The Romano-British Site on the Portway, near Gloucester

By BERNARD RAWES

Summary
On a site which can be interpreted as a wayside shrine the following have been found: a polygonal structure, a rectangular enclosure, rutted trackways, and evidence for iron working and pottery making. Objects found include the sculptured relief of a head, stamped tiles, brooches, and horseshoes.

Introduction
The Portway Roman site lies about 4 km south-east of the centre of Gloucester in the parish of Upton St Leonards (SO 859151), just west of the M5 motorway as it runs south between the Cotswold escarpment and the prominent outlier of Robinswood Hill. It was discovered in 1974 in fields later to disappear in a large housing development, which has extended the urban area of Gloucester out to the motorway at this point. Permission to excavate was given by the developers, Glevum Estates Ltd., who were most co-operative in allowing access. A rescue excavation started in April 1976 and continued during weekends and summer evenings until the summer of 1979, by which time bungalows covered the centre of the site.

The aims of the excavation were, firstly, to discover the nature of a site within the territorium of Glevum, and, secondly, to investigate its relationship with the Portway, which had been marked as a Roman road on 25-inch O.S. maps at the beginning of this century.

Background and topography (FIG. 1)
There is little evidence of prehistoric activity in the immediate area of the site, though a number of flints were found in the course of excavation. The nearest major hillfort is on Painswick Beacon about 3 km to the south and prehistoric earthworks are found at High Brotheridge about 3.5 km to the south-east on the Cotswold escarpment. The Roman settlements clustered round Gloucester have never been examined sufficiently to ascertain whether they had previous Iron Age occupation. Although there were round-houses at Brockworth and pottery has been found at Barnwood and elsewhere in the Vale, later disturbance has obscured the evidence for the sites which must have existed. It is probably correct to interpret scatters of Roman building material and pottery as derived from farmsteads, but this investigation has shown that they may include other features which make them sites of considerable variety and complexity. This certainly applies to Brockworth (Site 2), and Wells' Bridge (Site 9), and possibly to the nearer sites of Upton St Leonards (Site 13), the Wheatridge (Site 11), Coney Hill (Site 10), Robinswood Hill Barracks (Site 15), and Matson Rectory (Site 12). Hucclecote Villa (Site 3) and Great Witcombe Villa (off FIG. 1 to the east) also lie within the area. It is likely that all these sites are within the territorium of the colonia of Glevum.
FIG. 1 Site location map: regional and local setting.
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KEY TO SITES SHOWN ON FIG. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Portway</td>
<td>This report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hucclecote villa</td>
<td><em>Trans BGAS</em> 55 (1933) 323-76.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hucclecote bath-block, Trevor Road</td>
<td><em>Trans BGAS</em> 79.2 (1960) 159-73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ermin Street burial ground</td>
<td><em>Trans BGAS</em> 52 (1930) 201-54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lobley's Farm</td>
<td>Spread of pottery and tile (unpublished).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Beside Ermin Street</td>
<td>Scatter of pottery, including samian (unpublished).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Coney Hill R-B settlement</td>
<td><em>Britannia</em> 7 (1976) 354.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Whearidge site</td>
<td><em>Glevensis</em> 7 (1973) 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Matson Rectory, pottery in trench</td>
<td><em>Trans BGAS</em> 2 (1877-80) 242.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>'Triangle' site; pottery scatter</td>
<td>Gloucester City Museum (unpublished).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Robinswood Hill Barracks, ditches with pottery</td>
<td>Gloucester Museum Excavation Unit (P. Garrod pers. comm.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sandhurst Lane, Longford</td>
<td><em>Glevensis</em> 14 (1980) 30-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Kingsholm</td>
<td><em>Antiq</em> J 55.2 (1975) 267-94.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area of the Portway site two brooks, the Sudbrook and the Twyver, flow to the Severn and are separated by a gentle rise called the Wheatridge. Near the bottom of the southern slope of this ridge runs a straight length of the Portway, shown previous to recent development by a hedge and footpath. One km nearer Gloucester the Portway was until recently a lane between two hedges. Before the Inclosure of 1897 the Portway was a field road serving strips lying at right angles to it, each of which was indicated by a merestone inscribed with its owner's initials; several of these were turned up by the building operations.

Its name suggests that the Portway was a route of some importance in medieval times. It emerges from the Eastgate of Gloucester on the line of the Roman road out of the city and crosses the low land to the east of Robinswood Hill. After passing through the village of Upton St Leonards it ascends the Cotswold escarpment, skirting Prinknash Park, an important residence in the 16th and 17th centuries, and through land belonging in the Middle Ages to St Peter's Abbey, Gloucester. At the top of the rise it branches into a number of minor routes, some of which may have had greater importance in the past. Oolitic limestone quarried in the Painswick area was probably taken into Gloucester by the Portway; a possibility which must also be considered for the Roman period.

Important to the background study of the site is the evidence for geological disturbance (FIG. 2). In Clanley field, just to the east of the place where the polygonal building was found, the main sewer trench for the estate was dug to a depth of about 4 m into the Lower Lias clay along the east–west spine road. This showed two lines about 4 m apart descending almost vertically. They consisted of small broken pieces of limestone and were differentiated by the deeper colour of the blue clay between them, probably due to compression. This, taken in conjunction with observations from the area of the rutted cobbled surface, found north-east of the Portway line (where a Middle Lias rock-band of ferruginous nodular sandstone was revealed in what should have been Lower Lias beds), can be interpreted best as a geological fault in the basic Lias beds. This fault created a line of weakness approximately covered by the hedge which ran north-east and at right angles to the Portway. It is probable that the spring further up this line created the need for stones to be thrown down to make a cobbled crossing for the trackway. Water flowed
FIG. 2 Local geology and landscape features.
across the site forming a shallow linear depression which was subsequently widened further by natural clay and sand which swept down after heavy rainfall. This natural feature, having been used to some extent in the Roman period, is shown as feature 8 on the plans.

As the result of the excavation and field study of archaeological sites from Cleeve Hill to Robinswood Hill, evidence has been found of surface disturbance caused after periods of heavy rainfall by floods and soil movement during and since the Roman period. This took place where human activity had disturbed the surface cover either by quarrying or the intensive use of the plough. Subsequent flows of yellow clay and sand reached the foot of the escarpment, sometimes covering gravel and sand spreads that had been laid down in the Pleistocene. Thus Roman sites in the Vale can be eroded or partly obscured by natural forces. Clean, natural, yellow clay spread across the eastern half of the Portway site, and clean sand filled feature 8 and other depressions in post-Roman times.

Prior to excavation it had been observed that a wide, low bank ran parallel to the Portway in the northern part of Clanley field from where the main finds came. This was thought at first to be a plough headland. However, below the topsoil, it was found to be composed of a compressed, clean, and slightly clayey, yellow sand, with an occasional small sherd near the bottom. Underneath lay the usual thin bed of natural yellow clay with patches of orange grit over basic Blue Lias. It is thought that this bank, at least in part, had been artificially raised, probably to form a platform. As will be described later, the rectilinear enclosure to the north-west of the polygonal structure had an internal surface of compacted orange grit and sand under the topsoil. It is difficult to account for this except as a man-made base or platform for some kind of structure.

Later agricultural activities, which included ridge-and-furrow ploughing and the laying of land drains, resulted in the erosion of the surface so that only the lower parts of Roman features were left below the present topsoil. Among more recent features a pond is shown on the older O.S. maps to the east of the hedge-junction in the corner of the ‘M5 spoil’ field. This had been filled in, probably 50 years ago. The excavation produced evidence of cobbled tracks of similar nature on both sides of the pond area, located as if they were avoiding either wet ground or some other obstruction around which it was necessary to make a detour. This aspect is examined later in the report.

Field boundaries

Extensive strip systems in Upton St Leonards parish were described in the last century. Four long parallel boundaries running approximately south-east to north-west between the Sudbrook and the Twyver are of special interest in relation to this site (FIG. 1). The present road from Gloucester to Painswick runs on the south-west side of the Sudbrook where the parish boundary lies between Upton St Leonards and Matson. This alignment is broken and confused due to deviations of the stream. To the north-east lay the large open field of Great Awe, down the centre of which ran the Portway, used in the last century and earlier as a field road. The other two parallel lines consisted of the ‘Ash Path’ on the top of the Wheatridge and the straight hedgeline with a lynchet running along the southern edge of the ridge above the Portway. This boundary has a good claim to antiquity because the strips only occasionally cross it, whereas they continue on either side of the Ash Path (a recent name). This ‘middle’ hedge is more in line with the centre of the village and Upton church, which, although not older than Norman in structure, may be on an older site.

To the north-east runs the Twyver. This stream was used during the Middle Ages and later for a number of mills which were erected on its course. A study of contours shows that the Twyver originally joined the Sudbrook to flow into the Severn south of Gloucester. At some
time its course was culverted so that it could approach the centre of Gloucester on a slight ridge. This was probably done in Roman times so that the fortress could be supplied with water by means of a conduit or aqueduct. The Twyver provides an easier source of supply than bringing water from Robinswood Hill over the Sudbrook as is documented for the 12/13th century. The long straight stretch from Upton to Barnwood ends near site 10 on FIG. 1, towards which it makes an acute turn. It then curves round the knoll at Coney Hill maintaining contour height in order to approach Gloucester rather than flow down to the Sudbrook (see FIG. 7).

The alignment of boundaries in the direction of Gloucester from the Cotswold escarpment may have been due in the first place to the direction taken by streams and ridges, though these features are neither regular nor dominant in the landscape. We can therefore consider whether the recent boundaries are the result of an ancient planned lay-out of fields. At Upton St Leonards the strip-field system which existed before 1897 had the same straight boundaries, as shown on early O.S. and estate maps. This pattern is likely to have been the same in the Middle Ages or earlier, providing sufficient evidence for us to consider the possibility of a planned lay-out in the Roman period.

A regular land allotment for retired legionaries (i.e. centuriation) could have been set up either when the colonia was founded at the end of the 1st century, or earlier, after the establishment of the legionary fortress. Positive evidence for this land division has not been found in Britain, and it is thought by some that it would not have been set up at so late a date as the end of the 1st century. However, apart from a full-scale lay-out of boundaries, which was usually based on a ‘century’ measurement – that is on a square of 20 × 20 actus (709.68 × 709.68 m) – it may be that around Gloucester smaller areas were measured out at various times, even on occasion using other standard units. This could have created a complicated pattern on the landscape with grid systems superimposing and over-lapping each other, with much of the evidence obliterated by later environmental changes. The reasons for lack of evidence in this country are best exemplified by a comparison with places where centuriation has been found in the Mediterranean area. There, not only because of a drier climate, but also because of some continuity of land holding, the boundaries have become more firmly imprinted on today’s landscape. In the very different local conditions after the Roman period, the Severn Valley largely reverted to woodland, scrub, and marsh. Neglect of agriculture, silting up of drainage ditches, and subsequent flooding would have obscured many of the boundaries, whether originally shown by track, hedge, or ditch, leaving only a vestigial skeleton from which to reconstruct Roman field systems.

The possibility of Roman land measurement at the Portway site has already been discussed in an interim study. Roman area measurement has been found at Brockworth where the boundaries are on a different alignment to the Portway. A ‘century’ at this time and place would probably measure 710 to 720 m square. Rectangular grid systems are also known. The linear measurement of an actus of c. 35.5 m is normal, but there are also other less usual standards. The area measurement, outlined by ditches, found at Brockworth was a ingenum, that is 1 × 2 actus.

At the Portway site a rectangular area of 35.5 × 71 m was not found (see FIG. 3). However, a linear measurement along the line of the Portway between the two parallel hedges that butt onto the Portway hedge is approximately 71 m. This is demonstrated in the report on ditch 1. Three ditches, nos 19, 17, and 1, are parallel to the line of the recent Portway and the rectangular enclosure to the west is set on this alignment. The ditches to the north-east of the Portway contained occupation material in the same way as others. So at some time there must have been buildings here, though originally the area may have been laid out as a part of the general field system into which it fits. The distance of 24 m between ditches 17 and 18 may be a unit of length. The distance between feature 8 and ditch 16 (the hedge-line) is approximately 48 m. So this may have been used as a standard measurement, though no historical evidence can be found for such a
THE PORTWAY ROMAN SITE

unit, except that 24 × 3 is not far from 35.5 × 2. Because the grid of this small area is based on the general direction of the Portway, with the other parallel lines directed towards Gloucester, the Roman site may have been laid out within a large measured field system or centuriation, as shown in FIGS. 1 and 7.

Sites 10 and 11 and the Portway site are aligned approximately 730 m from each other. This line is at a slight angle to the proposed two ‘centuries’, with sides of 710 to 720 m each, based on the canalized portion of the River Twyver, and the four parallel boundaries directed towards Gloucester. The three sites may have been placed on a diagonal line across the two ‘centuries’, thus accounting for the greater distance of 730 m. The suggestion is that these occupation sites were on roadways laid down between ‘centuries’, and that the middle site, No. 11, is possibly half-way along the boundary track with the other two sites at the corners of ‘centuries’. The southern boundary could have followed much the same line as parts of the present Gloucester–Painswick road and, in places, the Sudbrook. On FIG. 7 it can be seen that the two Upton St Leonards sites are 20 actus (c. 720 m) apart, and form an isosceles triangle with the Whearidge site. The Matson site is also approximately 20 actus from both the Portway and Whearidge sites. This significant distance between sites is difficult to fit into an easily recognizable grid system based on Gloucester. However, future research in this and neighbouring areas may resolve this question of superimposed and obscured centurial systems.

EXCAVATION AND FEATURES

During excavation the conditions encountered were similar to those experienced at the Brockworth allotment site,9 where severe damage had been caused to the archaeological levels by ridge-and-furrow ploughing and climatic erosion. A grid system was established to aid plotting during the sudden changes of development which invariably occur during building operations. A base line (A–A) was set out parallel to the Portway hedge and 30 m from it. Boxes 2 m square (starting with A1) were identified by numerals running from north-west to south-east and by letters from north-east to south-west.10 This system enabled quick location on the ground to be effected when foundations for buildings and roads were dug by machine. For the convenience of this report the site has been divided into three main areas: Western, South-Eastern, and Northern. The Western area lies south and west of the line of the Portway up to and including feature 8. Treatment of this area is more detailed and comprehensive, both here and in the pottery report, because systematic excavation was possible before building operations began. The features here were slightly better preserved, due probably to greater sand cover before plough erosion took place.

In February 1976 two trial trenches (KK 11–20 and EE 11–20) were dug parallel to the Portway in Great Awe Field. As no features were found a move was made to the south side of the hedge where the first box (S 15) revealed a linear feature (ditch 1). The dark deposit contained Romano-British pottery, tiles and bones. The ploughsoil rested on clean ‘natural’ sand on either side of the ditch, so that it was immediately evident that the former living surface had not survived. Similar conditions prevailed over most of the site with the result that only the lower parts of features of Roman date such as ditches, pits and gullies survived.

Ditch 1 (FIGS. 3–4)

This ditch ran nearly parallel to the Portway in a straight line for 55.8 m with a break of 4.8 m forming a causeway near the centre. At its south-eastern end it had a stone culvert to carry surplus water into feature 8, a wide depression where a
FIG. 3 Site plan and key to feature numbers.
ditch or water course formerly ran. At the north-western end there may have been a similar overflow into a possible Roman ditch coming from the north-east. Ditch 1 is two Roman actus (71 m) in length, suggesting the possibility of some basic planning in its original layout. This has been discussed under the section on field boundaries.

When it was noted that the ditch was parallel to the Portway Hedgeline it was conjectured that it might be the side-ditch of a Roman road. This could not be proved, because trenches dug into the hedge showed that the present Portway had become a sunken track which would have removed all traces of any Roman road surface. Furthermore the profile of the ditch was not V-shaped, but similar to those at Brockworth (Site 2), where flat-bottomed ditches were thought to have been dug alongside buildings for drainage. Even if they had no outlet these would have been useful as soakaways. This presents the possibility of buildings on either side of the length of ditch 1. This hypothesis of an earth platform for buildings is supported by the fact that no ditches leave ditch 1 at an angle, either between it and gully 2, or to cross the Portway line. It is also evident that the wide area destroyed by the later sunken Portway gives enough space for both a row of buildings and for a trackway between ditches 1 and 17 (see FIG. 3). In what sequence they lay cannot be stated, but a side-track from a road can be postulated leading across the causeway half-way along ditch 1. This suggestion for the layout of this part of the settlement fits in with features discussed later, and with other evidence for a row of timber buildings on the sandy platform on the south-western side of the ditch.

Before excavation began, what appeared to be a flattened earthwork ran along the top of Clanley field parallel to the Portway hedge. Three trenches were dug across this feature and others along its length. Later observations made during the building operations confirmed that no ditches or other below-ground features existed on this platform area. Excavation revealed a slight gully running parallel to, and about 1 to 2 m from, the edge of ditch 1. This may have been the remains of a beam-slot or a drip-gully. It was between this gully and the ditch edge that a few scattered and eroded 4th-century coins were found. Only a radiate copy was identifiable.

The pottery from ditch 1 was mostly of 2nd- and 3rd-century date. There were a few pieces of later black burnished ware of the 1st half of the 4th century. The chiefly 2nd-century samian included a decorated piece by Cinnaeus (AD 135-70) and a form 45 which dates to the end of the century. The ditch contained much building debris, which included both sandstone and clay tiles; one of the latter was an imbrux stamped PP (FIG. 14, c). The sculptured stone head (PLATE II) was found in the north-western half of the ditch opposite feature 7. Also found was a decorated boss or whorl (FIG. 11, no. 9) and a small piece of a decorated bone handle (FIG. 14, e). One illegible coin and part of a brooch spring were found immediately above the ditch deposit, which suggests, in conjunction with the pottery evidence, that ditch 1 may have filled up well before the end of the 4th century.

**Feature 7 and the rectangular enclosure (FIGS. 3-4)**

Four features, that is ditches 1, 4, and 5 and feature 7, radiate from what appears to be a focal point at the north-eastern corner of the rectangular enclosure (FIG. 4). These features deepen considerably where they end at this central point, possibly suggesting substantial posts. This is consistent with the erection of a porch in front of the entrance to the rectangular enclosure. The small gully between the end of ditch 5 and feature 7 may have contained a silt-beam, or have been a door-slot at the entrance to this porch. From this point the ground rises to a platform of compressed sand near the entrance to the enclosure, in the centre of which was a hard surface of orange grit and sand. This suggests, with other evidence such as pottery and tiles found in ditches 2, 3, 4, and 11, that a building stood here. The structure would have been of timber with an imposing entrance to the north-east, and may have had clay roof-tiles. The gravel platform, which had been eroded so that no evidence of the impression of beams supporting a plank floor or any wall support remained, could have been the podium of a temple. The higher the platform the more likely that any surface features would have been destroyed, thus explaining the lack of evidence for any structure. So the raised podium of a temple with a porch and steps is visualized. One cannot go further with this interpretation, except to say that no other possibility appears to fit the archaeological evidence. The theory is supported by the presence of the adjacent polygonal building which is proposed as a shrine, and by the discovery of the sculptured head.

Ditches 5 and 6 and gully 11 form an outer rectangle on three sides, thus presenting the possibility of an ambulatory or portico, which is a common feature of Romano-Celtic temples. The gap between ditches 2 and 3 may represent a small side-entrance to the building. Gully 3 to the north appears to have been for drainage. It is probable that the walls of the building rested on the platform, with the coves of the roof throwing the rain into the outer ditches; ditch 6 acting as a main drain for the polygonal building as well. There is space for a building of about 12 by 15 m, a reasonable size for a temple or shrine.

Although the purpose of this building cannot be stated with certainty, the area of the supposed porch had some special importance. The mass of pottery and other finds in the features nearby suggests a focal point for the site. Not far from here was found the sculptured head (FIG. 14, a) which had been broken off a larger sculpture, possibly a figured monument. Feature 7, which may have been the post-pit for a large timber (or even stone) post or pillar, was broad and shallow on its west side, gradually deepening to the east. Nearby, in gully 2, one of two RPG stamped tiles (FIG. 14, b) was found.
FIG. 4 Western area.
From the many finds in feature 7 the following should be noted: the cranium of a human skull, an iron door latch (FIG. 12, no. 14), an iron spike with chain link (FIG. 12, no. 2), a crushed eggshell, a mortarium with geometric stamp (which dates to the end of the 2nd century) found at the bottom of the deposit (FIG. 9, no. 41), and a samian stamp near the top. From the associated area of the enclosure, ditch 2 produced half a large Severn Valley ware bowl; ditch 3, two brooches (FIG. 11, nos. 1 and 4); and ditch 4, studs from a sandal, a glass bead, and another crushed eggshell from near the porch where much pottery was found. Throughout there were occasional pieces of clay and stone tile, though it was noted that the latter was absent from feature 7. This fits with the dating of pottery from these features, suggesting that they were filling sometime in the 3rd century, probably in the 2nd half, or at the beginning of the 4th century.

The polygonal building (FIGS. 3–5 and PLATE I)

Included under this heading is the area covered by ditches 5 and 6, gully 4, and features 10 and 12. These features may be delineating the tenemos, or boundary of a sacred area. Gully 4 can be regarded from the archaeological evidence of its clear-cut section as a construction slot of a fence or stockade. This interpretation can apply also to gully 2 on the other side of ditch 5, though the evidence in the ground could just as well be seen in either case as a timber wall-slot. Features 10 and 12 consist of irregular lengths of trench, either for a building, or dug alongside one for drainage. The finds here suggest some occupation; possibly there was a service building such as a stable or shop adjacent to the cobbled area on the north-east side of ditch 5. No barrier was found to the south-west. The proximity to the small stream suggests swampy ground here; or possibly erosion removed all archaeological traces.

Gullies adjacent to ditch 6 produced evidence for an octagonal structure. Although ridge-and-furrow ploughing had almost totally destroyed the gullies on the eastern side, enough remained to estimate the shape and position of the walls of a polygonal building. The cobbled surviving on the next ridge to the east was probably the end of the cobbled track crossing ditch 5 from the south-west cobbled area (SWC). This track, from what may have been a general assembly place,
FIG. 5 Polygonal building and South-east Area.
led to the entrance to the building. It is usual for native-type round-houses and polygonal structures to face east. When the gullies were sectioned (FIG. 5) there were clear signs of differential filling with a dark silty deposit on the inside and a packing of clean yellow clay on the outside. This evidence from a construction trench or gully indicates a wall of timber plates which had rotted in situ. This type of construction was particularly suitable for straight lengths of wall, as opposed to the curving walls of round-houses, where upright stakes or planks were the normal practice. Rectangular sections of timber planks nailed together were set in straight lengths of trench and clean clay was rammed in to make the wall secure. They would have been firmly attached to each other at changes of angle, ensuring a stable structure. Roof struts could rise from this point of juncture at the top of wall plates to be tied together at the apex of a conical roof. A low wall under the thatch would suffice. However it must be remembered that we have no positive evidence above ground level, and there may have been other posts and supports.

In the centre of the building, surviving on the top of a ridge, was a trench 1.8 m long, which was square in section (see FIG. 5) with a dark deposit outlined by clay burnt red against the natural yellow clay. This feature appeared to be a slot dug for a timber beam which subsequently caught fire. The beam could have been set in the ground as a lateral support for a central post which may or may not have been a structural part of the building. It is not necessary for this type of structure to have a central post. Often a hearth is found in such a central position, but it is difficult to think of this feature as a hearth. There were no paving stones. There was also a slight depression to the north-east of the feature, which had also contained something which had burnt the clay red. Was this the place where the upright post fell?

The other internal feature was a depression filled with scattered paving stones on the north-east side of the building. This could have been a stand or setting for an object, or alternatively, with the pit to the south-east, a post-hole for the entrance to the building. External gullies on the north side drained rain-water to ditch 6.

The finds from the gullies of the polygonal building are not closely datable. The few small worn sherds of pottery were of 2nd- and 3rd-century date. The finest object was a bronze octagonal finger ring (FIG. 11, no. 11). Other finds included: an iron spike (no. 21), eight shoe studs (no. 29), several nails, two lumps of iron slag, a lead rivet, and a black quartz polisher. The drainage gullies produced: part of a handle from a glass vessel, several lumps of slag, two pieces of daub, a sandstone rubber, and a few nails. These items are not necessarily connected with the building, but may be the result of operations nearby. Features 10 and 12 produced similar objects such as slag and nails, also part of a quernstone and two oyster shells. The pottery consisted of local and other wares dating from the 2nd to 4th centuries. Among the bones were a large number of horse teeth; however, these may have come from only two or three animals. A larger than usual number of nails came from the occupation deposit in gully 4.

Ditch 5 in its northern stretch, before it met ditch 6, was the same depth as ditch 6, presumably being part of the enclosure. From this junction ditch 5 became shallower until it reached the causeway, which was cobbled and had a narrow gully to allow water to pass to the deeper part of ditch 5 adjacent to the southern cobbled area. A pair of iron shears (FIG. 12, no. 15) and part of a (?) hipposandal (FIG. 12, no. 18) came from near the causeway. Two iron collars (FIG. 12, nos. 6 and 8) were found on the slope of the ditch near the edge of the cobbled (SWC). The occupation deposit in the ditch contained several large pieces of clay roof tile, six small lumps of daub, and several scattered hobnails as well as the usual quota of building nails. Two bronze items, a pin (FIG. 11, no. 10) and a finger ring (FIG. 11, no. 12), also came from here.

Southern cobbled area and the western end of feature 8 (FIGS. 3-4)

The edge of the cobbled was irregular and broken except for a row of larger stones on the east side where a kerb had been laid down beside the first of the series of black silt-filled gullies which cross this part of feature 8. In the centre of the cobbled area the stones were small, densely compacted and worn. Elsewhere, and especially on the surrounds, it was as if stones had been thrown down as in a yard. The area may have been a general assembly area for animals, carts, and people. It is also possible that a timber shelter stood here, which may explain the straight edge of the worn stones on the east side. The series of dark, silty, shallow gullies crossing feature 8 could be interpreted as showing the position where beams, which were supports for a timber floor, had rotted or been burnt. Possibly this had been a timber trackway laid as a continuation of the cobbled track crossing ditch 5 and leading to the polygonal building. In the opposite direction it would join the cobbled which carries a worn surface over the stone-water-conduit at the end of ditch 1. The dark, ashy, silt bands were set in a silt yellow clay and stopped where they met the gully that runs along the centre of feature 8. This gully contained most of the pottery (chiefly of 2nd-century type) found in feature 8.

Feature 8 proved to be a wide depression running down Clanley Field with evidence of a recent surface ditch (possibly an attempt to drain the area of the pond beside the Portway). Under this there was a wide deposit of sand with yellow clay on the eastern side. This, as has been explained in the introduction, is probably the result of floods bringing natural sand and clay from the ridge near Upton village. It is probable that there was a Roman ditch along the line of feature 8, which later had its upper part completely eroded away, leaving only the gully. Alternatively this gully might be a small ditch running alongside the track postulated above. Much could have been removed on either side of feature 8 by ploughing and erosion. In this respect the cobbled track coming from the polygonal building may have been destroyed where it crossed
FIG. 6 Trackways either side of the Portway crossing feature 8.
the slightly higher ground between the causeway over ditch 5 and its crossing of the culvert at the end of ditch 1.

The rutted trackways (FIG. 6)

The track to the polygonal building mentioned above did not have ruts and, because of its narrowness over the causeway, must have been used for foot passage, whether human or animal. The ruts in the two cobbled trackways on either side of the Portway provide evidence not only for the use of carts, but also for the direction in which they were going. The discovery of horseshoes on the rutted cobbles adds to the picture of wheeled traffic. However, because horseshoes found on Roman sites have often been found in doubtful contexts, and have not been shown to have any typological difference according to period, there remains a possibility that they are of later date. This is discussed below in the finds report.

The sections on FIG. 6 show the stratigraphical implications. The rutted cobbles was sealed by the thick sand layer which contained no pottery or other datable artefact. As there were none of the recent sherds or pieces of brick and slate which occurred in the topsoil of the neighbouring fields, the massive build-up of clean sand must have happened earlier than two hundred years ago. There was only a thin layer of dark silt between the cobbles and sand, which implies that only a short time elapsed before the rutted surface with its Roman sherds and pieces of horsehoe was covered with sand. Alternatively, it is possible that the original levels above the cobbles were removed by water or other erosion, and successive layers of sand scoured away previous deposits down to the surface of the cobbles.

The sand did not cover the higher layer of paving, of which a small part remained, as shown in the section. Any levels above this upper paving had been removed by the plough, and not enough was left to indicate whether this was a later trackway surface or the floor of a hut. Sand lying between the cobbled and paved layers suggests that the upper paving was laid down after the major deposition of sand (FIG. 6).

All the finds below and on the two rutted cobbled surfaces were of Roman date, with the possible exception of the horseshoes, which cannot be dated with certainty. Although medieval finds were absent, a post-Roman date is possible. The site may have been uninhabited at this time, with no datable objects being dropped. Nevertheless, there is cause for hesitation in placing the two rutted cobbled tracks in a different period to known Roman features such as ditches 1 and 17. With Roman levels directly underneath both rutted surfaces, it may be that the upper cobbles-stones were thrown down after the Roman period. Unfortunately, all evidence from the area between the tracks was absent because successive Portway surfaces, which in the process of time moved south-west down the slope, gradually deepened with use. All previous deposits and features were thus destroyed (FIG. 7).

It appears that at the point where feature 8 crossed the line of the Portway, carts were avoiding some obstruction, such as a pond (recently present), monument, or other construction. Even so, difficult swammy ground was encountered and cobbles were thrown down to prevent wheels sinking into mud. Most of the horseshoes were found on the Gloucester side of this difficult crossing, as if they had been wrenched from the animals' feet as they struggled to pull a laden cart up the slight slope. An explanation for this could be that stone was being carried to Gloucester from the limestone quarries of the Cotswold escarpment. This may have been necessary when the Cathedral or other building work required stone at a time when Roman building stone could no longer be recovered and used in the city. Some of the horseshoes may be late Roman in date, implying a similar use of the trackway at that time, in which case the transport may be associated with a 4th-century rebuild of the walls of Glevum at a time when the towns of Britain were becoming anxious to defend themselves. The trackway may have been in use at any time between the sub-Roman and medieval periods.

The important finds were: a spoon and brooch (FIG. 11, nos. 8 and 2) from among the cobbles of the northern track (both broken, possibly deliberately), several sherds of Roman pottery from the silty layers below the cobbles, and at the bottom, near the natural clay, mortarium no. 47, which is of early Roman date. Slightly to the east of this, below the former hedge in silty clay, was found the fire-bar (FIG. 14, f) and the twisted clay 'handle' (FIG. 10, no. 72). Comments on these objects are at the end of the pottery report.

Working areas

It is becoming clear that many Romano-British settlements engaged on a minor scale in the making of pottery and in metal working. Smears of reddened soil and clay are often the only sign left of a furnace, oven, or even of a kiln after many hundreds of years of erosion by man and the elements. Structures originally above the ground would soon be destroyed, especially if they were unprotected by the walls of a building. All one can hope to find are pits, stoke-holes, or associated artefacts. On the eastern and northern parts of the site there were indications that this type of 'industrial' activity was taking place.

For evidence of the making of pottery it is necessary to find wasters, or even better, parts of a kiln. This is discussed in the pottery report. The working area could have been in the south-eastern part of the site where water was near at hand. The discovery of the fire-bar (FIG. 14, f) near the spring beside the rutted trackway hints at the possibility of a kiln near here.

In the northern area ditch 17 was filled with a compact mass of wood-ash. This was most dense near the gap between
FIG. 7 The Portway and the Roman site.
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ditch 17 and 17 W (see FIG. 3). It did not occur in ditch 17 W, which contained the usual occupation debris. The black silty ash had been swept to the south-east through a stone culvert near the line of feature 8 (similar to the culvert at the south-east end of ditch 1). From here it was washed into feature 8 towards where the cobbled trackway crossed the area. The origin of this ash deposit was not clear. It probably came from some kiln or furnace positioned on or near the burnt stone cobbled that lay beside ditch 18 (F 21).

To the north there was evidence for a building in the enclosure formed by ditches 16, 17 W, 18, and 19. Roof tiles, pottery, and bones were found in these. It is difficult to interpret the small enclosure F 20, but it lay just outside what may have been the entrance to the enclosure (see FIG. 7). The burnt jaw-bone of an ox in the centre of the feature may have had some ritual significance. Ditch 19 is parallel to ditches 1 and 17 and is presumably part of the same lay-out. It too may have had a culvert at its south-eastern end. Only the bottom 0.2 m or so remained after disturbance by later cultivation.

The evidence for ironworking comes from the south-eastern area where many lumps of slag were found in pits 1, 2, and 3, and also in ditch 15. Although slag was found in most areas of the site, it was found here with ash and burnt stone and sherds of pottery. The features were in water-saturated yellow clay and were often no more than scoops, so that no furnaces as such were found. The pottery was interesting in its variety. Attention is called to no. 62 (FIG. 10), a small jar with a lead tube, and to the Severn Valley ware vessels. Also found was the rim of a glass vessel (FIG. 11, gl. 2).

The Portway

A section across the line of the Portway is shown on FIG. 7. The earliest track was to the north-east of the latest cobbled surface; that is, slightly up the slope. Subsequently, new surfaces were laid so that the line of the road gradually moved south-west cutting into the natural clay, ending up with the sunken cobbled track used at the beginning of this century. This latest surface consisted of compact cobbles, 30 to 60 mm in diameter, on a good firm surface. It was well worn and contained one deep cart-rut, suggestive of a considerable period of use. It was not the sort of surface for a mere field track. It has been suggested that, for periods going back to medieval times, the Portway was the route from Gloucester to London via Northleach, or from Gloucester to Cirencester. A more immediate destination was Prinknash Park and the land at the top of the escarpment, with its supplies of timber and stone, formerly belonging to the Abbey at Gloucester. For this type of transport money and time would have been spent in creating a good firm surface. It is not possible to state definitely how far back in time the broken surfaces go, but they could well be of medieval date. In that sense it means that we have not found the Roman Portway. However, if the north-eastern rutted cobbled track crossing feature 8 continued towards Gloucester, it might have been the antecedent of the sunken medieval route. Any raised agger with its small side ditches would have disappeared in the erosion subsequent to the gradual creation of a sunken lane. Once the Roman surface had disintegrated from lack of repair, the roadway would become lower and lower through wear, gradually eroding the banks of the depression on either side of the route. At the lower part of Great Awe Field adjacent to the Portway a mixed soil containing pieces of brick, slate, and recent pottery reached a depth of 0.5 m. This 'bricky' soil probably accumulated when the allotment strips were worked, and it is here that the 'Roman Portway' could have run.

CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY

There was little opportunity of using archaeological methods from stratification in order to build up a dated sequence for the site. Only in the deeper features such as ditches were different layers present and these were difficult to interpret. No evidence was found for recutting or re-alignment of ditches or anything that might imply rebuilding. Pottery at the bottom of a feature might suggest a date before which it had been dug. Fourth-century material was present in the top layer of many of the ditches, usually in a dark ashy deposit. Finds were absent from the yellow-brown sand which filled any depressions that formed above Roman features. From this, close dating is not possible. However, combining an appreciation of the lay-out of the site with the location of some finds and a knowledge of what to expect from the area, an estimate has been made as to when various developments occurred in the Roman period.

Before any chronology can be discussed, something must be said on the nature of the Portway site which, like other rural sites, must have been concerned with agriculture. However, because of its position near Gloucester, it probably came more under the influence of the Roman way of life than the many rural sites on the Cotswolds. As shown on FIGS. 1 and 7, it lies within a
regular field system and may have been set up under official auspices. This is supported by the presence of tiles stamped RPG (FIG. 14, b and c). One can visualize a few native families joining those of retired legionaries when settlement commenced. We do not know why a shrine was set up; whether it was under Roman influence or because the site had been sacred previously. In antiquity religion was very much a part of life and every authority had its ritual observances to the tutelary deity. Although most sites had their small shrine or sacred corner, at the Portway the religious aspect must have been something more important, and it appears to have developed into a minor religious centre. At other Romano-British or Gallo-Roman sites of this nature the temple was only part of the life of the settlement. So in putting forward the suggestion of a wayside shrine, it is not denied that other activities, which of necessity included agriculture, took place.

Romano-Celtic temples and shrines are known on many sites in Britain. Polygonal structures discovered in Roman Britain have usually been interpreted as shrines. These buildings are sometimes in timber and are often associated with circular houses. It has been postulated that they originated from pre-Roman Iron Age prototypes. However, there is no positive evidence that the Britons had polygonal shrines before the Romans came. On the Continent polygonal and round temples were built before the date of the invasion of Britain. Many examples of these buildings exist in northern and western Gaul and it is probably from here that the idea crossed the Channel. At the Portway we may have two different types of shrine, though not necessarily in use at the same time, for one may have replaced the other. If we can postulate a long building beside ditch 1 and other features including the spring, the plan of the site has a slight resemblance to larger religious centres, both in Britain and Gaul, which inherit much in lay-out from the classical world. The Portway site may have acquired some of these elements from its proximity to Gloucester, though, of course, everything was on a more humble scale. Possible votive offerings are few, but they may have been of a perishable nature. The defaced sculptured head (FIG. 14, a) was probably part of a cult monument. Dr Henig has made a tentative suggestion that it might have been a hunting deity. If this is so, a shrine can be envisaged where hunters paused before ascending the Cotswold scarp to the hunting grounds; grounds used in the Middle Ages for this purpose by Gloucester Abbey.

No evidence has been found for a pre-Roman routeway, though one may have existed, and it is unlikely that the Roman site was established before the end of the 1st century. The earliest date for pottery or other objects found on the site is in the last quarter of the 1st century. However, the local Dobunni were not far away, whether in hillforts on the Cotswolds or in as yet undiscovered sites near at hand. So they must have become involved when the Roman army moved in. The evidence from Brockworth and Portway suggests that as far as houses were concerned these were integrated into a Roman layout of parallel ditches. The evidence for this is stronger at Brockworth, where round-houses were erected within a measured rectangular layout. It is just possible, of course, that the Brockworth round-houses were shrines too. We know that the Romans would respect and assimilate local deities. This also fits with the suggestion that the northern Dobunni quickly came to terms and co-operated with the Romans.

At Brockworth (FIG. 1) there were two rectangular systems of ditches. The initial one was dated to the early Flavian period on the evidence of much 1st-century pottery in the fill of the ditches. Such early pottery did not occur in the Portway ditches. The second phase at Brockworth was thought to be at the establishment of the colonia at Gloucester, and this fits with the evidence from the Portway site. It is necessary to decide which features belong to the earliest layout at the Portway. Ditch 1 with its approximate Roman measurement is a possible baseline, which may have been in alignment with a pre-existing field system. Most of the other ditches and the rectangular enclosure are thought to have been established soon after; at least as boundaries.
The most suitable date for this development is in the first half of the 2nd century and is consistent with the pottery evidence. As at Brockworth, with its circular buildings within rectangular ditches, there was a resurgence of native influence at this time, especially insofar as native-type building was concerned. If it is correct that ditch 1 was the original base-line, we should expect the first substantial construction to have been the range of timber buildings beside the ditch, followed by a religious building in the enclosure, as it lies within the same geometric layout. These buildings were probably constructed of sectional panels on sleeper beams which left only slight traces on the previously prepared, level, beaten surface of gravelly sand. A square porch with four thick corner posts was placed at the east entrance of the 'temple'. This building probably had a clay tile roof. The other timber structures may also have had tiled roofs, but thatch is equally likely. Thatch was almost certainly used on the polygonal building, as customary for native round-houses. The date of construction is not certain. However, it appears to fit in with the layout of the rectangular enclosure and did not overlie any previous gully or ditch. So it is likely to have been standing at the same time as neighbouring buildings, suggesting a construction date sometime in the middle of the 2nd century.

The manufacture of pottery on the site was started early in the 2nd century. Severn Valley ware forms, presumed to have been made on the site, begin at this date and continued throughout the century. It is not known when the iron-working was active; but as long as the buildings were occupied supplies of iron would have been needed. Other nearby settlements might also have requirements for iron objects. Interpreting the Portway site as a cult centre with a shrine would presuppose a small market with shops or booths, as found throughout the classical world.

For over a hundred years no great changes are noticeable in the archaeological record. It may be that this denotes a period of stability with a secure way of life accepted under a Romano-British authority, which engendered a limited prosperity. The lower half of ditches and features near the 'porch' area did not contain pottery later than the middle of the 3rd century. From this and other evidence, such as the presence of clay, as opposed to stone, roof-tiles, it is thought that towards the end of the 3rd century, or a little later, some disturbance occurred on the site which resulted in the temple or building in the enclosure going out of use. Not much later a flood may have brought sand across the settlement which settled into the deeper hollows such as feature 7.

At some time the stone monument was thrown down and the head of the cult figure broken off and defaced. This presupposes a change of religious belief. If this happened when Christianity became an accepted religion, we can postulate a date in the middle of the 4th century or later. The central feature of the polygonal building has been interpreted as a post-support, which caught fire in situ. So this shrine may have been burnt down, monuments destroyed, and images defaced, all at the same time. However, this cannot be proved archaeologically. For one thing thatched buildings can catch fire at any time. Whatever happened to some of the buildings, the need for the trackway remained if material was to be transported from the Cotswolds to Gloucester. Pottery of the 4th century was found in the upper levels of most features and in the northern area the ditches contained this pottery throughout. It can therefore be assumed that buildings stood here alongside the supposed trackway in the 4th century. The cart-ruts on the two cobbled tracks on either side of the later Portway are possibly the last piece of evidence from the time when the site was occupied; though they may have been used and 'rutted' in the early Middle Ages after the site had been deserted. In fact, if we do not believe in horseshoes being used in the Roman period, we must accept a later date for the rutted trackway. Then finally a natural event, such as a very wet period, brought a mass of sand over the rutted trackways with horseshoes lying on them.

This occurrence most likely took place at a time when the fields above the site were ploughed,
or the ground otherwise disturbed, so that vegetative cover had been removed. Cultivation or other activity by man would have been at its most intense either in the late Roman period or in the 13th and 14th centuries when the slopes were being ploughed and strip lynchets formed. The late Saxon period, with the establishment of the monastic estates, is another possible time. The site was abandoned at the end of the 4th century or beginning of the 5th, leaving vestiges of tracks and boundaries, which became imprinted on the landscape to remain as features up to recent times.

**SUMMARY OF DATING EVIDENCE FOR THE PORTWAY SITE**

**Western Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ditch</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ditch 1</td>
<td>Samian stamp</td>
<td>AD 150–180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severn Valley ware</td>
<td>2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coins to side of ditch</td>
<td>Late 3rd and early 4th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stone head</td>
<td>Possibly defaced mid-4th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditch 2</td>
<td>Severn Valley ware</td>
<td>2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditch 3</td>
<td>5 pieces of samian</td>
<td>Mid-2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortarium stamp</td>
<td>Mid-2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooch no. 1</td>
<td>Late 1st into 2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooch no. 4</td>
<td>AD 55–75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditch 4</td>
<td>Samian stamp</td>
<td>AD 145–175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coarse ware</td>
<td>Beginning of 2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditch 5</td>
<td>Mortaria</td>
<td>AD 240–350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooch no. 5</td>
<td>End of 1st into 2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 7</td>
<td>Samian</td>
<td>AD 160–190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coarse ware</td>
<td>Mostly 2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 8 SW</td>
<td>Samian stamp</td>
<td>Antonine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortarium</td>
<td>AD 240–300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 8 NE</td>
<td>Mortarium</td>
<td>Late 1st century (in deepest level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-western cobbling</td>
<td>Samian</td>
<td>Late 1st century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 9</td>
<td>Samian</td>
<td>AD 145–170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 12</td>
<td>Mortaria</td>
<td>AD 180–300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gully 2</td>
<td>Stamped tile</td>
<td>2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortaria</td>
<td>AD 240–300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brooch no. 6</td>
<td>Before mid-2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gully 3</td>
<td>Samian stamp</td>
<td>AD 145–175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygonal Building</td>
<td>Samian</td>
<td>Mid-3rd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mortarium</td>
<td>AD 240–300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black-burnished ware</td>
<td>3rd century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rutted Trackways**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooch no. 2 (residual)</td>
<td>Late 1st into 2nd century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseshoes</td>
<td>Late Roman, or later to before 14th century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Northern Area**

| Ditch 17  | Samian stamp | AD 150–180 |
|           | Fine ware    | AD 100–150 |
|           | Mortaria     | AD 240–400 |
| Feature 21| Mortarium    | AD 240–300 |
| Surface Find | Samian stamp | AD 110–130 |
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South-Eastern Area

Ditch 13
  Samian
  Severn Valley ware
  Black-burnished ware

2nd century
Mostly 2nd century
2nd and 3rd century

Gully 22
  Black-burnished ware

AD 110-150

Gully 23
  Samian

End of 2nd century

Pit 3
  Severn Valley ware

End of 1st into 2nd century

THE FINDS

The Pottery (FIGS. 8 to 10)

The pottery is listed in features within the three areas previously defined; that is the Western, Northern and South-Eastern areas. Only a small proportion of the pottery found is mentioned, the emphasis in selection being on rim-form, fabric, or decoration. The illustrations show representative types and some vessels of special interest. The heaviest concentration was of Severn Valley (SV) ware, this being the commonest fabric found near Gloucester. Many examples of this ware found at the Portway site have been illustrated in Trans BGAS 100 (1982) 33-46. Cross-reference to an item in this article is given in brackets thus: SV Report (--). SV ware is of special interest because some of it was probably made on, or adjacent to, the Portway site. The reasons for supposing this are presented at the end of this pottery report. For further discussion of the definition, distribution, and period of use of SV ware in the neighbourhood of Gloucester, the above mentioned article should be consulted.

A summary is given of the black-burnished (BB) ware in each feature. The date range has been assessed from the Gillam types. 19

The small amount of grey ware was undistinguished. The mortaria have been related, where possible, to the types described in Young's work on Oxfordshire pottery. 30 Other distinctive wares, such as the 'late shell-gritted' ware, have been listed. The term 'native ware' is applied here to pots in pre-Roman Iron Age forms, usually in thick, gritted, friable fabric, dark grey to black in colour. The Samian consists principally of undecorated vessels. The form numbers are given. Six of the ten potters' stamps have been identified by Miss B.M. Dickinson of Leeds University.

WESTERN AREA

Ditch 1

Samian ware
This consists of sherds from about 28 vessels. These divide into 8 of form 31, 6 of form 33, 2 of form 27, 1 of form 36, and 1 of form 38. Others include 2 decorated sherds from form 37, one of which is identifiable as the work of Cinnamus, AD 135-170, from the double circle round a basket motif. A form 45, the samian mortarium, can be dated to the end of the 2nd century. An unusual rim from a dish with an out-curving wall having an overhanging lip is probably a variant of form Curle 15 found in the Antonine period. 31 The stamps are: a small piece from a form 31, Central Gaulish, one stamped A[. Antonine; a vessel of form Curle 15 or 23 (with a circular name-stamp), Central Gaulish, mid- to late-Antonine, and a form 31R, Central Gaulish, stamped I[LIOMARI]. The stamp is from a die of Illiomarus ii used at Lexoux (4a), and is known from Catterick and on form 80. Illiomarus also made form 27, and so his range will be c. AD 150-180.

Coarse pottery (FIG. 8)
1 Mortarium with the flange painted with broad red bands. Off-white fabric, probably Oxfordshire ware.
3 Large storage jar with heavy rim. Hard pale grey fabric with darker grey grog.
5 Globular jar with bead rim. Thick grey fabric with darker surface, speckled, with mica and small dark grits.
7 Small beaker with everted rim in grey ware. First half of 2nd century.
8 Flagon with faint signs of rings on the neck. Red ware with cream slip. First half of 2nd century.

SV ware
In addition to the above the rims of 30 jars in SVW were found, including SV Report (18) and (51). Among the 10 bowl rims are SV Report (38), (43), (86), (114), and (115). No. (113) represents a colander. Nineteen mugs range in date from the late 1st-century types with vertical sides to the mid-2nd century. SV Report (145) has two handles.

BB ware
This covers a date range from AD 120 to 350. There were 2 globular jars with small everted rims and close-set lattice; 3 cooking pots; 2 flat rim bowls and one plain rim bowl decorated with overlapping arcing lines; 3 flat rim dishes and 3 plain rim dishes. A miniature jar came from the east end of the ditch.

Other fabrics
Of the five grey ware vessels one has large mica platelets on the body surface, and another is an overfired 'waster' sherd. There was part of a large native-type storage jar in thick soft ware with grits. Also present were two plain-necked flagons in reddish ware.

Ditch 2
No samian ware was recovered from this ditch. Only two items of pottery have been illustrated:
9 Small bowl in SV ware with rilled rim.
10 Flat-rimmed dish. Pale buff-brown ware.

SV ware
This consists of a large flat-rimmed bowl of 340 mm diameter, SV Report (111); a large two-handled mug; 2 jars and a jug, SV Report (7); and 7 other rims.

Other fabrics
Only 3 vessels in BB ware were found, one being an early type with upright rim. Two lids were made in a grey gritty ware.

Ditch 3
Samian ware
This consisted of 2 pieces of form 31; the flange of a form 38; a piece of form 33 rim and the complete base of another form 33. This last vessel, the conical cup, was coarsely made, showing the finger-nail imprints of the potter as he dipped it in the slip. The coating is not uniform and is of a light cherry-pink colour. All 5 pieces are probably mid-2nd century in date.

Coarse pottery (FIG. 8)
11 Native ware. Uneven buff surface, black inside; with small grits of quartzite and limestone.
12 Native ware. Uneven blackish surface. Two large pieces of quartzite visible as tempering.
14 Mortarium stamp. Mrs K. Hartley reports: This incompletely impressed stamp, CICVRFE, belongs to a potter who always stamped CICVRFE, using a single die. Some such name as Cicervus or Cicervo is indicated, though neither has been recorded as a Celtic name. Fourteen mortaria of his are now known, all from the Midlands apart from two at Haltonchasters and Papcastle. The former provides the only site-dating evidence since it was found in the packing of a new floor laid down during the course of Period I, probably c. AD 163 (information kindly supplied by J.P. Gillam). His rim-forms certainly fit a mid-2nd-century date. His mortaria closely resemble those of the Hartshill potters Minomelus and Gratinus and the presence of a slightly distorted mortarium of Cicur – on the kiln site – makes it likely that he worked there.42
Nos. 11, 12 and 13 in native fabric are Iron Age types, which were probably made up to about AD 150.
In this feature SV ware was sparse, comprising 2 handled-mugs and a jar with a curving everted rim. These are probably mid-2nd century or earlier. The BB ware also tended to be early, with 4 rims of a date of AD 120 to 160; 3 others could be 2nd century. Although there are later pieces, they were not in the earliest fill of the ditch.
FIG. 9 Romano-British pottery, nos. 21-45. Scale 1:4.
Ditch 4

Samian ware
Two pieces from form 31, a rim of form 27, a flange of form 38, and 3 pieces of form 33 were found, one of which had a small part of the stamp of Camillus reported on under gully 3. Also found on form 33 was a stamp of Fabianus impressed FABIANI M in retrograde lettering, dating to the end of the 1st or to the beginning of the 2nd century. 21

Coarse pottery (FIG. 8)
15 This is a tray rather than a vessel. Perhaps its shape was that of a shallow basket with right-angled corners. Its use may have been as a 'fire-tray'. The fabric is soft and coarse with impurities in the clay. The grit consists of small pieces of limestone and grog. Another possibility is that this was a salt-tray.
16 Similar fabric but this vessel is bowl-shaped and may have been set in the ground for cooking or storage. Thumb impressions are found on the inside. A container of the same form was found at the Brockworth Roman site 4 set in a pit. They are thought to be late 1st century in date from the shape of the rim.
17 Flagon in white ware. Late 1st to 2nd century.
18 Large flanged-rim bowl with notched strap handle in SV ware. 2nd century.
19 Small grey jar with upright rim. Beginning of 2nd century.
20 SV ware jar.

SV ware
The following are illustrated in the SV Report and there numbered (21), (23), (29), (32), (45), (57), and (66) as jars, and (147) and (148) as mugs. Rims of 5 other medium-sized jars, a bowl with everted rim and 4 other mugs were found.

BB ware
The above compare with 12 BB rims which are all mid-2nd-century types.
   The 3 grey ware vessels are small jars with small everted rims, which are probably of the first half of the 2nd century. This gives an average early date for ditch 4, with the possibility of it filling up sometime in the 3rd century.

Ditch 5

Samian ware
Fifteen sherds were found. Among these are 2 of form 27, 2 of form 31, 2 of form 31R, 2 of form 38, 1 of form 36, and 1 of form 45. All these are early to mid-2nd century, except the last, which comes at the end of the century.

Coarse pottery (FIG. 9)
21 Mortarium. Oxfordshire white ware. Young type M21. AD 240-300. 22
22 Mortarium. Oxfordshire white ware. Young type M22. AD 240-350. 23
23 Small grey bowl or dish with flat rim.
24 Bowl. Black, smoothed, with lattice decoration.
25 Bowl with beaded rim. Black.
26 Bowl with beaded rim. Sandy burnished black ware, possibly Durotrigan.
27 Jar in native fabric.
28 Small jar. Dark grey ware with much rough grit.
29 Small jar. Fabric similar to no. 28.
30 Jar with prominent corrugation on a rounded shoulder. Pale grey with mica on surface.
74 Large jar. Parts of this vessel were scattered in the west end of this feature. All the sherds are twisted and warped with overfiring. This is discussed at the end of the pottery report. Illustrated on FIG. 10.

SV ware
A large quantity was found in this ditch. It consisted of a total of 39 jars of varying shapes and sizes, 23 mugs, 5 bowls, 1 dish, and 1 flagon. The following items are in the SV Report: nos. (8), (17), (19), (33), (40), (46), (50), (56), (74), (100), (112), (121), (141), and (150).

BB ware
Fourteen cooking pots, dating from approximately AD 100 to 300, 7 dishes from mid-2nd to mid-4th century and 3 bowls of late 3rd to early 4th century were found.

Other fabrics
Three dishes with plain rims in a greyish ware with large flecks of mica on the surface also occurred.

Ditch 6

Samian ware
Only 4 vessels are represented from 2 bases, a rim, and a piece of flange, all mid-2nd century.
FIG. 10  Romano-British pottery, nos. 46–74. Scale 1:4.
Coarse pottery (FIG. 9)
31 Small red bowl with grooved flat rim. SV ware. An unusual form for this ware.
32 Small jar in grey ware.
33 Similar to no. 32 but the ware more resembles BB.
34 Bead rim jar. Hard, pale grey fabric with dark grey surface.

SV ware
A large flanged bowl, 2 medium-sized jars, and 3 mugs were found in this ditch.

BB ware
Two cooking pots and 2 dishes are dated from mid-2nd to early 3rd century and there is a bowl of AD 290-350.

Other fabrics
A medium grey jar of BB form but not BB fabric completes the collection of rims.

Feature 7
Samian ware
In this 'pit' 3 rims of form 33 were found, a rim of form 31, and a decorated sherd of a form 37 bowl, which shows the figure of a soldier (O.177) in a double roundel. The ovolo and a small leaf motif help to assign this piece to the Lezoux potter Doceccus, AD 165-200. Two stamps were found: one, on form 33, Central Gaulish, with a stamp IO ∙ ∙, probably illiterate, Antonine; the other a stamp of Tituro of Lezoux on a form 37 reading TVRONISO-. Antonine.

Coarse pottery (FIG. 9)
36 Cooking pot or beaker with small everted rim. Pale grey with darker flecks.
37 Small beaker with small upright rim. Grey with smooth dark surface.
39 Large storage jar. Coarse, hard, native ware with many dark grits. Pale grey with darker wash.
40 Jar with cordon on neck and bead rim. Pale buff-grey sandy ware.
41 Mortarium with two matching stamps with a 'geometric' design.
42 Jar with distorted rim. Illustrated on FIG. 10. (See end of pottery report for a discussion on wasters.)

SV ware
The following numbers in the SV Report came from this feature: (22), (27), (30), (31), (34), (41), (81), (82), (83), (98), (103), (105), (109), (118), (119), (123), (130), (144), and (146). The last one is interesting in that it is a mug with 3 or 4 handles. There are 23 other mugs, which means there are more of these than jars (numbering 12), which is unusual. Ten bowls and 3 dishes were found.

BB ware
Feature 7 produced 24 cooking pots, 3 flat-rimmed bowls, 2 dishes, and 2 flanged-rim bowls. There was also a globular jar of early 'Durotrigian' type. Several of the cooking pots could date to the beginning of the 2nd century. This dating applies also to the dishes. However, other vessels carry the date into the 3rd century.

Feature 8, SW of the Portway
Samian ware
A small conical cup (form 33) is dated to the mid-2nd century. A much abraded base of a form 37 has a stamp which reads PATER[.] JAN[.] This is the Rheinzabern potter Paternianus who worked in the Antonine period.

SV ware
This consisted of 2 bowls, nos (80) and (132) of the SV Report, 4 flanged-rim bowls, 4 jars, and 2 mugs.

BB ware
Among several sherds the datable vessels were a flat-rimmed dish of mid- to late 2nd century, 2 small cooking pots of the 3rd century, and an oval dish of late 3rd to 4th century.

Other fabrics
The grey ware sherds were a flat-rimmed dish of BB type, a large dish and a flanged bowl, both with mica on the surface. A small sherd of pink fabric with a trail of white slip over a grey colour coat and a faint rouletting was found.
Gully 8 (slot at bottom of feature 8) (FIG. 9)

42 Small thick-walled jar with pulley rim in red ware.
43 Pale red jar with curving neck and cordon.
44 Lidded bowl with 4 square and 1 round holes. Red ware.
45 Large dish or bowl. Pale grey with mica platelets on the surface.

Also in this slot was found a mortarium of Young type M18 dated AD 240-300 and a micaceous black sherd and two burnt rims.

Feature 8, NE of the Portway, including the rutted trackway (Northern Area)

Samian ware
The flange of a form 38 and the base of a form 31 were found under the cobbles of the track and can be ascribed to the second half of the 2nd century. Also found were a small body sherd of form 33 and a large base where the form of the vessel is uncertain.

Coarse pottery (under the rutted cobbling) (FIG. 10).

46 Jar in native ware. Black with whitish grits.
47 Mortarium in local ware. Possibly made at the Gloucester kiln site. Late 1st-early 2nd century. Found at the deepest level in clay silt.
48 Beaker or mug with grooves near rim. Brown surface.
72 See below for a description of this object.

SV ware
Sherds of this ware were scattered throughout this feature. The 2 bowls (68) and (69) of the SV report were under the cobbling, as was (14), a jar with a cordon on the neck. Other SV ware consisted of a large jar with a thick rim, 2 bowls with flanged rims, 5 medium-sized jars, a carinated bowl, 2 small micaceous bowls and 2 bases with foot-rings.

BB ware
This comprised 2 cooking pots and a bowl of 3rd to early 4th-century type.

Other fabrics
Among other sherds there was a medium-sized jar in pale grey fabric with brown surface and tempered with small grits and grog.

On top of, and in, the cobbling
It is not proposed to enumerate the pottery found here as it is all residual and much abraded. It includes Oxfordshire mortaria, SV ware rims, and some late BB ware all found with nails, bones, pieces of tile, etc. among the cobbles.

Under the cobbling
The most significant vessels found here are 3 of similar form and colour to no. 44 found south of the Portway line about 6 m away. One of the rims could be from the same bowl, which is not a common type. Other sherds are: a flat-rimmed bowl that appears to be a much scorched SV type, 2 necks with flanges from colour-coated flagons, and 8 other SV type bowls. Four BB vessels of 3rd-century date were also found.

Deepest deposit, in the Pool
With a few undistinguished sherds there was a very abraded thick rim of a large storage jar usually dated late in the 1st century.

South-west cobbling
Of the 5 sherds, the lion-head spout from a form 45 mortarium is the only datable item, being of the end of the 2nd century.

Coarse pottery (FIG. 10)
49 Bowl with down-curved flange. Pale buff-brown.
50 Small jar with everted rim. Micaceous.
51 Mini-beaker. Pale grey.
THE PORTWAY ROMAN SITE

SV ware
This ware consisted of one flat-rimmed bowl, (110) in the SV report, 3 large jars (58) and (60), and 8 other rims of bowls and jars and 2 mugs.

BB ware
Eight vessels were identified dating from late 2nd to early 4th century.

Other fabrics
The base of a jar in Oxfordshire 'parchment' ware and 3 rims of large grey bowls were noted. Most sherds on the cobbled surface were abraded and all are residual.

Feature 9
This includes the two short gullies (4 and 5) connecting to ditch 1 from gully 9 (originally called ditch 9).

Samian ware
From the main gully 9 came a rim of a form 37 bowl showing an ovolo used by Cinnamus, AD 145-170. Also found were 2 pieces of a form Ludowici Tg, Central Gaulish, second half of the 2nd century.

SV ware
The pottery shown in the SV report from this area includes nos. (6) a jar with a cordoned narrow neck, (28) a large ovoid jar (about 290 mm diameter at the girth), and (65) a large bowl with an out-turned triangular-sectioned rim. Two jars, 2 large bowls, and a small, handled mug make up the numbers in gully 9. Five other rims of flat-rimmed bowl type were found in gully 4.

BB ware
From 6 vessels a date range from early 2nd to early 3rd century can be estimated. One piece each from gully 4 and 5 give a later date of early 4th century for their possible fill.

Other fabrics
Other items include body sherds from 2 large storage jars. One off-white in colour, with grog, is an early type of fabric; the other is very hard with quartzitic grit as well as grog. There is also a small sherd of a thin, finely-made, grey spherical beaker with burnished lines.

Feature 10
Samian ware
The 3 sherds can only be dated generally: 2 are 2nd century and the other, with two bead rows, probably 1st century.

SV ware
No. (36) of the SV report is a large jar or bowl of late type. The rest consists of 4 large flange-rim bowls, a bowl with everted rim, and 2 mugs.

BB ware
The 15 rims are from vessels dated from late 2nd to early 4th century.

Other fabrics
Other wares comprise 2 Oxfordshire mortaria and an Oxfordshire bowl. The rim of a jar in a fawn-grey fabric with mica flakes and another similar, but darker and probably burnt. These sherds could be over-fired SV ware. Finally, there was a pedestal base of a beaker with a black colour-coat.

Feature 12 (parallel to and near feature 10)
Samian ware
A small part of a form 36 and another of a form 31 were found.

SV ware
The following items are in the SV report: (10) narrow-necked jar with 'pulley' rim; (54) jar with triangular-sectioned rim, over-fired to a hard brittle condition; (79) bowl with everted rim; (129) flange-rim bowl; (151) mug with handle, brown surface. Three jars, 5 bowls, and 1 mug make up the total.

BB ware
Five cooking pots and 2 bowls give a late 3rd- to early 4th-century date. Three medium-sized jars with everted rims in a grey sandy stony ware, much burnt, were found.
Other fabrics
Also present were 2 Oxfordshire mortaria; the wall-sided mortarium (Young M16), dated AD 180–240, and the projecting turned-over flange (Young M17), dated AD 240–300.

Gully 1
Of the 7 sherds from this short gully joining ditch 5 with feature 7, the BB ware is of 2nd-century date and there is another rim of a highly micaceous small grey jar.

Gully 2
In this long gully an RPG stamped tile (FIG. 14b) was found near the central complex.

SV ware
A jar with an overhanging everted rim in a buff fabric is shown as (35) in the SV report. Also in this feature were a mug, a flanged-rim bowl, and a lid.

BB ware
This consisted of a plain rim dish of the early 3rd century, a flat rim dish of the late 2nd, an early 3rd century bowl, and a cooking pot of the late 3rd century.

Other fabrics
Three grey ware vessels, one of which is highly micaceous, and a small everted-rim jar in native ware with grit and grog as filler were also found. Finally, there were 3 mortaria rims of Young types M17 and M21, AD 240–300.

Gully 3
Samian ware
Form 33 base, stamped CAE MIM by Camius ii of Lezoux (Die 1a). This potter's output includes forms 27, 46 and 79/80. c. AD 145–175.

The polygonal building
1. The gullies

SV ware
Rim of dish, 2nd century.

BB ware
Plain rim bowl, flanged rim bowl, and a small jar, all second half of 2nd century.

Other fabrics

2. Internal features
Samian ware
Rim of form 31. Mid-2nd century.

SV ware
Bowl with flanged rim with lid seating.

BB ware
Flanged rim bowl of late 3rd to early 4th century.

Other fabrics
Mortarium, Young type M21. AD 240–300.

3. Outer gully

SV ware
Jar with beaded everted rim, 2nd-century type. Rim of hemispherical bowl, 2nd century.

BB ware
Small cooking pot of late 3rd century.
4. Unstratified material from the area

SV ware
Rim of mug, a jar, and a flanged rim bowl. All 2nd century.

BB ware
Rim of bowl, 3rd-century type. Three rims of dishes and 3 jars of 2nd and 3rd centuries.

Other fabrics
A grey micaceous jar. Two off-white sherds, one of a small pedestal base, the other, with a piece of flint in the fabric, is from a thin-walled handled flagon. Early 2nd century.

NORTHERN AREA

Ditch 16

SV ware
A fired rim of a small jar. Burnt and overfired neck of a jar with 2 shoulder cordons, grey throughout.

BB ware
Flat-rimmed bowl of 2nd-century date and 2 rims of 3rd century.

Other fabrics
A late BB-type bowl in a pale grey sandy and micaceous fabric. Rim of a thin-bodied colour-coated beaker in a pinkish fabric which is possibly made locally.

Ditch 17

Samian ware
Form 31, Central Gaulish. The stamp, SVO|BNil|Li, is from a die used at Lezoux by Suobnillus (44). The forms on which it appears range from the Hadrianic or early-Antonine 27 to the mid- to late-Antonine 80. c. AD 150–80.

SV ware
Rim of a heavy storage jar with straight neck and acutely turned-over rim and large heavy base. Three rims of medium-sized jars, one with pulley rim. Two rims and 3 bases of mugs. A rough and eroded upright jar which may be an early type of this ware.

BB ware
Seven flanged bowls with straight sides, dated late 3rd to mid-4th century.

Other fabrics
Sherd of rouletted beaker in what is probably local colour-coated ware. Small sherd of a scale-pattern decorated barbotine vessel, with scales outlined in black-painted 'eyelashes', AD 100–150. Copy of samian form 31 bowl in Oxfordshire ware, late 3rd to 4th century; 2 rims of mortaria, Young type M17; rim of mortarium copying samian form 45, Young type C97, AD 240–400+.

Ditch 18

SV ware
Three rims of bowls, one of which may be a potter's reject. There are also 3 very thin sherds with grit on them that may be waste pieces, and a grey over-fired sherd with mica flecks on its surface.

Ditch 19

SV ware
Rims of 2 jars and 1 mug; the last has grits on its surface.

BB ware
A cooking pot of late 3rd- to early 4th-century type. A flanged bowl of 3rd to mid-4th century.

Feature 20 (gullies forming a rectangle with a small pit in the centre)

Found in the pit with burnt stones and bones was a large narrow-necked jar (88 mm diameter) in SV ware, which has a row of indentations about 25 mm apart set in a circle on the interior surface about 60 mm below the rim where the wall of
the vessel increases its circumference. These marks may have been made by some implement used to support the vessel in the leather-hard state. Although the body is sturdy and regular, the surface is uneven as if it had been left unfinished. Other SV ware in the pit consisted of a storage-jar rim, the base of a mug with small grits on the surface, and the wall of a jar in reduced ware. Finally, there was a small hemispherical bowl with a beak rim of 85 mm diameter, which is an unusual form in SV ware and is probably 1st century.

The gullies produced large sherds of 2 SV ware jars, one of which is wide-mouthed (about 190 mm) with an upright rim. A base with a solid foot-ring might belong to one of these. There was also a worn base of an Oxfordshire bowl which gives a late 3rd- to 4th-century date for the fill of the gullies.

Feature 21 (cobble surface with burnt area in centre)

The pottery was very mixed, burnt, and abraded. The SV forms were usual except for a small flat-rimmed bowl, the rim of which protrudes internally in what is a characteristic special to Gloucester pottery. There is a lid for a narrow-necked vessel, a jug, or a flagon. Some of the sherds are encrusted with a dark pasty substance, possibly tar, or resin from burning timber. There were 3 BB ware sherds and 4 others of BB forms, but in a very gritty, thick, sandy fabric. Lastly a mortaria (Young type M17) gives a date of AD 240-300.

SOUTH-EASTERN AREA

Ditch 13

Samian ware

Form 30, Central Gaulish. The motif of a double medallion containing a Venus (a version of O.331 = D.185), between leaves, is a common one on bowls by Cinnamini ii, but the types of leaf used are uncommon. The bunch of grapes was probably added to the mould freehand. Cinnamini is also known to have used the tridit motifs back to back, c. AD 150-180.

Coarse pottery (FIG. 10)

52 Medium-sized necked jar. Micaceous grey ware.
53 Small jar with everted rim. Grey.
54 Flanged-rim dish. Pale grey with thin body.
56 Jar in grey fabric with patchy brown internal surface. Badly-fired SV ware?
57 Narrow-necked jar. Grey and overfired.
58 Small grey beaker with small everted rim.
59 Jar with curving rim from neck. Buff-grey, overfired.
60 Jar with distorted rim. SV type.
61 Mug with vertical surface markings. Overfired.

SV ware

The following items are in the SV report: (16) and (26) narrow-necked jars with flared-out rims, (48) large jar with short neck and prominent shoulder, (49) large pear-shaped storage jar with turned-over rim, (67) large wide-mouthed jar, (85) large bowl with heavy moulded rim and thick body, (89) large bowl with small out-turned rim, (99) plain-rimmed dish of early 2nd-century type, (117) large bowl with flanged rim, (120) and (126) medium-sized bowls with flanged rims, (135) small bowl with inturned rim, first half of 2nd century. A further 11 rims of jars or bowls and 5 of mugs were found.

BB ware

Twenty-five cooking pots were found in this ditch with 8 flat-rimmed dishes and bowls. About half these are mid- to late 2nd century. The others are later, some dating to the end of the 3rd century. This is possibly suggestive of reduced occupation here in the later period.

Other fabrics

Other sherds found were: a base with part of a body in hard sandy ware with many flecks of mica, the rim of a mug in dark grey ware (probably SV ware fired in reducing conditions), and 2 mortaria in Oxfordshire ‘parchment’ ware.

Gully 7 (continuation of ditch 13 into feature 8)

Samian ware

A small form 33 cup with internal and external grooves. First half of 2nd century.

Gully 22 (N.B. this and the following features were interconnected. There was much slag in all deposits.)

Jar in grey ware with orange-brown surface. Small beak rim of pale grey beaker. BB cooking pot, AD 110-150.
Gully 23

Samian ware

Other wares
63 Small jar in pale pink ware with brown surface. Signs of rouletting round the neck.

SV ware
(84) large thick-bodied bowl with moulded rim, and (88) pale grey bowl with triangular rim section. Twelve other SV type rims.

Gully 24

Heavy rim of a large storage jar. Grey ware with pink-brown surface.

Gully 25

64 Pedestal flask or jar with a thick band of fluting round the body girth. The unusual fabric is thought not to be local.
SV ware mug.
BB ware
Three cooking pots of 3rd to early 4th century and a dish of late 2nd to early 3rd century.

Pit 1

One SV rim and one BB cooking pot of the 3rd century.

Pit 2

65 Shoulder of large storage jar. Burnished decoration of diagonal lines. Thick grey fabric with hard grits.
67 Bowl with rim moulded for lid-seating. Orange ware with small soft grits on surface.
68 Carinated beaker. No rim survives. SV ware with small grits.
69 Small bowl with down-turned flange rim. Pale grey ware.

Pit 3

70 Jar with curving-over rim in pale grey ware.
71 A foot from a tripod dish or bowl in SV ware. End of 1st century, or first quarter of 2nd century.

Ditch 15

Large everted rim bowl and an everted rim jar of SV ware. BB bowl of 3rd-century type.

WASTERS IN SV WARE

72 Twisted clay 'rod'. Possibly a potter's doodle. From feature 8 near the spring.
73 Small jar with twisted rim. Overfired so that the neck is very distorted. From feature 7.
74 Large storage jar. Very distorted and overfired. Several pieces of this jar have been found and all are distorted. Definitely a potter's waste product. From ditch 5.

SURFACE FINDS

Samian stamp. Found when Great Awe Field was ploughed. Mr B.R. Hartley reports: cup fragment, stamped [G]ENI[ALIS], by Genialis iii. This potter worked at both Les Martres-de-Veyre and Lezoux in the Trajanic-Adrianic period. The stamp occurs at Les Martres and on two burnt fragments at London, which might belong to the second fire deposit, c. AD 110–130.

A SEVERN VALLEY POTTERY-MAKING SITE

Many vessels in SV ware from this site have been included in the study of forms found near Gloucester. It had been
FIG. 11 Objects of non-ferrous metals and glass.
noted that some of the sherds from the Portway site were distorted and overfired, suggesting the possibility of pottery making. Although erosion had removed anything which might have been a kiln, some areas indicated industrial activity from the quantity of burnt stones, black ash, rubbing stones, and slag. The last is, of course, concerned with iron-working, but similar debris accumulates in a general working area where many activities, possibly including pottery making, would take place. This burnt debris was thick in the SE area where pottery 'wasters' were slightly more in evidence than elsewhere.

The requirements for pottery making were available on the site. A clean plastic clay is present in the Middle or Lower Lias basic beds which underlie the area. Some of the water in the brook at the bottom of Clanley Field may at that time have been diverted through the site. Sand from gravel washed down from the ridge to spread across the centre of the settlement. Except for a possible fire-bar (FIG. 14, f), no evidence of kilns was found either from the archaeological or builders' excavations. However the M5 spoil dumped to the east could possibly cover remains. These would have been damaged or destroyed by ridge-and-furrow, which existed under the trees of the orchard in the last century. There is also slight archaeological evidence in the northern area, where a thick deposit of compressed ash in the wider western end of ditch 17 may be waste from a furnace (see previous discussion on working areas). Nos. 60, 61, 73, and 74, illustrated in FIG. 10, are overfired and distorted and thought to have been made in situ. Also suggestive is the presence of many sherds whose surfaces contain gritty sand. This trait occurs occasionally elsewhere in SV ware, but here it is much in evidence, especially in the south-eastern area (e.g. FIG. 10, no. 67 in this report and others in the SV Report.)

Four other pointers to pottery making are: (i) the presence of many sherds of SV form which are either grey, or with a rough brown surface streaky from overfiring, (ii) a clay object (FIG. 10, no. 72), which may have been a potter's reject or rough-out, (iii) the large jar from the enclosure 'pit' (feature 20) in the northern area, which has internal indentations as from a lifting implement and an unusually rough surface for SV ware, as if it had never been properly finished, and (iv) above all, the fire-bar (FIG. 14, f) found near the north-eastern rutted track in feature 8. The last is evidence for a kiln near at hand, possibly destroyed by the digging of the pond or other agricultural activity.

Metal Objects

The brooches by D.F. Macketh

(Fig. 11, nos. 1 to 4; nos. 5 and 6 not drawn.)

1 The spring is held in the Polden Hill manner; an axis bar passes through the coils of the spring and through pierced plates at the end of the wings. Normally the chord of the spring is held either by a rearward hook or is passed through a pierced plate on the head of the bow; in this case, however, owing to the cast-on loop, the chord is internal and free. The wings are short and each had a moulding at the end. On the head of the bow is a cast-on loop above a small pedestal. In front of this is a rectangular platform from which rises a small plain crest. The platform ends in a step down to a headstud with a circular ornament simulating a glass or enamel annulus. The forward point of the stud is slightly turned up. Beneath the stud, and running down the bow to the foot decoration, is a ridge with a series of cross-cuts. The details of the ornament on the foot are obscure due to corrosion, but it appears to have been made up of two cross-mouldings above two lentoild bosses on either side of a third moulding. The catch-plate is plain but its upper edge runs as a crest behind the bow and stops about a quarter of the way down from the top.

Ostensibly a Headstud, there are two points of difference which show that the original type was a Colchester Derivative. Firstly the sprung pin arrangement; no Headstud proper has a Polden Hill manner of securing the spring. The line of development followed by the Headstud is from the Colchester, in which the spring and hook for the chord are integral with the body of the brooch through a series of variants in which the Colchester's hook is retained but the spring is mounted on a cast-on loop behind the head of the brooch by means of a tube. The direct line of development continues through types in which the spring has been replaced by a hinged pin but the loose loop and collar to be found on sprung examples is retained, the ends of the loop being fastened into the hole in which the axis bar for the hinged pin lies. The final stage is that in which the pin is hinged and the loop and collar are cast onto the head of the bow. There are many variants, but the Polden Hill method of securing the spring forms no part of the main sequence.

There is only one main variant in which the Polden Hill is to be expected, but it was short-lived and there is no good evidence to suggest that it had any major influence on the present specimen: the hook for the chord developed a rivet at its end and the head of the rivet became the focus for ornament, but seldom of the form to be found on Headstuds, where, indeed, the stud was originally the rivet head in the end of the hook. Very few specimens are known where this is the case, most apparent examples having a proper Colchester hook which runs down to a separate stud. The Polden Hill variety in which the hook becomes a flat plate, often with two rivets, which grips the chord of the spring like a rearward facing hook, is early, as the two examples from Hod Hill show, and their general rarity indicates that their floruit was
short, possibly over by AD 60. However, the ornamental value of the plate gave rise to further varieties of Colchester Derivative in which the pin is usually hinged.\textsuperscript{14} The truly distinguishing feature which shows that it does not belong to the two groups mentioned above is the alien spring fixing arrangement.

Secondly, the form of the wings; these features closely resemble those to be found on a type of Colchester Derivative found commonly in the Welsh Marches, but with many outliers.\textsuperscript{15} A third feature is the ridge down the front with its series of cross-cuts. This is unusual on Headstuds, but is to be found on a group of brooches well represented at Nor'Nour and in association with enamelled bosses, which recall both the Headstud and another closely related group with a forward-facing boss at the foot (see brooch no. 2).\textsuperscript{16} The closest parallel known to the writer comes from Chepstow\textsuperscript{17} but not from a datable context.

It cannot be without coincidence that the major varieties mentioned above come from the south-west of Britain. It would seem that there developed here, due to cross-fertilization of ideas, groups of brooches which stand outside the mainstream of development. The present brooch comes from a conjunction of the Dolphin\textsuperscript{18} with a type derived from the failed line of Headstud development,\textsuperscript{19} but the crest above the stud shows that the Headstud itself was not without some influence.\textsuperscript{20}

Despite the web of relationships, there is very little to provide a satisfactory date. It is clear that it must date after the demise of the early type represented at the Roman fort at Hod Hill which came to an end c. AD 50.\textsuperscript{21} It would seem that, if the relationship with the common Colchester Derivatives belonging to the Welsh Marches be a true one, the date at which such a cross-fertilization would take place should be after the full development of that type, which appears to be after AD 75 as the only specimen from The Lunt, Baginton, belongs to the earliest stage in its formation\textsuperscript{22} and dates to before c. AD 75. The general time range for the Dolphin is late first century into the second. It follows from this that the type of Headstud which has the skeuomorphic hook of the Colchester in the form of a small crest should be no earlier, as it is likely that copies would have been made of items still in manufacture, a conclusion of some interest as none of the standard Headstuds upon which the crest occurs seems to come from a satisfactorily dated context. From ditch 3.

2 The spring was held as in no. 1 except that the external chord was held by a rearward-facing hook. The wings are short and each has a moulding at the end. The bow sweeps forward from these mouldings and has an elaborately decorated surface. The main ornament is divided into two parts, each mirroring the other: a single curved ridge, starting at a boss at the bottom, runs up to touch its neighbour and then turns out to the edge of the bow, where it changes through a trumpet-like motif to recurve a short distance down the side of the bow before ending in a small boss. The lower bow is missing below the centre of an expansion of the bow on which sits part of an annular ridge running round a hollow with a rivet hole through the bow in the bottom.

No parallel is known to the writer. On the form of the wings and the spring fixing arrangements alone, the relationship of this brooch would seem to be with the Colchester Derivative found in the Welsh Marches. The relief ornament on the head is also reminiscent of that to be found on a group of Trumpet brooches whose distribution, likewise, is in the Welsh Marches.\textsuperscript{23} The same date range as for no. 1. From the rutted trackway.

3 The iron pin is hinged and its axis bar is housed in the rolled-over head of the bow. The bow has a flat section and a taper down towards the break beneath which the rest of the brooch is missing. The taper of the bow ceases just above the break and the sides expand slightly as though to accommodate some form of central feature.

The appearance of the brooch is that of a Strip brooch. However, unlike that type, the head is rolled over and not under in order to house the axis bar of the pin. Similarly, the expansion of the bow at the break suggests that there may have been some form of special central feature on the bow which, again, is not a characteristic of the Strip brooch. No good parallel is known to the writer and there are no leads as to its date. From ditch 1.

4 Only the lower bow survives. Its section is a thin rectangle and it tapers to a forward facing boss with a recessed centre in which sits an amber glass stud with a hollow in the centre.

The generally more useful part of the brooch is missing. However, there is a feature present which may be diagnostic both of the family and the date; the forward facing boss on the foot. The foot arrangement is to be found on a set of varieties which may be described as being related to the early Headstuds, except that these varieties tend to have ornament running down the bow to the foot and here the bow is plain. Nevertheless, the dating of the possibly related group may help in the present case. Four specimens come from The Lunt, Baginton, two with forward facing bosses—the other two brooches have lost the lower part of their bows.\textsuperscript{24} These all come from one pit but cannot be more closely dated than AD 60–75.\textsuperscript{25} The upper part of a similar brooch from Wall, while itself not dated, does, however, have a blue and white glass ring set in the stud.\textsuperscript{26} The use of the boss with enamelling in rectangular panels on a Headstud can be taken back to before c. AD 70,\textsuperscript{27} while a brooch from Stoke Abbot, Dorset, carried the forward-facing boss to before c. AD 60, although the connection between the brooch and any Headstud is a little obscure.\textsuperscript{28} The general range of c. 55–75 may be suggested for the period of manufacture. From ditch 3.
A complete spring with internal chord and pin whose end is missing. The form of the spring of six coils with an internal chord in a shallow arc does not suggest that it came from a Colchester Derivative but more probably from a Trumpet brooch. The date, therefore, is likely to be from the latter part of the 1st century into the 2nd. From the northern end of ditch 5. Not illustrated.

I half a spring from a Colchester Derivative. This is likely to be before the middle of the 2nd century. Otherwise it is undatable. From near the southern end of gully 2. Not illustrated.

Pin of a brooch with 4 turns left of the spring. From feature 8. Not illustrated.

Brooch spring. From feature 8 on the rutted cobbles. Not illustrated.

Other Metal Objects (FIG. 11)

Spoon handle with a pointed end for picking up food. It has been bent and snapped. Possibly silver. From the rutted cobbles of the trackway just north of the Portway.

A spindle whorl or decorated boss. The body is probably of lead, with bronze or copper leaves. There is red paint or enamel between the leaves. From ditch 1.

Bronze pin with decorated head. From ditch 5.

Eight-sided bronze finger ring. From wall-gully of polygonal building.

Bronze finger ring with a square setting for an ornamental stone or a seal. From near the causeway in ditch 5.

Curving strip of bronze of diminishing width. From ditch 5.

Bronze tag or fastener. Possibly for fixing to leather or cloth. From just under the ploughsoil over feature 8.

Bronze wire with hooked end. Possibly part of a bracelet. From feature 7. Not illustrated.


Iron Objects (FIG. 12)

Spike with small looped head. From feature 7.

Spike with loop with part of chain link corroded to it. Another part of the link was found nearby. This appears to be a tethering spike, which before corrosion was of greater length and size. From feature 7.

Split-spoke with loop. From feature 7.

Pin, probably continuing in one length to be twisted into a head which may have been a spring. This presents the possibility of it being an iron brooch. Corrosion makes certainty impossible. Alternatively it might be a horseshoe nail. From between ditch 1 and the Portway hedge.

Type of (?) nail with chisel point and peaked head. Possibly for turning after fixing into wood. From ditch 6.

Ring. May be part of horse harness. From edge of ditch 5.


Collar or ring. Probably too small for a hub. A band for a wooden handle? From ditch 5.

A sheet with 2 nail-holes. From feature 8 under M5 spoil.

Sickle or reaping hook. Much worn. From feature 7.

U-shaped hook. From near south edge of ditch 1.

A curving band, possibly from a wheel rim, with a nail head. From the northern area, at the junction of ditch 17 with feature 8.

Clamp for joining. From outer gully of polygonal building.

Latch-key. Iron Age and Roman type. From feature 7.

Half of a pair of shears. From edge of ditch 5.

Possibly a pony’s shoe, but there is no sign of nails. A narrow bar could have crossed at the rear (bottom of drawing). From ditch 19.

Hook and plate. This is probably the rear attachment of a hipposandal. From ditch 1.

Plate with vertical edge which is probably the wing of a hipposandal. From ditch 5.

Items 19 to 32 not illustrated

A worn plate with an upturned end, which may be where the hook of a hipposandal has been broken off. From ditch 5 near the southern cobbled area.
FIG. 12 Iron objects.
20 A spike with a loop. Similar to no. 2 but smaller. 78 mm long. From gully 4.
21 Smaller version of no. 1, that is a spike with a looped head; 94 mm long, but originally longer; 7 mm diameter. From gully of the polygonal building.
22 A bar 165 mm long and 6 mm diameter, thickening to 9 mm. It flattens slightly at the thick end and may be the handle of a shovel. From feature 8.
23 Small clamp similar to no. 13 but only about 50–60 mm long. From ditch 1.
24 A V-shaped piece of flat iron with arms 35 and 40 mm long. From ditch 1.
25 Small part of the handle and blade of a sickle. Unlike no. 10, this one shows evidence for a handle socket. From feature 8 under the M5 spoil.
26 Flat oval plate about 40 by 64 mm. In sand near no. 25 above.
27 The end of a solid flat bar, about 45 mm wide. From the southern cobbled area.
28 Slightly curving flat plate with 47 mm nail through it. 90 by 52 by 5 mm thick. This is probably a protective terminal for the tow-bar of a cart. It was found on the northern rutted cobbled surface with a number of horseshoes.
29 Studs from two shoes found in the gully of the polygonal building.
30 Shoe studs from ditch 4 near the south-western corner of the rectangular enclosure.
31 Studs from sandal found upside-down on the northern edge of ditch 5 near the southern cobbled area.
32 Shoe studs found in small gully off the wall gully of the polygonal building.

The Horseshoes

The remains of 32 horseshoes were found on the site; of these 26 were within an area with a radius of less than 4 m on the northern cobbled trackway, with its cartwheel ruts, implying an association with draught animals. These cobbles were covered with a thick deposit of sand which sealed the trackway and the surrounding area. This natural phenomenon has been discussed above and is shown in section on FIG. 6. Among the cobbles were several horseshoes, abraded Roman pottery and two Roman objects – part of a brooch (no. 2) and the handle of a spoon (no. 8). These pieces may have come from Roman deposits since destroyed by erosive action; or they may have become lodged amongst the cobbles at any time after they were laid down and before the deposition of the sand. The only statement as to date that can be made from stratigraphical evidence is that the levels under the trackways on which the horseshoes were found contained only Roman material. This does not give a firm Roman date for the rutted surfaces. Furthermore, because the horseshoes themselves are not datable by typological means, they do not help in dating this upper surface. Such a quantity and variety of horseshoes found in a small area makes it more likely that they were deposited after the Roman period, though some of them may be Roman in a residual context. In spite of the horseshoes being the only objects found on the upper surface which could conceivably be medieval, a post-Roman date would be more acceptable for at least the upper rutted surface of the track. This would allow for the possibility of the lower cobbles being a late Roman trackway. The layers below this, of black silty clay containing Roman pottery, included, as can be seen in the sections, at least one stone surface which may be the original trackway. If this is correct a few of the horseshoes may be Roman and the remainder early medieval. The main concentration lay where the track crossed the swampy area. They collected here only because they fell off at this point, and may have accumulated over a long period of time. It is possible that some are as late as the 13th century, but an earlier date in the sub-Roman or Anglo-Saxon period is more likely.

Some excavators have identified horseshoes as being in use in the Roman period and there has been controversy as to what types, if any, were used before the medieval period. The Portway horseshoes are varied and it is difficult to sort them into categories. Most have calkins, which are the down-turned ends of each branch of the shoe. The wavy edge type of shoe had fiddle-key nails, which were found not only in the shoes, but scattered on the site, usually near the line of the Portway. The combination of calkins and this type of nail, which projected below the shoe, was used to give the horse purchase when pulling a heavy load on slippery uneven ground. On a hard paved surface, such as would be found in a town, they would be a hindrance. Thus the form of shoe is conditioned by use. When nail-holes are made, the soft metal
FIG. 13 Iron horseshoes.
is forced away from the hole. If the hole is near the edge of the shoe, a 'wavy' outline will be created unless a firm barrier stops the soft metal spreading, which might not be considered necessary. So a wavy outline might be purely incidental. Similarly with the V-shaped arch, this may be merely the result of the method of manufacture and not intentional design.

All these factors make dating on style and form difficult, and no final statement can be made as to which of the Portway shoes are Roman or not. They are small and would not have been suitable for the larger type of horse introduced after the 13th century. The shoes are linked with the cobbles among which they were embedded. Some were found in the clay where the cobbles were absent at the top of the rise. This is just where the horses would be exerting their major effort to pull the load out of the soft, wet ground. What is more, two shoes were found in the clay tilted with their fore-part stuck downwards (nos. 24 and 29). This evidence, preserved at a moment of time, combined with the cart-ruts, supports the theory that there was a sudden flow of a mass of sand down what had previously been a natural gully with a spring.

Two pieces of horseshoe were more closely associated with Roman features: no. 27, in gully 2 near feature 7; and no. 28, near the edge of ditch 1. They could have found their way into these positions at a post-Roman date, as they were not far from the line of the Portway. On the other hand a Roman road may have followed the same route previously. Supporting the theory of an early route through the site are a few horseshoe nails between ditch 1 and the Portway and other finds from the site, such as parts of carts (iron objects nos. 7 and 12) and hippo sandals (FIG. 12, nos. 17 and 18).

**List of horseshoes (FIG. 13)**

(because of corrosion measurements are approximate)

1. Large complete shoe, 6 mm thick. No visible nails or holes. Calkins. It is uniformly encrusted with small angular grits from the orange grit layer lying over the basic Blue Lias clay. Found on the natural bed at the top of the rutted cobbled slope south of the Portway-cut in the hedgerow.

2. Two separate branches have been drawn as if forming one shoe, one of the calkins having corroded away. Like no. 1 the corrosion is full of orange grit and yellow sand. Found at the top of the cobbled slope.

3. This evenly-shaped type with no calkins, 8 mm thick, was encrusted with grit similar to nos. 1 and 2 and had fiddle-key nails. The shape is usual for shoes of medieval date. Found below the Portway surface.

4. Half shoe with a limestone cobbled stuck to it. Found in cobbles of the sunken Portway.

5. This half shoe was also found in the disturbed cobbles of the recent Portway surface.

Nos. 6 to 26 and 29 to 32 were all associated with the northern, rutted cobbled trackway; found either on the surface embedded among the cobbles, or in the yellow clay at the top of the slope, or where the surface had been broken up at its edges.

6. This is presumed to be a horseshoe. Either corrosion has resulted in its being round in section, or it was made this way, possibly as an experiment. There is evidence for 3 nails in one branch and 2 on the other. It is encrusted with yellow sand and grit.

7. A narrow shoe showing the wavy outline and the heads of fiddle-key nails. Faint impressions of corroded calkins.

8. This shoe shows a fiddle-key nail protruding about 18 mm, and a small turned-over calkin.

9. A long calkin, now folded flat, was presumably made to protrude in its original state.

10. A good example of the small wavy-outline type with prominent nails and calkin. Found on the surface of the cobbled trackway.

11. A broad shoe, possibly an ox shoe.

12. This is one of the few shoes where the nail-holes are not entirely corroded over and are faintly discernible as rectangular or oval. A medieval shape.

13. The branch is broken so that the calkin end is missing. A fiddle-key nail, protruding 28 mm, is bent over, as are 3 others which have lost their heads.

14. A solid, even shoe encrusted with yellow sand and brown grits. No holes visible; one obviously had a nail in it 8 mm thick.

15. Bent at the top of the arch, it has 2 prominent nails.

16. Only 2 mm thick, broad and small; this may be for a pony. Three nails, one with a large head protruding 14 mm from the shoe.

17. This shoe has a pointed arch like no. 1. It has prominent bent-over calkins. Seven mm thick. Like no. 1 it may be medieval.


19. Small piece of a wavy-outline shoe with fiddle-key nails. In the cobbled.

20. This shoe was found at a depth of 1 m from the modern surface in grey silt where the cobbled trackway dips to cross the bed of the natural gully.

21. A complete shoe with 2 nail-holes not corroded over and a fiddle-key nail detached. In the cobbled.

22. A complete shoe. The nail-holes show as distinct depressions. Only one contains a piece of a nail. In the cobbled.
FIG. 14 Objects of stone (a and f), clay (b, c, and d), and bone (e).
A lighter type, wavy outline, showing a slight depression which may have been a groove for nail-holes, though these are entirely corroded over with the remains of nails obscuring any detail. Found in the yellow clay at the top of the slight rise where the cobbles of the trackway end.

Two other examples of the wavy outline type. Found in positions similar to no. 23. These shoes could have come off as the horse exerted all its force to pull a cart out of the swampy area near the spring.

This shoe has a nail bent over to form a hook. A fiddle-key nail is illustrated next to this item.

Two small pieces of horseshoe are significant because they were found some distance from the others and in association with positive Roman features. No. 27 was in gully 2 near feature 7, no. 28 was found near the edge of ditch 1 west of the causeway across that ditch.

Not illustrated

Part of a horseshoe with a nail and a cobble (35 by 20 mm) corroded to it. In the cobbling.

Small piece of shoe. In the cobbling.

A wavy outline shoe with fiddle-key nails. This came from the yellow clay where nos. 24 and 25 were found and was pressed into the mud in a position where it could have been lost by a draught animal pulling a load over sticky ground.

A small piece of shoe with a nail bent over. In the cobbling.

Lead

A sheet of lead c. 60 × 60 mm folded over twice. This could have been a defixio, though only a few scratch marks are visible. From the south-western cobbling.

Rivet in SV sherd. From the gully of the polygonal building.

Rivet for the repair of a BB ware cooking pot. From ditch 6.

The Coins

The few coins found in the excavations were heavily corroded and not very informative. Nos. 1 to 4 are unidentifiable except that they are the right size for 3rd or 4th century date. From ditch 1.

A barbarous radiate. From beside ditch 1.

As above very corroded and illegible. From near ditch 1.

A radiate type. From the disturbed sunken Portway area.

A Constantinian type commemorative coin of AD 330-346. From the southern cobbled area.

A copy of a Claudius II issue and therefore later than AD 270. Found in the south-eastern area near gully 23.

Possibly Constantinian. Found with disturbed burnt stones in feature 21 in the northern area.

An illegible coin from above deposit in ditch 17.

Glass

The glass was very fragmertary and only a few vessels could be identified.

Base of bowl. Colourless. From south-western cobbled area (FIG. 11, gl. 1).

Rim of jar. Blue. From the south-eastern area (FIG. 11, gl. 2).

Part of a handle from a bottle or flask. Blue-green. From gully 11.

Small curving piece in pale green showing a raised trail. From ditch 4.

A flat green piece with a rounded edge which may possibly be a piece of window glass. Opaque. From feature 8.

A small pale green piece showing 3 faces of a polygonal vessel, the central face being 16 mm wide; possibly from a scent bottle. From between ditches 3 and 5.


Four turquoise beads, 2 mm in diameter. From ditch 1.

A flattened cylindrical green bead, 6 mm long, 2.5 mm across. From ditch 4.
Worked Bone

1. Part of a small handle, possibly of a knife, decorated with an incised lattice pattern (FIG. 14, e).
2. The head of a bone pin. Similar in shape to bronze item no. 10, but with the 3 parallel grooves near the top end. From gully 2.

Clay Items

1. RPG tile stamp from a tegula. It shows the faint impression of wood grain from the stamp die. From gully 2 near feature 7 (FIG. 14, b).
2. Tile stamp from an imbrex impressed PP. This may be an RPG stamp with a damaged R. Found in ditch 1, west of the causeway, in two parts, 3 m apart (FIG. 14, c).

Pieces of both tegulae and imbric tiles were found in most ditches. The impression of a dog's paw was found on a tile from feature 7 (FIG. 14, d).

Stone Items

Tiles

Pieces of stone tile were spread across the site. Stone tiles generally replace clay tiles in the middle of the Roman period in the Gloucestershire area. This supports the view that the site was continuously occupied. Most of the tiles were of Old Red Sandstone, probably from west of the Severn.

Stone bar

This piece of Lias Limestone shaped as for a fire-bar of a pottery kiln has been intensely burnt so that it is cracked and eroded along the laminations of the rock. From feature 8 near the northern cobbled track under the M5 spoil (FIG. 14, f).

Shale

Fragment of a flat, 20 mm thick, ring of about 35 mm diameter. From ditch 11.

Sculptured Relief of a Head in Limestone (FIG. 14, a and PLATE II)

This is the most important find from the site. It gives definite evidence for a cult centre, supporting the interpretation of the ground features. It is made of Oolite limestone which outcrops about 2 miles from the site near the top of the Cotswold escarpment. Other pieces of similar limestone were found nearby, and may have been other parts of a broken monument, although none showed identifiable carving. The head lay in ditch 1, at the point nearest to the 'porch' of the possible temple.

Dr Martin Henig has kindly studied the relief and contributes the following report:

Although the face is missing, there is enough of the piece remaining to show that it was a work of high standard, indeed comparable with some of the finest products of the Corinium region. Lack of detail here as elsewhere is due to the relative coarseness of the oolite compared with marble and not to any lack of skill by the sculptor. The curls which cascade downwards below the figure's hat are especially reminiscent of those which frame a head of Mercury from Cirencester. There the cap was a Petasos, but the Portway head is crowned by a peaked 'Phrygian-type' of headgear and this cannot belong to a statuette of Mercury.

Ralph Merrifield has been making a study of a small group of figures from London, each of which wears a Phrygian cap. One of them, discovered recently in Southwark, beneath the Cathedral, is depicted with a hound and a deer. A second, from the site of the Goldsmiths' Hall, previously identified as Diana, portrays a hunter and a dog. The third, found at Bevis Marks,
originally thought to be Atys, has no animal attribute, but the youth holds a bow and must be a huntsman.

These putative hunting deities are not confined to London, and a striking example where the god may be wearing the same ‘Phrygian-type’ cap was found at Chedworth. In none of these cases is the identity of the huntsman certain, but Merrifield has suggested (pers. comm.) that he might be Maponus. However, it is at least likely that, as far as iconography is concerned, there has been some conflation with an oriental deity such as Atys or even Mithras (and I have suggested elsewhere that there may be a connexion with the Trojan prince, Aeneas, one of the founding fathers of Rome and her Empire). It is thus possible that the Portway head gives a clue as to the nature of the cult practised at the site, and that, as at Chedworth, ‘the temple’ was dedicated to a god of hunting."

Querns

Some dozen pieces of stone querns were found on the site. Most of these are of Forest of Dean sandstone conglomerate.

Human bones

Part of a human cranium, showing the eye-sockets and forehead. Found about 500 mm deep in feature 7.
Animal Bones

Those studied here came from the ditches, throughout which they were fairly uniformly scattered. The date of deposit in features must have been from the 3rd into the first half of the 4th century.

Barbara Noddle reports:

The bones were in an excellent state of preservation, although they were fragmented and there was some root damage. A total of 355 fragments were identified from 7 species, all domestic, except for 5 red deer. Expressed as percentages, the species count was as follows: cattle 57, sheep 20, horse 17, dog 3, red deer 2, pig 1, and goat less than 1. The goat may be under-represented as its bones often cannot be distinguished from those of sheep, and were counted as sheep. Another way of apportioning species is to estimate the minimum number of individuals (using Grayson's method). For this purpose it was assumed that the bones coming from different ditches originated from different individuals. Expressed in this way, the proportions are as follows: cattle 35%, sheep 31%, horse 18%, dog 8%, red deer 5%, pig 2%, and goat 1%, the order being the same but the sheep increased at the expense of cattle. However, too much numerical precision is spurious in such a small sample as this. Compared with other Roman sites both in this area and elsewhere, the proportion of horse is high and that of pig very low. This might result in part from the nature of the site; the bones of large animals tend to be disposed of in ditches rather than pigs. The almost complete absence of pig may be more apparent than real; the meat of these animals might have been salted and the carcass boned out in some sort of workshop with its own bone dump. Chutton-Brock has suggested this for Saxon Britain. Salt appears to have been taken in quantity from Droitwich to Claydon Pike, where it may well have been used in salting meat; the main meat produced here was again apparently beef.

Some idea of the site economy may be gained from the age range of the animals. Rearing animals for their carcases only is expensive, and the consumption of elderly animals, which had already produced offspring, labour, wool, etc., is more economical. On the other hand very young animals would not have given good carcases since livestock of this period is much slower growing than that of the present century, so that young animals might have been casualties or anticipated casualties. These groups are designed mature, immature, and juvenile respectively. At Portway the cattle (30 aged individuals) were: juvenile 9%, immature 33%, and mature 58%, with no newborn individuals, a fairly typical Romano-British result. With sheep (21 aged individuals) the results were: juvenile 4%, immature 48%, and mature 48%, again typical of the period. Of 6 horses that could be aged, 5 were mature and 1 immature; this gives little indication as to whether horses were bred or merely worked on the premises, but a general absence of newborn animals suggests this was a site where animals were consumed rather than produced.

Further information can be gained from the anatomical composition of the sample. Head elements were represented almost entirely by loose teeth and mandible, that is to say that the fragile skull had disintegrated elsewhere and this was a secondary bone deposit. Bones deriving from the good meat parts were outnumbered by the less edible parts of feet, loose teeth, etc.; the actual numbers are, among cattle, 52 meat bones and 105 ‘waste’ bones or teeth, and for other animals combined there were 41 meat bones and 98 waste. Possibly other meat bones were fragmented beyond recognition for the extraction of fat, or at least deposited elsewhere.

A considerable proportion of the bone fragments could be measured, which was carried out according to the recommendations of Von den Driesch. The results of this are set out below, included in a description of the individual animal species.

Cattle. Since no horn cores were found, a description of type cannot be given. However, the cattle were of moderate size, typical of Romano-British stock.

Dimensions of Cattle Bones (in mm)

a) Whole bones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proximal Width</th>
<th>Distal Width</th>
<th>Midshaft Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacarpal</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metatarsal</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Fragments of bones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Part measured</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower 3rd molar</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>34, 35 (3), 36, 37 (2), 38, 39, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scapula</td>
<td>Min. width neck</td>
<td>45, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>Distal width</td>
<td>76, 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>Prox. width</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacarpal</td>
<td>Prox. width</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>Distal width</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus</td>
<td>Max. length</td>
<td>55, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metatarsal</td>
<td>Prox. width</td>
<td>40 (2), 41, 42, 45 (2), 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st phalanx</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>48, 52, 55, 58, 59, 60, 61 (2), 63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figure in brackets indicates how many times the preceding measurement occurred.

Calculations based on dimensions of 2 astragalus indicate body weights of 155 and 196 kg (using Noddle's method).

**Sheep.** There is also little to be said about the sheep, other than that they appear to have been of uniform size, again typical of the Romano-British range. Actual bone measurements are as follows:

a) Whole bones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proximal Width</th>
<th>Distal Width</th>
<th>Midshaft Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metacarpal</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Parts of bones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Part measured</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower 3rd molar</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>20, 21 (2), 22 (3), 23 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>Distal width</td>
<td>25, 26, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>Prox. width</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>Distal width</td>
<td>25, 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Horse.** A number of complete horse bones was found, rather more proportionately than those of cattle. There is thus a slight suggestion that horses were not subjected to the same form of butchery as cattle. The bones indicate animals of large pony size, again typical of the period.

The dimensions are as follows:

a) Whole bones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Proximal Width</th>
<th>Distal Width</th>
<th>Midshaft Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metacarpal</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibia</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metatarsal</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Parts of bones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bone</th>
<th>Part measured</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humerus</td>
<td>Distal width</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radius</td>
<td>Distal width</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st phalanx</td>
<td>Length</td>
<td>79, 87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dog.** The only measurable bones of dog were the carnassial teeth. These were: upper carnassial 21, 24, and 24 mm, and a single lower carnassial 21 mm. These indicate animals of the size of a fox terrier and perhaps a collie.

**Red deer.** There was a single measurable bone from red deer, a scapula neck, minimum width 52 mm. This represents a large animal, presumably male. Red deer of this period were much larger than present day British specimens.48

**Pathology and abnormality**

Among the cattle one common abnormality was not observed, the absence of a posterior cusp in the lower 3rd molar. A
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1st phalanx showed signs of high ringbone and a 3rd phalanx had a cleft in the articular surface extending to nearly half its width. These phenomena are further described by Baker and Brothwell. The condition of the 3rd phalanx is thought to be the result of rapid, possibly compensatory, growth.

The smaller of the two partial dog skulls had cramped teeth, possibly the result of malnutrition. A 3rd molar was present on the left side, but only a vestigial one on the right.

A red deer scapula exhibited an exostosis, possibly the result of a torn ligament.

Conclusion
This bone collection, though small, contains quite a lot of information. Because it comes only from ditches, the species data may not be typical of the whole site. Otherwise the bones seem typical of other Romano-British material from this area.
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