of good stratification and characteristic 'type-fossils', it is difficult to be precise about the chronology of this phase.

Early post-Roman (c 450-550 A.D.)

Two sub-phases could be distinguished within this short period. Their dating depends on that given to imported Mediterranean pottery in western Britain.

Mid/late 5th century

Behind the PRIA rampart a roughly rectangular timber building was put up, a contemporary hearth of Roman roofing tiles lying between it and the rampart back. A similar hearth lay a few metres further east. Immediately east of this were fragmentary remains of some sort of stone structure, the bulk of which was, about this time, cleared away into a large PRIA pit or quarry. This debris was itself revetted, and across its top a low stone bank was built. Probably at the same time, a round object rather like a small tub or sliced tree-trunk was placed against the debris in the pit and a carefully laid stone platform constructed around it.

Late 5th/early 6th centuries

The division between the sub-phases is marked by the construction of a low stone bank or platform, the use of which was mainly during the time when imported pottery was current on the site. This bank was c 30 cms high and

c 3 m wide. Although c 40 m of this bank were excavated, its construction and function are even now uncertain. It seems most likely that it was the base for a (framed?) timber and turf structure or that it was itself merely the low platform behind a front wall of turf. The entrance through it was 5 m wide, the absence of postholes again suggesting that if there was any superstructure there it can only have been timber-framed. Two iron gate-hinge sockets were lying close together in the entrance passage; their scale suggests they supported something akin to a small garden gate.

Behind this entrance to the nucleus of the site were three timber buildings of different size, shape and probably, function. Buildings 1 and 2 have already been published (1968 Rpt.). Building 1, however, was longer than shown in the published plan: further excavation doubled its length. 5 m west of its entrance were several post-pits suggesting that another, probably large, timber building lay west of the edge of the excavation. Immediately to its east was the roughly circular Building 2. Immediately SE of its entrance was another palisade trench for a structure of irregular, though roughly circular, ground plan. This structure may have been physically connected with a stockade which ran across the inside of the 'hill-fort entrance'.

THE EXCAVATED MATERIAL

The quantity of material dated to the later 5th and 6th centuries is, by post-Roman standards, considerable. It includes a wide range of pottery, both locally made and from the East Mediterranean, North Africa, and probably Spain or S.W. France. This includes both amphorae and table-ware. Iron and copper alloy objects are numerous. Hundreds of small pieces of glass, many burnt, were probably all being used as raw material; some pieces of red enamel and crucibles suggest that it was for enamel manufacture; slags indicate too the working of iron and copper alloy on the hill. Food bones occur in quantity and, with the many corn-grinding and other functional stones, will give much information on the economy.

The finds were all carefully plotted in situ and the distribution of each class of material has been shown to be different; the full implications of this have yet to be considered in relation to, for example, the buildings, but for the first time in this country we can suggest different functions for the classes of imported pottery, based on their differential distribution patterns.

DISCUSSION

We now know a lot about the nature of the site and the advantages and disadvantages of our methods of examining it. The essentially straightforward vertical stratigraphy, even where it exists more substantially than as topsoil and subsoil surface, provides many advantages but affords only

tenuous relationships horizontally. Though excavating on rock also has advantages, the nature of the Carboniferous Limestone bedrock presents great problems of technique and interpretation at its interface with overlying material; and of course the fact that this particular bedrock has been utilised for at least 4-5000 years on the site means that the overburden contains millions of stones occurring in random and non-random patterns and relationships. As far as possible, all have been recorded in situ before removal but it is all too clear that we have not yet developed adequate techniques for either recording or interpreting this evidence. The associated problems of dealing with the phenomena of differential weathering on in situ and on moved Carboniferous Limestone are also difficult, though we can demonstrate to our satisfaction that the rate of erosion is sufficient to have produced clearly detectable differences in the last 1500 years. On the geological front too, further complexity on site is afforded by pockets of clay and cave-earth and by veins of minerals. Relatively high quality iron ore is present in significant quantity and may indeed have been a reason for at least some of the quarrying. Furthermore, the geological variety of the surrounding area is reflected by the petrological material on the site, ranging from the ubiquitous 'natural' 'Bristol diamonds' and man-transported Pennant sandstone tile fragments to Conglomerates and Oolitic limestones.

In many ways the most striking feature of the lithic material is the quantity of flint: in 1973 it was the commonest artefactual material recorded. Much is heavily patinated or is struck from patinated parent material. Most is in the form of flakes and other waste material, but the tools and implements represent a wide range from polished axes to micro-burins. We have suspected a Palaeolithic element (1968 Rpt.) and a Mesolithic tradition, though most of the material is either Neolithic or Neolithic/Bronze Age in type. Though we do not doubt that the last is the correct ascription for most of the flint, its repeated occurrence in quantity in PRIA and post-Roman contexts has led to some thought about the use of flint in later times.

If our interpretation of timber structure in the PRIA rampart is correct, the evidence is helpful not only on this site but also in attempting to understand Dolebury and Worlebury whose huge ramparts have always prompted thoughts of internal timbering. At Cadbury we seem to have horizontal timbers appearing through the rear revetment at right angles to the long axis of the rampart, and the disposition of the rubble in the rampart strongly suggested an original arrangement of timber-framed 'boxes' subsequently filled with stone. The collapse of the rampart down the hill, however, and the small scale of our excavation on this particular structure, invites caution in taking the interpretation too far. Otherwise, the PRIA structural and cultural evidence is so far archaeologically 'dull', if we dare be so subjective, though there are many hints of its potential e. g. parts of apparently circular and rectangular structures, the almost ubiquitous quarrying and the relative richness of the very late PRIA finds.

Though the Roman pottery now amounts to hundreds of sherds and other Roman material totals thousands of separate items (mainly Pennant roof and floor tiles), we see no occupation in the area we have excavated during the Roman period. Sources of the material may of course lie just outside the excavated area, and we have by no means ruled out the possibility of activity on the hill-top between the 1st and 4th centuries A. D. We certainly suspect a link with the Romano-Celtic temple site 300 m ENE in Henley Wood and would guess that much of the Roman material, especially the tiles, came from there in the 5th century. The one structure in our excavation which, in some form probably existed before 500 A. D. is also the most difficult to describe and the most controversial in interpretation. This is the large rock-cut pit or quarry, immediately behind the PRIA rampart, and its associated, if anomalous, features. The main fill of this pit was certainly deliberate, after initial silting probably in late pre-Roman times, and consisted of a mass of stones still pitched with air pockets between them. This material contained only late Roman pottery and three weathered pieces of human skull. The source of this material was, without much doubt, the rock shelf immediately above and to the west, where, tantalisingly, were indeed the slight remains of the base of what appeared to be some sort of rectangular structure. It had been cut by an (early?) 6th century ditch; hence the uncertainty.

While the association with skull fragments may be fortuitous, the complete absence of any other human skeletal material from the excavations is probably significant. We are therefore inclined to interpret this evidence as indicating some form of (open air?) pagan shrine involving the display of human heads and the deposit of offerings in pottery vessels in the late-Roman period. Improbable though this may sound, the cult of the head is of course a well-attested trait in the pre-Roman Celtic world and a revival of pagan practices, particularly on hill-tops, is a feature of late-Roman times in southern Britain. The background for our suggestion is clear; it is only its form which is doubtful.

Whatever was on that rock shelf, it was deliberately destroyed, and pushed into the large hole in front of it. But - and here we move into more controversial interpretation and into the mid-5th century - the destruction was controlled: one side of the pit was revetted to contain the debris; in the pit and against the debris, stood something which was c 1 m round, in plan and around this 'thing' further stones were packed to be finished off with a horizontal surface of selected fist-sized stones. A turf subsequently developed on this surface but it contained no 'finds'. In contrast, the break in the surface and the hole beneath it created by the decomposition of the 'thing' contained a remarkable collection of bits and pieces, almost completely representative of the surviving material culture of the 5th/6th century on the site. We are of course puzzled by these phenomena but, as the favoured interpretation of several

at the moment, we suggest that the religious function of this area continued after the destruction of the 'skull structure' in the form of a timber base for something at the foot of which little offerings were placed. A parallel may be seen in the rural niches and grottoes, often marked by a small cross or image of the Virgin, characteristic of Roman Catholic countries today; such places also contain in their trinkets and bits and pieces, a representative selection of small personal offerings typical of present-day 'peasant material culture'.

If our evidence in fact represents anything at all like this, it could be that the 'thing' so carefully placed in the large pit when the 'skull structure' was destroyed was no more than part of a tree trunk, sliced horizontally to provide a flat surface on which to place an image and offerings. Such a piece of wood could also have acted as the base (the mortice?) for something standing upright - a post or even a cross? We can never prove this, or indeed the other suggestions, but we obviously favour a religious interpretation of the evidence. We also wonder whether that evidence is not indicative of what happened in this particular rural context when Christianity replaced the local pagan cult(s). In Henley Wood, different evidence from the cemetery indicates the same process, possibly the same event.

Merely to say that, however, begs the question of function of this re-used hill-top. To us, it is quite extraordinary, not to say stimulating, to have devoted our best attentions during nearly 5 months of excavation spread over 6 years to this particular site and still to be in the position where we do not know what it is that we are excavating. There is no single crucial piece of evidence, nor a significant accumulation of evidence, to persuade us that the site overall is either secular or religious, let alone what its nature was within those basic categories. It could be a monastery, or a centre of political and/or military power on the 'Camelot' model; and we have suggested other alternatives elsewhere. But the fact is that we do not know; partly, we suspect, because in archaeological terms we are looking at a 'new' phenomenon, certainly one which is difficult to parallel, and therefore to recognise archaeologically, and partly because we have not excavated enough of what is obviously a complex and varied site. We shall be taking stock in 1974-5, hoping to prepare for publication the mass of evidence accumulated during 1970-3 - its meaning should become clearer in the process. We plan to start excavating again in 1976 on our second 4 year campaign, hopefully right on the hill-top where trees now stand. It is not just a hunch that that area is where the answers lie: a great deal of our excavated evidence points unequivocally in that direction and clearly, so far, we have only been examining the fringes of the site's nucleus. In retrospect, we suspect we shall not regret this: we are, after all, only just beginning to understand how to excavate the site.

SQUARE OR LONG? NOTES ON SOME PREHISTORIC HOUSES

P. Dixon

The results of the excavations so far carried out in the interior of the hillfort at Crickley Hill, Gloucestershire, have been presented in summary form (Dixon 1972a). The purpose of this note is to treat in outline the problem of reconstructing timber houses and to place in a wider context house plans which have some significance in the later prehistory of the region.

In excavations the survival of timbers depends on special site conditions, generally waterlogging and peat formation. For most prehistoric houses evidence is derived from postholes and trenches; traces of buildings constructed of timbers framed on sill beams on the ground may be slight, perhaps recognised solely by the position of stones kicked up against them or by differences in the amount of occupation debris or traffic wear (for examples see Barker 1969). There are two dangers here: without postholes a house, however large its floor area, may be considered 'the frailest of structures' (Williams 1946, 53), or may not be noticed at all: this despite the fact that a large medieval timber-framed hall could leave for the archaeologist nothing more than patches of flooring. As a result a house typology based on traces of earth-fast posts may be seriously distorted.

Sensible reconstruction of posthole structures is also difficult, even after overcoming the preliminary problems of sorting out individual structures from what is frequently a jumble of holes of different dates and functions, a problem which has recently been clearly demonstrated from the example of Thorny Down (Musson 1970, 267). If it is assumed that the structure above the ground was rationally built - that it did not in fact collapse through inherent weaknesses in its construction - a number of possible interpretations of posthole plan would be immediately eliminated. But recorded collapses of buildings in classical, medieval and modern times may suggest that the assumption is not self-evident. Interpretation here depends to a great extent on a generally unspoken assessment of the level of technology in a society, for sophisticated joinery allows the erection of lofty and complicated structures on a simple base. Should the simplest possible reconstruction be the best? Notched poles and simple lashings comparable to those found in modern undeveloped societies are a frequent stock-in-trade of reconstructors: the invocation of ethnographic 'parallels' may serve to clear the ground of preconceptions about what building methods are appropriate to a primitive community, but what allows one to judge whether the 'parallel' is relevant? Many factors which have a bearing on building - availability of long timber, attitudes to the needs of protection against the climate, traditions developed and made sophisticated among a possible class of professional house-builders,

variations in social status (which structure was thought suitable for which class? Compare Hamilton 1968, 71-4) - can rarely be elucidated by the archaeological investigation of a culture.

A reconstruction must therefore never be considered certain: like any hypothesis the preferred interpretation or interpretations are those which do least violence to the evidence. Clues to the superstructure may be provided by increased depth of certain postholes (for this in practice see Beex 1968, 112); traces of walling material allow conclusions about the structural strength of the walls; the effective area of a house may be indicated by the position of wear on the ground surface, evidence which may permit some valuable re-interpretations (Musson 1970, 268-70), or by the position of what are taken to be rainwater gullies beyond the position of the walls.

The problem of reconstruction at Crickley is two-fold, for, in addition to the objections that can be made to any interpretations of superstructure, even the ground plan of individual houses cannot be considered as established beyond doubt. Before the excavations small square houses associated with the timber-laced defences were predicted at Crickley (Stanford 1971, 50). The postholes of this phase did indeed lie in pairs, and in the majority of cases each pair could be matched by a second pair to form a four-post structure. But this does not show that these small square structures were individual houses, as was asserted at a recent conference, for the gaps between each square 'house' exactly match the size of the 'houses'. Without any preconceptions of 'square-ness' the postholes would be seen as lying in five groups of eight, twelve, twelve, eighteen and twenty posts, each group forming two parallel rows. Between groups lay gaps and differences in alignment very much greater than within each group. If these were square houses, then they formed separate terraces; there was no evidence of variation in wear between the individual 'houses' and the space between them, and the difference between a contiguous row of small square houses and a single long structure would lie only in the possession by the latter of a continuous roofline. It was objected that the rows of postholes were insufficiently well aligned to carry the members of a continuous roof, and this is certainly true of square houses interpreted at Credenhill, where the variation between hut size and the spaces between huts is marked (Stanford 1970, 101-5), or at Danebury, where the misalignment of individual huts in the rows is extreme, but to assert this at Crickley is to ignore a large body of evidence from the houses of the Bronze Age and Iron Age on the Continent.

The greatest misalignment of a posthole centre at Crickley is about 65 cms., a similar distortion to that shown for example by the aisle posts of a Bronze Age four-aisled hallhouse at Nijnsel in North Brabant (Beex 1968, 123). The two largest of the Crickley groups show 'wobbles'

in alignment, matched at Elp (Waterbolk 1964, esp. houses 2 and 3) or Deventer (Modderman 1955, 29), and a reconstruction of the upperworks of such a house, with explanations for the distortion, has been proposed by Soudsky for the large, four-aisled Linearbandkeramik house at Postoloprty (Soudsky 1969, 8, 31).

The Continental examples do not merely show that the misalignments at Crickley are not unusual. Differential traffic wear outlining part of the wall line of Houses 1 and 2, and additional postholes beyond the main posts of House 5 suggest that the posthole lines represent the aisle posts of the houses, with the walls framed upon sill beams (Dixon 1972b, 6 and Fig. 7). The buildings at Crickley should thus be seen as three-aisled halls, varying in length from 8 m (26 feet) to 24 m (80 feet), and in width from about 6.5 m to 7.5 m (21 to 25 feet). It would be no surprise to find such structures on the continent of Europe (see in general Zippelius, 1953): Middle Bronze Age houses similar in scale to those at Crickley have been excavated at Elp, with radiocarbon dates from 1280 \pm 80 B. C. to 805 \pm 65 B. C. (Waterbolk 1964), Deventer, with dates of 1110 \pm 70 B. C. and 1180 \pm 70 B. C. (Modderman 1955: cf. Waterbolk 1964, 115), and as four-aisled houses at Nijnsel (1140 \pm 75 B. C.) and Dodewaard (Beex, 1968); the tradition continues through the Late Bronze Age with excavated examples at Grontoft and Ristoft (Becker 1968, 87) and Spjald (Becker 1972, Taf. 2) into the Iron Age at Beaufort and Boomborg-Hatzum (Jankhun 1969, 63-5), Goldberg (Zippelius 1953, 22), on the Marne (Rowlett 1970), or at Ezinge (Van Giffen 1936), and continued developing in Northwest Europe during the first millenium A. D. (Trier 1969; Van Es 1967, esp. 388-90). Phase 2 of the Crickley defences is stratified between Beaker pottery and the angular white-infill pottery which is generally attributed to the earliest Iron Age. The longhouse pottery so far recovered is, because of its poor quality, difficult to parallel. If the suggested derivation of the three-aisled from the four-aisled house is accepted (Beex, 1968, 128) the house types on present evidence would fit any date after the middle of the second millenium. Until absolute dates are available Dr. Stanford's suggested date of the seventh century B. C. for Crickley rampart phase 2 is not unreasonable.

More important is the implication of aisled hallhouses on this side of the Channel. The roundhouse tradition in Britain has been advanced as a measure of insularity (Hodson 1964, 103) and the occurrence of roundhouses on the Continent has been seen as a result of immigration from this country (Beex 1968, 128); examples of pre-Roman aisled houses in Britain are disputable, such as those at Park Brow (Wolseley *et al.* 1927), Ffridd Faldwyn (O'Neil 1942) or Dinorben (Gardner and Savory 1964), and Richmond could trace no satisfactory native ancestry for the Romano-British basilical houses (Richmond 1932). The houses at Crickley do not provide this ancestry,

nor do they prove the occurrence of an invasion from the Marne or the Netherlands, but they show that British insularity has been over-emphasized and suggest that future excavations may disturb the accepted typology of late prehistoric housing in this country (compare Harding 1972, 32-5). Small square houses, frequently referred to on the continent as 'sheds' and relegated to ancillary use, are present in quantity - not all, as was once considered, as granaries (Stanford 1970, 108-13, 125-6). Similar square buildings are found as houses on the continent, at Buchau (Reinerth 1928: c. 1100 B. C.), in the Lausitz culture at Baalshebbel (Schuchhardt 1926), or at the end of the Bronze Age at Dampierre-sur-le-Doubs (Petrequin, 1969). The aisled halls are typically farmhouses - many preserve traces of the stalls at the byre ends; the square structures best attested as houses, with hearths, come from hillfort excavations. It is worth considering whether the prolonged concentration of attention on the results of a comparatively small number of hillforts is tending to present as typical of housing small buildings of specialised function laid out, like those of the fortified settlement of Biskupin (Piggott 1965; plate 35), in regimented rows.

REFERENCES

- BARKER, P., 1969; 'Some Aspects of the Excavation of Timber Buildings' World Archaeology I
- BECKER, C. J., 1968: 'Bronzealderhuse i Vestjylland' Nationalmuseets Arbejdsmark 1968
- BECKER, C. J., 1972: in Bonner Hefte zur Vorgeschichte 3
- BEEK, G. and HULST, R. S., 1968: 'A Hilversum-Culture Settlement near Nijnsel ...' Berichten R. O. B. 18
- DIXON, P. W., 1972a: 'Roundhouse and Longhouse at Crickley Hill' Antiquity (Vol. XLVI no. 181) 49-52
- DIXON, P. W., 1972b: Crickley Hill, 4th Interim Report
- ES, W. A. van, 1967: Wijster (Palaeohistoria xi)
- GARDNER, W., and SAVORY, H. N., 1964: Dinorben
- GIFFEN, A. E. van, 1936: 'Das Warf in Ezinge ...' Germania 20
- HAMILTON, J. R. C., 1968: Excavations at Clickhimin, Shetland
- HARDING, D. W., 1972: The Iron Age in the Upper Thames Basin
- HODSON, F. R., 1964: 'Cultural Grouping within the British pre-Roman Iron Age', Proc. Preh. Soc. 30
- JANKUHN, H., 1969: Vor-und Frühgeschichte
- MODDERMAN, P. J. R., 1955: 'Woonsporen uit de Bronstijd en de Ijzertijd op de Margijnen Enk onder Deventer' Berichten R. O. B. 6
- MUSSON, C., 1970: 'House-plans and Prehistory' Current Archaeology 21
- O'NEIL, B. H. St. J., 1942: 'Excavations at Ffridd Faldwyn Camp' Arch. Camb. 97
- PETREQUIN, P., et. al., 1969: 'Habitat et Sepultures de l'age du Bronze Final a Dampierre-sur-le-Doubs' Gallia Prehistoire 12

- PIGGOTT, S., 1965: Ancient Europe
- REINERTH, H., 1928: Die Wasserburg Buchau
- RICHMOND, I. A., 1932: 'The Irish Analogies for the Romano-British Barn Dwellings' Jour. Roman Studies 22
- ROWLETT, R. M., et al., 1970: 'A rectangular Early La Tène Marnian House at Chassemy (Aisne)' World Archaeology I
- SCHUCHHARDT, C., 1926: Praeh. Zeitsch. 17
- SOUDSKY, B., 1969: 'Etude de la Maison Neolithique' Slovenska Archaeologia 17
- STANFORD, S. C., 1970: 'Credenhill Camp...' Arch. Journ. 127
- STANFORD, S. C., 1971: 'Invention, Adoption and Imposition' in The Iron Age and its Hillforts, ed. D. Hill and M. Jesson
- TRIER, B., 1969: Das Haus im Nordwesten der Germania Libera
- WATERBOLK, H. T., 1964: 'The Bronze Age Settlement of Elp' Helinium 4
- WILLIAMS, A., 1946: 'Excavations at Langford Downs, Oxon...' Oxoniensia 11/12
- WOLSELEY, G. R., et al., 1927: 'Prehistoric and Roman Settlements on Park Brow' Arch. 76
- ZIPPELIUS, A., 1953: 'Das Vormittelalterliche dreischiffige Hallenhaus in Mitteleuropa' Bonner Jahrb. 153.

SOMERSET WINDMILLS

B.A.R.G. member Godfrey Shove, one of our speakers at this year's Annual Symposium, is making a survey of Somerset windmill sites. He will be glad to hear of any windmill or field references such as Mill Moot, -Mead, -Shard, -Acre, or -Tining, which are quite certainly unassociated with watermills. Mr. Shove's address is The Windmill, Windmill Hill, Hutton, nr. Weston-super-Mare, Somerset.

RESCUE

In response to a request from RESCUE a shortlist of threatened sites was sent to them during the summer. A R. B. site in the Thornbury area demands constant attention at weekends and is producing a number of interesting small finds. Assistance would be welcome. The site is not pin-pointed for you-know-why reasons, but please contact me if you wish to help.

Bill Solley, RESCUE Liaison Officer

NEW MEMBERS LIST

Once again we are delighted to welcome a number of new members. This Bulletin may well be their first formal contact with B.A.R.G., so our Hon. Sec. has supplied a brief outline of our aims and activities on the leaflet, p. ii.

- * ADAMSON, Miss D., 1 Bradley Crescent, Shirehampton, Bristol BS11 9SP
- * ADEY, Miss S., 29 Davids Close, Alveston, Bristol BS12 2LR
- * AVENT, S.R., 67 Kings Drive, Hanham, Bristol BS15 3JJ
- BAYLEY, Miss R.L., 10 Brecon Road, Bristol BS9 4DS
- * BUCKINGHAM, Miss W., 4 Cedarhurst Road, Redcliffe Bay, Portishead,
 Bristol BS20 8HG
- BURROWS, Miss L., 29 Meridian Place, Clifton, Bristol 8
- * DAY, Miss C., 5 Cottle Gardens, Stockwood, Bristol BS14 8QS
- DAY, Mrs. J.M., Hunter's Hill, Oakfield Road, Keynsham, Bristol BS18 1JQ
- * GASCOIGNE, R.I., 40 Church Road, Stoke Bishop, Bristol BS9 1QT
- * HAYES, M., 47 Trelawney Road, Cotham, Bristol BS6 6DY
- * KEMP, R., 208 Cranbrook Road, Bristol BS6 7QT
- KIDGER-PRESTON, K., 18 The Limes, Wellington Place, Frenchay, Bristol
- MANDER, D.C., 34a Stoke Hill, Bristol BS9 1LG
- MONSELL, C.N., 110 Newbridge Hill, Bath BA1 3QB
- * NAGEL, Miss H., 5 Eastwood Road St. Annes, Bristol BS4 4RN
- NEWTON, Mrs. C.F., 10 Melita Road, St. Andrews Park, Bristol BS6 5AZ
- NICHOLLS, Mr. and Mrs. P., 7 Brookdale Road, Headley Park, Bristol
 BS13 7PZ
- * POLLARD, R., 14 Westway, Nailsee, Bristol
- * POPE, R., 51 Eastlyn Road, Bedminster Down, Bristol BS13 7HZ
- * RUCZ, S., 27 Burghill Road, Westbury-on-Trym, Bristol
- * ROBINSON, Miss C., 26 Hengrove Avenue, Bristol BS14 9TB
- RUMBALL, Miss S., 30 Old Newbridge Hill, Bath BA1 3LU
- SCOTT, I., 5 College Fields, Clifton, Bristol 8.
- SMYTH, Miss P., 65 Cotham Hill, Redland, Bristol BS6 6JR
- * WEDLOCK, T.J., Bali-Hi, Tickenham Hill, Tickenham, Clevedon, Somerset

- * - Associate Member

BOOK NOTES: L. V. Grinsell has an article 'A Viking Burial in a stone coffin in Bath', about to appear in Notes and Queries for Somerset and Dorset; also, an essay, 'Witchcraft at some Prehistoric Sites', in a collection The Witch Figure, for Dr. K. M. Briggs' 75th birthday. The essay includes references to sites on Mendip, among many others. A reprint of Ancient Burial Mounds of England, with a new introduction and bibliography 1953-73, is expected shortly.

Joan Day, Bristol Brass. The History of the Industry (David and Charles) 1973 £4.75. We are delighted to note a first book by Mrs. Day, a new member of B.A.R.G., Secretary of B.I.A.S.; we wish it every success.

EXCAVATIONS AT WESTMEAD, ROW OF ASHES FARM, BUTCOMBE, 1972-4.

The 7th and 8th fortnights of excavation at this Romano-British farm have been mainly concerned with disentangling a very complex area of stone-based structures in the NE corner of the site, where earlier levels, presumably prehistoric and 1st/2nd century A.D., have not yet been examined. A large, trapezoidal structure, possibly a stone-based timber building (barn?) is later than the unexcavated stone structures but earlier than a previously unknown entrance to the surrounding stone-walled enclosure which dates from the general reorganisation of the settlement c 270 A.D. A large, circular, rock-cut depression c 1.5 m deep, perhaps a quarry or possibly a pond, partly underlay the N wall of the trapezoidal structure. Its filling contained a stratified sequence from mid-1st century to late Roman: a valuable key to the pottery from the rest of the site, and indeed, elsewhere in the area.

Further evidence about the two known Iron Age levels comes from another circular palisaded structure, part-located only c 3m E of the round house already published, apparently contemporary with it early in the PRIA. Later, perhaps technically just in the Roman period, more evidence of metal-working includes a clay-lined bowl-hearth containing a small iron-bloom, and a long, thin channel leading into a rock-cut pit with quantities of pottery and slags, amongst which was a burnt clay object, possibly part of a tuyère (blast pipe). The site as a whole has now produced a representative sample of material, both for the PRIA and the Roman period; from late in the former and early in the latter comes a fine series of brooches, but otherwise most of the 'finds' are 'typical RB'. Interestingly, although the prehistoric pottery remains to be classified, probably over 90% of the RB pottery from recent seasons is covered by the type fabric series published in 1968.

The excavation will continue for the 9th fortnight from Sat. 25th May-Sat. 8th June, 1974. It is perhaps worth stressing that it is conducted as a training excavation by the Extra-Mural Dept. and that anyone is welcome, as beginner, as volunteer, as pot-washer or as experienced assistant. Hundreds of people have passed through Row of Ashes Farm since 1966; I think most have survived.

Peter Fowler

'Butcombe Fortnight' is now a well-established feature of B.A.R.G.'s yearly programme. Many members incorporate at least one week into their annual holiday plans, finding that the highly professional tuition given in such congenial surroundings make it a rewarding and enjoyable experience. New members wishing to enrol should apply to P. J. Fowler, Dept. of Extra-Mural Studies, 32 Tyndall's Park Road, Bristol BS8 1HR.

PARISH CHECKLISTS An up-to-date model Layout and Abbreviations has been compiled by Frances Neale and is available from Elizabeth Adams, 95A Whiteladies Road, Bristol BS8 2NT.

PARISH CHECKLISTS

ABBREVIATIONS AND SOURCES

In addition to those listed in previous Bulletins:

General

IA	Iron Age
M, m	Map, map
man	manor, manorial
psh	parish
RB	Romano-British
S	Somerset

Sources

BAO	Bristol Archives Office
BE(NSB)	Pevsner, N., Buildings of England: North Somerset & Bristol, 1958
BWC	Bristol Waterworks Company, information from
CJ	Collinson, J., History of Somerset, 1791
D&M(1782)	Day & Masters, Map of Somerset, 1782
DPD	Dawson, D. P., Archaeology of Somerset, 1931
GBJ(P)	Greenhill, B. J., personal information and MSS including etching of Brockley Academy c.1808; Bristol Mirror advertisements for same, 1827 and 1841
MC(1708)	"A map of the Mannor of Chelvey & Midgell in the County of Summerset", 1708, in possession of Mr. B. J. Greenhill of Nailsea; copies with Mr. H. R. Wyatt of Chelvey and SRO
MW(1738/9)	Map of Manor of Wrington by J. Rocque 1738-39. BAO 22160(1-3)
NF	Neale, F., ed., Wrington Village Records, 1969
PC	Pooley, C., Old Stone Crosses of Somerset, 1877
RJ	Rutter, J., Delineations of North-West Somerset, 1829
SRO	Somerset Record Office
UBSS	University of Bristol Spelaeological Society, Proceedings
VCH(S)	Victoria County History of Somerset, vols. 1 & 2, 1906 & 1911
WI(FN:)	Women's Institute Fieldname Survey, with Parish and date

Brockley Parish Checklist

All National Grid References (NGR) within Brockley are prefixed ST, and these letters have been omitted to save space.

BRO	Brockley
C	Chelvey
WI(FN:BRO)1970	Women's Institute Fieldname Survey of Brockley, 1970

BROCKLEY : INTRODUCTION

The present parish of Brockley was formed by combining the former manors of Brockley and Chelvey, together with the smaller estate of Midgell. There is no recognisable village, but there are two 13th century churches, one at Brockley and one at Chelvey.

A large area of woodland occupies the higher southern side of the parish, most of the remainder being in pasture as it slopes down towards the small River Kenn. The "very fine romantick glen called Brockley-Combe" is a steep-sided, thickly wooded gorge running down from the higher land to Downside towards the open country below the 150 foot contour. There is no surface water above this level, but the lower land has ample supplies of water in springs, ponds and small streams. Below the abrupt edge of the rocky woodland is a gently sloping area of good deep soil where the sites are noticeably concentrated. Today there are five farms and a few scattered cottages for agricultural workers, with a similar number of private houses of recent date. As "an area of outstanding natural beauty" it is not at present threatened by any new development.

Domesday Book records the existence of three Saxon estates and their owners. In the time of King Edward (the Confessor), "Torchil held Calviche", "Almar held Megele" and "Eldred held Brochelic". Chelvey eventually passed to the Tynte family who lived at Chelvey Court from 1629 to the end of the 18th century. Midghill went to the Bishop of Coutances after 1066, but later became part of Chelvey Manor; more recently it has once again become an independent estate. Brockley Manor was purchased by Thomas Pigott in the 17th century. He married the widow of Thomas Smyth of Long Ashton; the Smyth-Pigott family developed the estate with its Deer Park, a bowling green hidden in the woods, and built Brockley Hall to replace Brockley Court as the family residence.

The ancient manorial boundaries of Chelvey emphasise its layout as a long narrow strip, comprising a little of every type of ground from hilltop to river frontage. The Manor of Brockley has a similar though more irregular shape. Midgell would seem from its shape to have been carved out of Brockley - presumably before 1066 - and to have usurped most of Brockley's share of riverside lands. Whereas most of the settlements in this area are strung along the foothills, and the road and spring lines associated with them, Midgell and Chelvey are distinguished because they combine deliberate situation on slight, isolated rises in the ground close to the river, with a very early documented existence; and since the 11th century have, it would seem, changed little either in size or nature as, basically, single farmsteads.

J. M. Pullan

BROCKLEY PARISH CHECKLIST

Site	NGR	Extant	Sources
<u>BOUNDARY & OTHER MARKERS</u>			
<u>BOUNDARY STONES</u>			
Brockley psh/man by	46706660	no	OS 6" 1932
ditto	46826640	no	OS 6" 1932
ditto	46956628	no	OS 6" 1932
Lady Tynte's estate by No.4	48146701	no	MC(1708); OS 25" 1903
ditto No. 5	48146694	no	MC(1708); OS 25" 1903
ditto No. 9	48056678	yes	MC(1708)
ditto No.11	47086703	yes	MC(1708)
<u>CAVES & POTHOLES</u>			
Pot's Hole: ancient psh by mark	48406627	yes	(MW(1738/9); NF 107; OS 6" 1932
<u>STONES</u>			
Stone, corner of Chelvey Pumping Station building	46386795	yes	OS 6" 1932
<u>TREES</u>			
Brockley Elm	46916738	yes	OS 6" 1932
<u>BUILDINGS, DOMESTIC</u>			
<u>LESSER</u>			
Brockley Rectory	46806671	yes	OS 6" 1932; TA(BRO)1845
Chelvey Rectory	46636831	yes	OS 6" 1932
Chelvey Street, cottages	46906795	no	Vbl (J.M.Pullan)
Cottage, Brockley Combe	-	no	CJ 2 120; RJ34
Keeper's Cottage, Brockley Park (site and remains)	47206620	no	OS 6" 1932; Obs; RJ 31
Manor Cottage	47436687	yes	OS 6" 1932
Piggots Cottage or The Elephant House	47596710	yes	BE(NSB)147
Upper Cottage, Chelvey Batch	47906731	yes	OS 6" 1932
<u>MAJOR</u>			
Brockley Hall	47156693	yes	BE(NSB)147; RJ 25-30
<u>MANOR</u>			
Brockley Court (see also Brockley Court Farm)	46606700	yes	BE(NSB)147
Chelvey Court	46556840	yes	BE(NSB)156; CJ 2 317; MC(1708); RJ 22,74
<u>BUILDINGS, OTHER</u>			
<u>ECCLESIASTICAL</u>			
ch X(BRO), St.Nicholas	46586698	yes	BE(NSB)146; CJ 2 121; RJ 32-33
ch X(C), St.Bridget	46606838	yes	BE(NSB)155-6; CJ 2 318; RJ 22,23

Site	NGR	Extant	Sources
<u>BUILDINGS, OTHER (cont'd)</u>			
<u>FARMS AND BARNS</u>			
Brockley Cottage fo Home Farm or Durbands	47606706	yes	BE(NSB)147; MC(1708)
Brockley Court Farm, ?fo man ho behind Brockley Court, q.v.	46606702	yes	OS 6" 1932
Brockley Elm Farm	46936733	yes	OS 6" 1932
Burnt House Farm	47506798	yes	OS 6" 1932
Chelvey Court: barn	46586834	yes	BE(NSB)156
Chelvey Farm	48366768	yes	MC(1708)
Manor Farm, Brockley	47086713	yes	OS 6" 1932
Midgell Farm	46136800	yes	OS 6" 1932
Upper Farm, Brockley	47726720	yes	TA(BRO)1845
Upper Farm, Chelvey	47686757	no	MC(1708); Obs
<u>INSTITUTIONAL</u>			
Brockley Academy (now Brockley Elm Farm, q.v.)	46936733	no	GBJ(P); GM(1808); VCH(S)1 360
Poor House, site and remains	47976791	no	Obs; TA(C)1839
<u>MISCELLANEOUS</u>			
Stone wall footings, ?RB (Brockley Academy/Elm Farm site; <u>see also</u> Surface Finds)	46966733	yes	Obs
<u>COMMUNICATIONS</u>			
<u>MILESTONES & SIGNS ETC.</u>			
Milestone, Weston Road	47786750	yes	OS 6" 1932
<u>ROADS</u>			
Chelvey Batch: pre turnpike road	47956775	to yes	DC(76); D&M(1782); OS 6" 1932;
	47474493		TA(BRO)1845
Pit Lane (man/psb by)	48206785	yes	OS 6" 1932
disused stretch, now cropmark	47906790	no	MC(1708): Obs
<u>SUBWAYS</u>			
Brockley Hall estate; Hall to gardens	47206700	yes	Obs
ditto: Hall to Park & Bowling Green	47696670	yes	Obs
<u>FIELDS</u>			
<u>LYNCHETS</u>			
? lynchets	475673 x		
	477675	yes	Obs
<u>NAMES</u>			
Barrows	46406720	yes	TA(BRO)1845
Burnt House Eight Acres	46106730	yes	WI(FN: BRO)1970; TA(BRO)1845
Cattenhays	46756800	yes	TA(BRO)1845
Moundrill Orchard	47606695	yes	TA(BRO)1845

Site	NGR	Extant	Sources
<u>FIELDS (cont'd)</u>			
New Ditch	47006790	yes	TA(BRO)1845
Old House	47806795	yes	MC(1708)
Pit Field	47806780	yes	MC(1708)
Yadley Pit Coppice	46954770	yes	TA(BRO)1845
<u>OPEN FIELD SYSTEMS</u>			
Remains of strip system layout, with fieldnames inc. Brockley Field, Binley	c.472674 479679	x yes	OS 6" 1932; MC(1708); TA(BRO)1845
Chelvey Batch?	48156730	yes	MC(1708); TA(C)1839
Midgell: remains of strip system layout with fieldnames inc. Barking Furlong	c.454675 464678	x yes	TA(C)1839
West Field	46706750	yes	TA(BRO)1845
<u>INDUSTRIAL</u>			
<u>BRICKYARDS</u>			
Site, remains, fieldnames	46856785	no	Obs; OS 6" 1932
<u>LIMEKILNS</u>			
Limekiln, remains of	48066744	yes	Obs
<u>MILLS, WIND</u>			
Stone windmill	47306608	yes	OS 6" 1932; RJ 31
Windmill, 1528	-	no	CJ 2 121
<u>MINES AND WORKINGS</u>			
Mineshaft	47286637	yes	Obs
<u>QUARRIES (STONE)</u>			
Brockley Combe	47836660	yes	OS 6" 1932
Brockley Woods	48006718	yes	OS 6" 1932
Brockley Woods	48106710	yes	OS 6" 1932
<u>PARKS AND WARRENS</u>			
Brockley Deer Park	47006640	yes	OS 6" 1932; RJ31; VCH(S)2,570
Chelvey Park	-	no	CJ2,317
Chelvey Swannery	-	no	CJ2,317
Chelvey Warren	-	no	CJ2,317
<u>SETTLEMENTS AND ASSOCIATED FEATURES</u>			
<u>CAVES, POTHOLE & ROCKSHELTERS</u>			
Yorkhouse Cave alias Hermit's Cave	47736662	yes	OS 6" 1932; RJ 33; UBSS 5 (1938)57
<u>HILL-FORTS & RELATED EARTHWORKS</u>			
Tap's Combe Camp	47806710	yes	DPD 254; UBSS 2(1923)279-282
<u>PIGEONHOUSES</u>			
Dovehouse 1528	-	no	CJ 2 121
<u>POUNDS</u>			
Brockley Pound	47656723	yes	TA(BRO)1845

Site	NGR	Extant	Sources
<u>WATER SUPPLIES</u>			
<u>PONDS</u>			
Brockley Hall, near; manmade	47346680	yes	OS 6" 1932
Pool Paddock	47656718	yes	OS 6" 1932; TA(BRO)1845
<u>PUMPING STATION</u>			
Chelvey 1867, with 1923 steam engine <u>in situ</u>	46386795	yes	BWC(information); OS 6" 1932
<u>WELLS</u>			
Upper Farm, Brockley: "well" is vaulted stone under ground water cistern	47726720	yes	TA(BRO)1845
<u>MISCELLANEOUS</u>			
<u>BOWLING GREENS</u>			
Brockley Park	47156625	yes	OS 6" 1932
Churchyard Crosses, Chelvey	46626835	yes	PC 168
<u>SURFACE FINDS</u>			
Coins, Roman (Brockley Academy/ Elm Farm site)	46936733	?	VCH(S)1,360
Gravestone, uninscribed, (Brockley Elm Farm orchard)	46966739	yes	Obs

FROM ADVERTISING TO ARCHAEOLOGY: A RESCUE SCHOLARSHIP COMPLETED

At the end of August I completed eight months of varied archaeological assignments, provided under the auspices of the Rob Walker RESCUE scholarship.

I started the year by executing a study of the archaeological implications of development in Axbridge, Somerset; this provided a good opportunity to observe a local authority planning department. In March I started a series of work periods on excavations at Lincoln and Dover; later in Somerset, Oxfordshire, Berkshire and Northampton. This broad range of urban and rural excavation experience was supplemented by non-excavational work during an attachment to the County Planning Department of Essex and the Field Department of Oxford City and County Museum. In all these situations I was able to assess the methods used, and to gain skills in administration and liaison, whilst obtaining a varied series of 'exposures' to rescue situations.

Before taking up the Scholarship I had been involved in some parish survey work, watching on the M5 motorway and recording vernacular architecture, all on an amateur basis. The Scholarship has been an ideal transition from a non-archaeological job, and has no doubt played a vital part in my acceptance by University College, Cardiff for a first degree course in Archaeology as a mature student.

M. C. Batt

SYMPOSIUM ON POST-MEDIEVAL POTTERY

Recent excavations in various parts of Bristol under Mike Ponsford's direction have produced quantities of pottery dated to post-1500 A. D. This forms the basis of another in a successful series of pottery symposia, to be held in the Extra-Mural Department on Saturday and Sunday, 26/27th March 1974. Other distinguished contributors will include K. J. Barton, now Director of Portsmouth City Museums, returning to Bristol for the occasion; and Richard Coleman-Smith, University of Newcastle who is the expert on Donyatt pottery and the discoverer of its place of origin.

Anyone wishing to contribute information or exhibit material should get in touch with Peter Fowler as soon as possible; at the latest by 23rd February 1974. Tickets limited in number; please apply early. Price 90p from 32 Tyndall's Park Road. Bristol. BS8 1HR.

RECENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL ACCESSIONS IN THE CITY MUSEUM, BRISTOL

by Dr. J. J. Taylor and D. P. Dawson

During the past year the City Museum has received several fine and important gifts; this has helped to offset the sacrifice of our purchasing funds, due to the 'rates crisis' which has limited our acquisitions policy. We hope that local people will continue to contribute towards the development of our collections.

The opening of St. Nicholas Church and City Museum attracted many generous gifts and loans; notably five 15th century alabaster panels and a statue of the Holy Trinity from the Nottingham workshops, formerly in the Pro-Cathedral, given by the Bishop of Clifton and the Clifton Diocesan Trustees. Three stained glass windows from the Moravian Chapel were given by the Dept. of Works, Bristol Royal Infirmary. Some of this year's finds from Greyfriars are displayed by courtesy of Messrs. Laing and Son, who have placed all the excavated material on permanent loan. Fine examples of medieval stonework have been lent by St. Mary Redcliffe, S. S. Philip and Jacob, and St. Thomas the Apostle.

Two important collections of flintwork have enriched our Prehistoric section; a bequest by the late E. A. Shore (from districts around Bath); and a gift by Mr. Keith Reed, complete with field records (Bristol region and Mendips). Dr. H. A. Fawcett contributed further British prehistoric material and some African and Egyptian antiquities from his world-wide typological collection. Mr. E. Roberts donated a fine microlith from a new site by the Little Avon River.

Roman acquisitions included further material from Barnsley Park, and a coin of Constantine the Great from Clevedon, given by Mrs. Hobbs, More Dark Age material came from the local excavation at Cadbury Congresbury.

City Museum excavations in Bristol produced important Medieval and post-Medieval material from Greyfriars (see above), Rackhay, Temple Back, and the Bush warehouse. Mr. Keith Reed has kindly given much of the material and information collected by him and Mr. Marochan in the crucial period following the War, notably some major assemblages from the City of clay tobacco pipes.

Mr. Nicholas du Quesne Bird has added to our Numismatic collection by kindly giving several lead tokens and two checks from the L. M. R. Bristol Goods Dept. The Corporation has agreed to give a 'Bristol 600' medallion.

A fine collection of Ethnographic material has been acquired on loan from Mr. L. Dando who was working in the Admiralty Islands in 1926-7.

We are grateful to many people for contributions to our Library, notably Leslie Grinsell for a copy of The Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles: the Coins of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Mints; Miss S. Myer of the Smithsonian Institution for U. S. excavation reports containing much material derived from or paralleled in Bristol; and Dr. A. Miller for his book on the Teotihuacan Murals.

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 23rd February 1974 at The City Museum, Bristol. Members are reminded that in accordance with Rule 10, nominations for officers and members of the Committee should be received by the Hon. Secretary not less than 14 days before the date of the meeting (i. e. by 9th Feb. 1974) accompanied by the names of the proposer and seconder and the written consent of the nominee. See accompanying leaflet, p. i for details of nominations required and agenda. Afterwards, our retiring Chairman Charles Browne will give an address: "Interpreting the British Upper Palaeolithic".

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Excursion to Woodchester Roman Villa, 29th July 1973

At 9.15 a. m. a party of twelve watched the well-used mini-coach pull in on time at the Centre. Mr. Dawson kindly acted as our guide and we headed first along the M5 to reach Woodchester at about 10.30 a. m., finding that by our early start we had missed the large queuing crowds. The villa was extensively excavated by Samuel Lysons between 1794-6. Of the sixty-five rooms recorded only one was uncovered, the great dining hall which everyone had come to see, with an elaborate 15 m square 4th century mosaic. This work of the Corinium school shows Orpheus subduing wild creatures by playing his lyre. An estimated 1½ million tesserae make up the twenty four panelled mosaic, which is only

uncovered about once in ten years, so that it was fortunate for us that we could seize this opportunity.

Our next stop was at the Avening burial chambers. After crossing a field and negotiating a fence with its adjoining patch of nettles, we scrambled up a bank to reach the site. These Neolithic cists were probably moved from a barrow near Avening Court by the Rev. N. Thornbury, who excavated them in 1806. Of the three cists the one having a porthole entrance, just large enough to pass a corpse ~~through it~~, was the most interesting.

We had lunch in the small village of Minchinhampton, and after visiting the Parish Church we examined the earthworks on the Common. The purpose of this quite substantial bank and ditch system is obscure.

Next we travelled west to Uley. Here we squashed ourselves into Hetty Peglar's Tump, a famous chambered cairn; then we made a circuit of the perfectly-sited Iron Age hillfort of Uleybury, lying to the south of the cairn and affording good views in all directions. After returning down A46 some distance towards Bristol we stopped to visit Sodbury Camp. This hillfort is remarkably rectangular and is sited on the edge of the Cotswold escarpment, having a wide berm between its two ramparts. We then continued on our way to Bristol, completing a trip enjoyed in almost continuous sunshine.

Stephen Cogbill, Hon. Sec. Associate Members
Details of trips to be arranged for Spring 1974 will be sent to all members

REVIEWS

D. Iredale, Discovering Local History. (Shire Publications Ltd., 1973), 71 pp., 10 plates, 30p.

David Iredale, who contributed one of the best previous booklets in this series with This Old House, has achieved a remarkable feat of compression in this lively, highly informative pocket guide on how-to-do-local-history. While he does not hide the size of the undertaking (something many archaeologists do not fully realise) he makes it stimulating and not daunting. He fits archaeology firmly into place at the beginning of the book, as a method of studying the past. His definition of 'history' includes all the mud-on-the-boots that the field archaeologist requires, and he maintains a good balance between physical and documentary evidence in all the relevant sections.

Mr. Iredale's solution to the small size of this booklet seems to be to make every second sentence, at least in the earlier part of the text, into a question. Occasionally (Boundaries, p. 13-14) the whole of a complex subject is packed into a nutshell of non-stop questions. While the result is sometimes slightly breathless, it is certainly stimulating. He weaves skilfully between questions and copious suggestions of further reading, to achieve remarkably even coverage over an even more remarkably wide scope: from Iron Age hillforts and town plans, to recording railway buildings; from fieldwork to

public records. The lucky beginner has tips on organisation and methods (p. 4-5) - easier to do than to explain - which ten years ago one had to invent painfully for oneself by trial and, more usually, error. The central section, 'Some Features of Your Locality' (pp. 15-23) is the weakest, in that it attempts to provide a gazeteer of types of site in too small a space. Over-compression has become dullness, and a simple list with recommended reading would have been preferable. The section of 'Houses' (p. 25-6) likewise suffers from being merely a summary of his earlier book for this series. The second half of the booklet, however, picks up again with a series of sections on types of records and their whereabouts which packs an enormous amount of useful information into a smaller space than any previous book on this subject. He even fits in ten plates, a list of record offices, and an index! His concluding advice will be familiar to all fieldworkers and fieldwalkers: when you have looked at it all - go and look again.

This booklet is no substitute for the full-scale studies by Hoskins, Emmison and others (which it recommends); but it provides an introduction, a portable aide-memoire, and a reviver of the occasionally flagging spirit, which - at this price - every P. S. U. group could and should possess for itself.

Frances Neale

John Coles, Field Archaeology in Britain. (Methuen 1972) pp. 267, 8 plates, 78 figs. £1.75 (paperback)

This book provides, in a simplified form, the background and theory for most of the archaeological techniques encountered by students on an excavation. Although it is a useful addition to the library of the practising archaeologist, it suffers in comparison with the more detailed reference works such as Atkinson's Field Archaeology, Webster's Practical Archaeology and the O. S. publication Field Archaeology because of its almost superficial treatment of certain topics.

The weakest part of the book is that concerned with the disciplines required for the fastest growing of all archaeological pursuits, the Field (or Parish) Survey. The section on the trigonometrical principles of surveying is more than adequate for basic needs but the subsequent interpretation of surveyed features is not covered. The author has presupposed that any amateur archaeologist is 'familiar with the material in his own area'. Cold comfort for the field surveyor confronted with the plethora of humps and bumps usually revealed by a detailed survey. Instructions on how and where to obtain documentary sources of information, the tithe maps, deeds and charters which form the backbone of any efficient survey, are likewise omitted.

The basic tenets of excavation techniques, and the treatment and interpretation of excavated features are concisely expounded. It is perhaps more a criticism of the format that the diagrams and plans

reproduced do less than justice to the text. The Wandlebury section (fig. 57) and that of the Pitnacree barrow (fig. 65) are both reproduced at so small a scale as to render detail indistinct and interpretation difficult. As indicated in the Preface the illustrations are drawn only from prehistoric sites, and the book lacks the breadth that would have resulted from a consideration of the complexities encountered in later and multi-period excavations. One has only to consider the problems raised (in recording and interpretation) by the superabundance of pottery and bones found on Roman sites; the re-use of materials, or the continuation in use of structures in later periods. These problems have often to be solved on site, and an understanding of how the site became "what it is" coupled with expertise in recovering all available information is a necessity. Perhaps Dr. Coles considers that insight into how such an understanding may be acquired lies outside the scope of this, basically introductory, book. Notably absent is any mention of the results of recent experimental farms and earthworks, on which future archaeologists will lean heavily for interpretative information.

To summarise; this book is of interest and use to the beginner in archaeology but needs to be supplemented by other reference works.

J. H. Drinkwater

R. A. Buchanan, Industrial Archaeology in Britain. (Penguin Books 1972) 446pp., 60 p.

In this meaty paperback Dr. Buchanan has written a most comprehensive introduction to Industrial Archaeology as it is now practiced. For about fifteen years now, this subject has been regarded as a field of study in its own right; a serious interest in engineering history, railways and canals is far older.

The book is in four main sections. It begins with a general introduction, defining the subject and explaining its organisation. Then follow two sections outlining the various categories of industrial remains, and finally there is a regional survey. The book concludes with notes and references. Dr. Buchanan is to be congratulated on having written a most readable and scholarly survey in parts 2, 3 and 4, while special praise must be given to the comprehensive bibliography and to the high standard of the illustrations and maps. The author's local expertise is to be found throughout the book; many of his examples and illustrations come from the immediate neighbourhood of Bristol.

This book has a major fault: a failure to integrate conventional excavation techniques, to which Dr. Buchanan pays lip service, with the customary methods of Industrial Archaeology. It is essential that workers in this field become familiar with such techniques in order to obtain the maximum information when sites are redeveloped, particularly in older cities such as Bristol where early industrial areas have been built over and redeveloped several times during the past couple of centuries.

D. W. Crossley, reviewing a similar work in Post-Medieval Archaeology vol. 1, (1967) p. 137, warns that disregard for controlled excavation, and analytical and statistical techniques will place future industrial archaeologists in a position comparable with that of a prehistorian today confronted by a Victorian antiquary's residual confused results.

The experienced practitioner of Industrial Archaeology will probably treat the opening chapters with reserve. The novice, however, must beware of adopting an approach which, superficially logical, is in fact a 20th century version of the antiquarian approach in which an excess of enthusiasm was coupled with an abundance of ignorance.

A. P. Woolrich

Archaeological Review for 1972 No. 7. 76 pp. 65p. post free from Extra-Mural Dept. 32 Tyndall's Park Road, Bristol BS8 1HR.

This is the largest A. R. to date; and contains the M5 Fourth Interim Report by P. J. Fowler and Julian Bennett. Sites lying east, south and south west of Taunton are listed with a noteworthy concentration of all-period sites at the northern foot of the Backdown Hills. The next section, Wellington to Cullompton, may produce evidence of a "cultural break" at the entrance to the south western peninsula.

CALENDAR OF
FORTHCOMING COURSES, MEETINGS AND LECTURES
January - April 1974

Abbreviations additional to those used in previous issues:

B. S. A. Banwell Society of Archaeology
K. S. L. H. S. Keynsham and Saltford Local History Society

BRISTOL'S MAGNA CARTA Exhibition continues at City Museum, BRISTOL until 31st March, 1974.

January

- 2 The Products of the Bristol Pottery Industry, by D. P. Dawson. Olveston Parish Historical Society. Methodist Hall, OLVESTON. 7.30pm
- 3 Development of Bristol Pottery Industry, by D. P. Dawson, Lunchtime lecture, City Museum, BRISTOL. 1.15 p.m.
- 5-12 History of Keynsham and Saltford Exhibition. K. S. L. H. S. Church Hall, KEYNSHAM.
- 7 Beckford - his Life and Tower, by J. M. Millington, B. G. A. S. City Museum, BRISTOL. 5.45 p.m.

January

- 8 The Origins and Development of Heraldry, by Mrs. Grace Grant. Course of 10 meetings at The Folk House, 40 Park Street, BRISTOL. 6.00p. m. Workers' Educational Association, 7 St. Nicholas Street, Bristol. Visits will be arranged during the Summer term.
- 10 B.A.R.G. ASSOCIATE MEMBERS: THE CLAY PIPE INDUSTRY IN BRISTOL, by R. G. Jackson. City Museum, BRISTOL. 7.30p. m. Visitors 10p.
- 12 B.A.R.G. PARTY See leaflet (i) for details
- 15 Romanesque Sculpture and the Capitals in Bath Abbey, by F. Kelly. Bath and Camerton A. S. Lecture Theatre, Technical College (new building), BATH. 7.15 p. m. Visitors 15p.
- 17 B.A.R.G. LECTURE: ROMAN LEAD MINING ON MENDIP, by David Elkington. City Museum, BRISTOL. 7.30p. m. Visitors 20p.
- 19 Bronze Age Barrows - Tombs or Temples, by Mrs. H. Miles. S.A.N.H.S. Wyndham Hall, TAUNTON Castle. 2.30p. m.
- 25/27 Marine Archaeology. Panel of lecturers. Res. and non-res. w/e. Burwalls, Leigh Woods, BRISTOL. University. (P).

February

- 2/3 Pollen Analysis (11), by K. Crabtree. Non-res. w/e., Geography Dept. University of BRISTOL. 10.00a. m. University. (P).
- 5 Recollections of a Somerset Archaeologist, by W. J. Wedlake. Bath and Camerton A. S. Lecture Theatre, Technical College (new building) BATH. 7.15p. m. Visitors 15p.
- 8 Medieval Church Furniture and Furnishings, by J. H. Bettey. B. S. A. Village Hall, BANWELL. 7.30 p. m.
- 8/10 Archaeology and the Motorways. Panel of lecturers. Res. and non-res. w/e. including an 'archaeological drive' along the M5. Burwalls, Leigh Woods, BRISTOL. University. (P).
- 11 The Bristol Brass Industry, by Mrs. Joan Day. B. G. A. S. City Museum, BRISTOL. 5.45 p. m.
- 13 B.A.R.G. ASSOCIATE MEMBERS: WESTBURY COLLEGE, by M. W. Ponsford. City Museum, BRISTOL. 7.30p. m. Visitors 10p.
- 15 Local History in the Landscape, by J. H. Bettey. K. S. L. H. S. Ellsbridge House, KEYNSHAM. 7.15 p. m. Visitors 15p.
- 18 Roman Military Equipment, by H. Russell Robinson. G. A. D. A. R. G. Old Crypt Schoolroom, Southgate Street, GLOUCESTER. 7.30p. m.
- 23 B.A.R.G. ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING, followed by the Chairman's Address: INTERPRETING THE BRITISH UPPER PALAEO-LITHIC, by Charles Browne. City Museum. 2.30 p. m. (see p. 264)
- 21 The Roman Contribution to the West, by J. B. Ward-Perkins, C. B. E. City Museum, BRISTOL. 7.30 p. m.
- 14 Assyrian Reliefs in the City Museum, by Dr. Joan Taylor. Lunchtime lecture. City Museum, BRISTOL. 1.15p. m.

March

- 2 M5 Symposium. P. J. Fowler and other. Wyndham Hall, TAUNTON Castle. 2.15-6.00p. m. Admission free.
- 4-8 Archaeological Field Surveying. A res. week at Urchfont Manor, near DEVIZES. University. (P).

March

- 5 Bath - Past, Present and Future, by P. J. Greening. Bath and Camerton A. S. Lecture Theatre, Bath Technical College (new building) BATH. 7.15 p.m. Visitors 15p.
- 6 Historical aspects of the River Severn, by Rev. R. J. Mansfield. Olveston Parish Historical Society. Methodist Hall, OLVESTON 7.30pm
- 8 More Gleanings of Weston-s-Mare, by G. P. Rye. B. S. A. Village Hall, BANWELL. 7.30p.m.
- 11 Offa's Dyke, by Mrs. Wheaton. B. G. A. S. City Museum, BRISTOL 5.45 p.m.
- 12 The 1373 Bristol we can see today, by Reece Winstone. Bristol Civic Society. Quakers' Meeting Room, Hampton Road, Redland, BRISTOL. 7.30 p.m.
- 15 Annual General Meeting, K. S. L. H. S. A discussion on the Stanton Drew megaliths, led by R. Milner. Ellsbridge House, KEYNSHAM. 7.30p.m. Visitors 15p.
- 16 Romano-British Pottery in the Severn/Avon basin, P. J. Fowler and others. Fitzhamon Arts Centre, Mill Street, TEWKESBURY, University. (P).
- 16 The Romano-British Temple on Creech Hill, Bruton, by R. H. Leech. S. A. N. H. S. Wyndham Hall, TAUNTON Castle. 2.30 p.m.
- 16/17 Laboratory Conservation of Archaeological Material (111), by Miss J. Escritt and Mrs. M. Greenacre. Non-res. w/e at City Museum, BRISTOL. University. (P).
- 18 Annual General Meeting, G. A. D. A. R. G. Archives and Archaeology, by H. R. Hurst. Old Crypt Schoolroom, Southgate Street, GLOUCESTER, 7.30 p.m.
- 21 B. A. R. G. LECTURE (in conjunction with City Museum) VIKING AND MEDIEVAL EXCAVATIONS IN DUBLIN, by Breandan O Riordain. Lecture Theatre, City Museum, BRISTOL. 7.30 p.m.
- 23/24 Post-Medieval Pottery Symposium. Non-res. w/e at the Extra Mural Dept. 32 Tyndall's Park Road, BRISTOL. (P). see p. 263.
- 28 Archaeology and Planning: a talk and discussion. M. W. Ponsford. Lunchtime lecture, City Museum, BRISTOL. 1.15p.m.
- 29/31 Man's Influence on the Landscape: the Highland Zone. Res. w/e Conference at University of LANCASTER. Applications to C. B. A., 8 St. Andrew's Place, Regent's Park, LONDON NW1 4LB.
- April
- 5/6 Early Man and his Environment: P. J. Fowler, T. Barklem and others. Res. w/e at Urchfont Manor, nr. DEVIZES. (P). Applications to Warden, Urchfont Manor.
- 8 Excavations in Bristol 1973, by M. W. Ponsford. B. S. A. Village Hall, BANWELL. 7.30 p.m.
- 10/20 Southern Italy: Archaeological Study Tour, visiting Greek and Roman sites and museums, including Pompeii and Herculaneum. Details from Extra-Mural Dept..
- 19 Keynsham Abbey, by E. J. Mason. K. S. L. H. S. Ellsbridge House, KEYNSHAM. 7.30 p.m. Visitors 15p.
- 27/28 Somerset Levels Symposium. Panel of Lecturers. Non-res. w/e Strode Technical College, STREET. University. (P).